

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

SPECIAL MEETING

SIXTEENTH DAY

NOVEMBER 4, 2009

OPERATING BUDGET

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

**VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT TAKEN BY
LUCIA BRAATEN AND ALISON MAHONEY, COURT REPORTERS**

**TRANSCRIBED BY
ALISON MAHONEY AND KIMBERLY CASTIGLIONE**

***[THE FOLLOWING WAS TAKEN BY LUCIA BRAATEN-COURT REPORTER AND TRANSCRIBED
BY KIMBERLY CASTIGLIONE, LEGISLATIVE SECRETARY]***

[THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 11:00 A.M.]

P.O. LINDSAY:

Mr. Clerk, would you call the roll, please?

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk)

LEG. ROMAINE:

Present.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Here.

LEG. BROWNING:

Here.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Here.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

(Not Present)

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Here.

LEG. MONTANO:

Here.

LEG. ALDEN:

Here.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Here.

LEG. KENNEDY:

(Not Present)

LEG. NOWICK:

Here.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Here.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Here.

LEG. GREGORY:

Here.

LEG. STERN:

Here.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Here.

LEG. COOPER:

Here.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Present.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Here.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Could everyone rise for a salute to the flag, led by Legislator Nowick?

*(*Salutation*)*

And if you'd remain standing, and if Legislator Nowick could come and introduce visiting Clergy.

LEG. NOWICK:

Good morning, everybody. It's with great pleasure that I bring to you today Father Tony Stanganelli. Father Tony is the tenth Pastor of Saint Philip and James Roman Catholic Church in Saint James, and I think I've been through most of them myself. He was appointed Pastor in June of 2008. He was ordained a priest in March 1979. Father Tony has served as an Associate Pastor in Our Lady of Lourdes in West Islip, Saint Edward's in Syosett, Saint Catherine's of Sienna in Franklin Square, Saint Philip Neri in Northport, and prior to his present appointment, he was the Pastor of Holy Spirit in New Hyde Park. In addition, Father Tony taught in the college seminary and has also received a Licentiate in Sacred Theology. That's from the Gregorian Pontifical University of Rome. Please welcome Father Tony.

*(*Applause*)*

FATHER STANGANELLI:

Thank you, Legislator Nowick. Once again, I just invite you to bow your heads as we gather in this moment of prayer and continuing to recognize that we come together as servants, as people who truly want to see a vision and a plan unfold for our community. Let us pray.

Dear God, you have assembled here before you this day these men and women whom you have called to a life of service to this community. Beyond the call to be accountable to constituents, they are accountable to a higher power, a greater authority. You, who have bestowed upon all of us the task and the duty to bring about unity, a cohesiveness through which your great work can be accomplished. Dear God, the work at times can be so difficult, and I ask you this day to shield us from all discouragement, especially when it seems that our efforts do not achieve the goals which we have sought. We know that it is you alone who sees our every effort and blesses each effort. We may never see the fruits of what we have labored for, but we trust that you will bring to fruition every honest labor that we put forth. Through the grace that you alone can bestow upon us, help us in our work to bring about your vision for this great County. Consecrate us to the truth so that we may exercise our office with integrity. Help us to be diligent in fighting for the causes that enhance the dignity and the welfare of all people of every race and language, especially those who feel that they do not have a voice in this world today. May we be open to bring about your great designs in all that we do. We ask this in your name, faithful God, Father of us all, Amen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

If everyone would remain standing for a moment of silence. On October 26th, Staff Sergeant Keith R. Bishop, who was 28 years old, of Medford, who was one of seven soldiers who lost their lives in the crash of the helicopter in Afghanistan. Let us remember our fallen son, and let us also remember all the men and women who put themselves in harm's way every day to protect our country.

*(*Moment of Silence*)*

Good morning, everyone. First, I want to start off by congratulating the Legislators that won last night's re-election. It was a long night. At times campaigns don't resemble reality, but we're back to reality this morning because we've got a real tough budget to examine and to look at and to go through. And while I'm at it, I really appreciate the work of the bipartisan Working Group that spent a long, long time dissecting every piece of this budget and making their decisions with a lot of thought. And I also want to thank the Budget Review staff for the wonderful job that they did in assisting us in this long process.

(Applause)

Like all of our meetings, we have a one-hour public portion, and I have a number of cards and each speaker is allotted three minutes. All right? First up is Robert Mitchell.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee --

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

You have to hold the button down. You'll see the light light up.

MR. MITCHELL:

Okay. Congratulations. I'm the Attorney in charge of the Legal Aid Society and we've submitted our budget, and you gentlemen -- and I've lobbied every one of you, so I won't -- I'll try not to be redundant.

I understand that we're in the omnibus package for half a million dollars which allows us to continue. It does not allow us to give out any raises, though. We needed another 136,000. I'm not trying to look a gift horse in the mouth, but I just want to make you aware of that.

In addition to that, it had just come to my attention that we have a Senior Citizens Division and we are funded 218,000 by the Federal Government. I understand that, according to the omnibus, that 218,000 is being transferred to Touro Law School and the contract will go to Touro Law School.

Now, I have George Roach in the audience and I also have the Dean of the school. It's my understanding that when George agreed to go to Touro, he was under the impression he was bringing his staff, which is four people, two attorneys and two paralegals. Now, it turns out we have to fire the four of them, and he's going to go over to Touro. Touro does not have the money to fund this program, they do not have the expertise. We're going to have to make a lot of motions and get of cases that we're representing people on foreclosures. It's going to be a disaster, but I understand this is a fait accompli.

The Dean is here now. If you'd like to speak to him, he's right here. Well, at this point, he doesn't have anything to say, I gather. George, you want to say?

That's basically what I have to say. My general budget is what it is. And the senior citizens I'm really worried about now because you're not going to be able to support the program or these cases. What am I supposed to do with them? Who is going to take these cases?

P.O. LINDSAY:

You're here to make a statement, Bob.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

You can't have a dialogue.

MR. MITCHELL:

Thank you very much.

P.O. LINDSAY:

George Roach.

MR. ROACH:

Presiding Officer Lindsay, Members of the Legislature who won re-election, congratulations. I've been here before, and I'm the Chief Attorney for the Legal Aid Society Senior Citizen Division, and I've been in that position for the past 30 years. This contract to provide the legal services to the senior citizens to Suffolk County, the Legal Aid Society's had it for the past 35 years. I don't think there's any complaints about the program in that our program, the way we run it for the past 30 years that I've been there, it's been a model for the New York State Office for the Aging. They want to run their Legal Services Program exactly the way we run it down here and provide the type of representation that we provide to the over 250,000 senior citizens who reside here, your constituents. We handle cases that as Legislators you send over to our office. They're a problem case, you call us up and we take it, but you never see the result. People in these economic times they're losing their homes, either for a judgment or a foreclosure. If you say to somebody, "Look, you're losing your home, what's the choice?" I can send you to a legal clinic at a law school and be represented by a law student, or I can have you represented by somebody with 30 years of experience in this field. I think the choice is simple, that's a no-brainer. And by not funding this program and moving it somewhere else, essentially you've told the senior citizens of this County you are simply not worth quality representation.

And now, as a result of this, we're going to have to lay off four people and we have five, it's just going to be me. That money covers just me, so essentially, the program is terminated and the legal ramifications are, as Bob said, we have a lot of cases we're going to have to get out of, all right, and it's not going to be a pretty sight for these people. And you're really, in my opinion, throwing them to the wolves. And that's about all I have to say this morning. Thank you very much for 30 years of service.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Mary Finnin.

MS. FINNIN:

Good morning. Congratulations. I'm here today --

P.O. LINDSAY:

You've got to hold your hand on the button.

MS. FINNIN:

Good morning and congratulations. I'm here today as a registered nurse and a resident of the Central Islip community. I am requesting that you reinstate or restore the funding for the Central Islip Clinic. It's a little over a million dollars. That money was taken out of the budget with the plan that the patients would be sent by December 15th to the Brentwood Health Center. Brentwood Health Center is already overcrowded, understaffed, inadequate parking and transportation. Most of the patients at both of these clinics are from minority groups. In Central Islip, 85% of our OB patients are Hispanic, and we've had an increase in teen pregnancy in the Central Islip and Brentwood area. We need the services for women and children in this center and to add another

over 12,000 annual visits to the Brentwood Health Center is just setting them up to fail. We need this center.

The HEAL money was to be spent to build a state-of-the-art Regional Health Center for Brentwood, Central Islip and Bay Shore. That's what that money was for, not to build a few extra exam rooms at a rented facility in Brentwood where then the owner can raise your rent because you've upgraded the facility. We need this center for the residents of Central Islip and we're requesting that you please restore it. They do not have the -- have not made the changes that are necessary to absorb these patients and we have a problem with transportation, even when that happens. Please restore the funds and put back into the plan the Regional Health Center for those three communities. Thank you very much.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Looks like Ms. Mulry. Am I pronouncing this correct? Mulry? Lauratte. Lauratte Mulry?

MS. MULRY:

Right here.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay.

MS. MULRY:

Good morning. I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Lauratte Mulry. I am a staff attorney at the Legal Aid Society, Senior Citizens Division, and I just want to reiterate what Bob Mitchell and George Roach so eloquently spoke about in that we provided a great service for the senior citizens of this County. We handled tens of thousands of cases over the last ten years that I have worked for Legal Aid, and in many different areas of law, not just traditional elder law, and, in fact, many of our County's agencies often referred cases to us. We have many cases with Adult Protective Services, with Social Services, even the Judiciary themselves have referred cases to us, realizing that these senior citizens need the legal representation and/or advice in order to be able to navigate a legal case.

When I say we've done representation, we've done representation in many different arenas in court, not just in court. We do arbitrations, mediations, we've been in fair hearings. And we assure that the senior citizen's voice is heard. Unfortunately, in this economic downturn, our volume of cases has shot up dramatically as you can well imagine. We have at least assisted those senior citizens, especially with regard to mortgage foreclosure cases and identity theft and different areas of denial of any types of government programs such as Medicaid and Social Services.

In fact, Legislator Stern, you will recall I presented many times before your Task Force meetings the summer before last, where I talked about many of the more salient issues that are affecting senior citizens in this County. And unfortunately, I'm in landlord tenant court a lot more than I'd like to be because it is definitely happening that we have seniors who are being evicted in this County. So I hope that you will find at least a little more money to allow us to be able to carry forth the program as we have known it thus far. We are happy to include Touro and continue to work with Touro.

I, in fact, am an adjunct professor over at Touro. I love what they're doing over there. They have really involved a more practical experience for the students at Touro, and I think that there's a lot that we can do to utilize the young legal scholars there in helping the seniors of this County. So, again, I want to thank you. I hope that you will help us to find the money to be able to continue to run the program as it has been run. Thank you very much.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Nancy Manfredonia.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Good morning. I have a letter from the Central Islip Civic Council. My name is Nancy Manfredonia. I'm the Executive Director of the Central Islip Civic Council. I am also a resident, a long-time resident of Central Islip. I would like to just briefly read into the record our letter.

"I am dismayed to hear about the imminent closure of the Central Islip Health Center. I can only conclude that there's been confusion about the timing and consequences of this action.

The facts are that the Brentwood Health Center is seriously overcrowded and cannot possibly handle an influx of the 12,000 Central Islip clients at this time. The Central Islip Civic Council is not opposed to the eventual consolidation of these centers, as long as the welfare of the clients takes precedence.

I'm sure that none of you want to endanger the health of the lower income teens, families and seniors from our predominantly minority communities or to overwhelm local emergency room facilities. The promised improvement or expansion of the Brentwood Center or a new center has not been done. It is imperative that you provide the funding to extend the operation of the Central Islip Center until provisions can be made to properly handle the Central Islip clients at Brentwood."

And, as an aside, I must tell you that the Central Islip Civic Council, as our local nonprofit, sees clients every day who use the Central Islip Health Center. I can't stress enough that the center is convenient for people, the seniors who live right around the block, the students from the Central Islip High School that go there. And I believe I want to reiterate what Ms. Finnin mentioned, that the monies that were supposed to be used to create a state-of-the-art Regional Center have not been used. And we just think it would be unconscionable at this point to close Central Islip with absolutely no way to handle the excess people at Brentwood. Brentwood is absolutely busting at the seams. So I hope you will please consider this request and put the money back in the budget. Thank you for your consideration.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Gail D'Ambrosio. Gail D'Ambrosio.

MS. D'Ambrosio:

Good morning. My name is Gail D'Ambrosio and I am the President of the Suffolk County Probation Officers Association and a Senior Probation for the Probation Department. I'm speaking on behalf of our 274 POA members regarding the abolishment of three senior Probation Officer positions in 2010 budget. One of these positions is from our Day Reporting Center, DRC. DRC is an alternative to incarceration mandated program for the drug and/or alcohol addicted ages 16 and older. Its current population is predominantly young heroin users. It costs approximately \$42 per day for each person on probation to be supervised on DRC, compared to \$268 per day in jail. In DRC the probationer can work, get his or her high school diploma and live at home. Suffolk County can be proud to offer their residents such a comprehensive and proactive program.

I believe heroin use, especially among our youth, is rising. It's just a matter of time before we have more arrests and more convictions. At the last full Legislature meeting I was asked if an increase of probationers would occur as a result of the Rockefeller Drug Laws. There are two senior probation officers to handle the projected amount of probations based on prior years. However, I'm inclined to believe that the number will rapidly increase.

When Probation Officers voted overwhelmingly to accept a wage deferral to help the County in a time of fiscal crisis, they did so not only to protect their members from being laid off, but also to preserve 37 vacant positions from being abolished. We appreciate how important it is to public safety to be well staffed. We understand the difficulty the County Executive and the Legislature have in dealing with the current discrepancy projected for sales tax revenue and where to make appropriate cuts. However, once these Peace Officer positions are abolished, they are gone. It is not that they are not needed. They are senior positions, who deal with the more intensive caseloads

and work with the more at-risk of incarceration population. We need these positions so that our more experienced Probation Officers can be moved into them. I'm asking for these positions not to be abolished. In the event there's an unexpected influx of revenue we would ask these positions be filled. Having these vacation positions available saves money in the long run and prevents us from having to start all over.

I'd like to thank you and the Budget Review Office for recognizing our concerns, that to transfer our Automation Unit to the Department of Information Technology Services would negatively impact the safety of our Peace Officers and the public. Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Thank you. Frank Lombardi.

MR. LOMBARDI:

Thank you for having me. I'm Frank Lombardi. I'm the Director of the IGHL Foundation. I'm also here to represent the families of TWA Flight 800, who are asking you to consider restoring the \$25,000 grant to help maintain the Flight 800 Memorial down at Smith Point County Park.

I just want to quickly -- I know each of you received letters from the families, but I wanted to put things in perspective. The actual cost of maintaining the memorial is closer to \$150,000 a year. The \$25,000 is just a small portion of what we do down there, and we're able to offset the remaining cost through volunteer workforce, as well as inkind donations and monetary donations.

It takes approximately 7,000 hours of labor to work down at the memorial, and we incorporate through this grant programs for 60 developmentally disabled people, which would be directly affected if this money is not put back in the grant. These are disabled people that, through the Flight 800 Memorial, are able to be gainfully employed in a very public situation so that they've given back to the community.

We also utilize three dozen Red Cross community service volunteers, as well as two dozen workfare people from the Department of Labor, who are people who are in economic distress who aren't able to work, as well as the SLAP Program from Sheriff DeMarco's SLAP Program.

Now there's a couple of other figures that -- I'm not sure if you've all been down to the memorial, but that memorial generates, by the Suffolk County Parks Department estimate, 200,000 additional visitors to Smith Point County Park, which is helping that park generate additional revenue for the County.

We're also able to maintain the memorial significantly at a reduced cost than the Parks Department would be able to, mainly because who the flight 800 families are, through their donations and had -- if the Parks Department were able to take over some of the maintenance efforts, I'm not sure if people would want to donate materials and/or time and labor to Suffolk County as opposed to the Flight 800 Family Association.

We've also been able to make the park as a whole a much nicer park. We've landscaped your building down there, both sides of the building, as well as some areas across the parking lot as well.

Having said that, I understand you guys have a tough and challenging job ahead of you and cuts need to be made somewhere. The families last month did announce the establishment of an endowment, and we are working towards making the memorial financially sufficient. However, we do need some time to do that, and we're asking you to consider reinstating the \$25,000 in this year's budget. Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Mary Ann Spencer.

MS. SPENCER:

Good morning. I'm Mary Ann Spencer, a member of the CEO, and I Chair the Suffolk County Historic Trust. I am here this morning to speak to Budget Amendment 11, which restores the funding for historic services to the Parks Department. This is -- this is crucial. In the past, the hotel/motel tax has provided some funds to help in restoring properties that belong to Suffolk County. It was not meant to supplant historic services. And by moving the Operating Budget line into hotel/motel you're supplanting historic services and decreasing their budget.

I brought with me something that you all have, it was given to all of you. This is the historic structure survey of 49 of the County's over 200 historic properties. If you look in the back of this survey, just to stabilize and secure these 49 properties is over 4 million dollars. So the need is well established, it's profound. And I do understand that this is a tough year, but I would ask that you at least support historic services in their efforts to maintain, secure, and stabilize the structures that belong to the County.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Jay Veranco.

MR. VERANCO:

Good morning. My name is Jay Veranco. I'm a resident of Port Jefferson, a 16-year veteran of the Police Department, 24-year veteran of the military service, and Iraqi veteran, disabled veteran, and number one on the current Sergeant's exam. Driving here this morning I said to myself, "What could I talk to this Body about that already hasn't been beaten down regarding this list?" And I settled on the integrity of Civil Service lists.

I talked with Mr. Alan Schneider, as you all know is the Civil Service Director, last week and he brought this up. Why do we even go through the process of giving a written test for anything in Civil Service? Why don't we just appoint friends and relatives and others to positions that are open and let it go at that? We do that to -- because this is a democracy still and we attempt to have a level playing field for all to rise and be promoted and move through jobs in Civil Service. As you realize, in the Police Department the only way to be promoted is by a 90 question test which is giving, there are 25 rules and procedures questions, added with seniority and in my case veterans and disabled points. That's your score. My score is about 107 point something. Realizing that on this list if they make any promotions, you probably won't get down to people that got less than 100, 100.

Suffolk County is known for the difficulty in getting promoted because of the competition on this job. We have -- this is not the department of my father, who was from Glen Cove, where back in the day if you got a 70, a score of 70 in 1970 you were made, and they made promotions as vacancies occurred. It's come now to where next week, Wednesday at 23:59 hours on Veterans Day, how ironic, that this list will die, maybe with no promotions on it.

The rung to the promotion or the rank of Sergeant has been broken on this job. Since November, 2007, 26 promotions have been made in the ranks of Lieutenant and above. Well over 100 {A and E} positions have been made. Some Detectives have been made. We're the only rank not represented, and the most crucial rank is Sergeant. Sergeant. That's the guy who watches the guys on the streets to ensure that civil rights are protected, to ensure that officers are doing their job. How do you fly without that? How do you do anything? A twenty-four year military veteran, I was an enlisted man and commissioned officer. I had a company commander. I look at that and say, "How can you operate like that?" You can't. So it boils down to if you take all other things out, why are those promotions not being made? Is it money? No, other promotions were made. It has to be something else. We can answer -- you know, we can draw our own conclusions for that.

In closing, I just wanted to say that, you know, in the past the opportunities were there, and if they thought that this list was not going to be used they shouldn't have given a test in June. They should have extended it. That would have been the right thing to do. But apparently that's not the case, it won't be extended. So in this final hour, this final Hail Mary pass, the last hour here, I guess I'm

pleading to this body. And I know you have no power to make the Executive hire anybody, but afford me and the 29, 28 other individuals who worked hard on this test, and it's not easy to get where we're at, afford us after 16 years or 20 years, to move up one rung on the ladder. Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

That's all the cards I have. Is there anyone else in the audience that would like -- please come forward, sir, and identify yourself.

MR. SMITH:

Good morning. I'm Terence Smith. I think I did sign a card. I'm the Administrator of Huntington Hospital's Dolan Family Health Center. I'm thankful for the opportunity to be here. I'm really here on behalf of the many working poor families in Suffolk who depend upon our health centers for affordable healthcare and the chance at a reasonable quality of life. I've been the Administrator of the Dolan Family Health Center for 15 years. The health center opened in 1995 and immediately we grew from 15,000 visits to well over 30,000 visits in ten years. There was tremendous unmet need in northwest Suffolk County, and there still continues to be that need for a 30,000 visit health center.

I'm also here to thank you for the resolutions that have been introduced to restore approximately \$700,000 to the Dolan Family Health Center so that we can continue this work. We would not have been able to grow, to accommodate 9,000 Suffolk County residents and 30,000 doctor visits demanded annually, if it were not for the stewardship of this body for which we are very grateful.

I'd also like to just comment briefly on what my colleague, Mary Finnin, said a few minutes ago about the health centers that serve the Central Islip/Brentwood area. At the Dolan Family Health Center we're blessed, we don't have too long a wait for prenatal care, and in the last two weeks we've begun to see more people from outside the Township of Huntington coming to the Dolan Center requesting prenatal care. Some of these are on waiting lists at other health centers, but the waits are much longer, and apparently other health centers are saying that just possibly the Dolan Family Health Center might be able to get people into prenatal care in a shorter amount of time.

So I thank you for supporting the growth of the Dolan Center as we've doubled in volume. We hope to be here for many years to come. And I thank you for supporting working families in Suffolk County. Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Mr. Smith, let me first apologize to you. I accidentally passed over your card. I apologize for that.

MR. SMITH:

Thank you. I'm delighted for the opportunity to speak.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Is there anyone else in the audience that would like to address us on -- okay. Seeing none, I'll make a motion to close the public portion.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Second by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Gail, I'm going to turn it over to you to -- because we're going to go into the meat of the budget. Before you do that, though, I just have a couple of questions about the public testimony. The issue about the DRC center with Probation, was that in the budget or not in the budget?

MS. VIZZINI:

Well, we did not restore any appropriations for the filling of additional positions in Probation.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Did we take any positions out of Probation?

MS. VIZZINI:

We didn't take any positions, we did transfer the IT positions back to Probation.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Right, right, which was a separate issue. But we didn't affect the funding of Probation or the positions, we left it as --

MS. VIZZINI:

As was recommended.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. The Sergeants exam, which the issue came up and, as the speaker pointed out, we don't have the ability to sign the SCINs and hire or promote Police Officers to Sergeant. And we certainly understand the problem with the exam and how these folks have been waiting and how hard they've studied, but we did put some funding in for the promotions; am I correct?

MS. VIZZINI:

That is correct. We reflected in 2009 that we would estimate that promotions would be made in the short-term, since that list is due to expire. We reflected that by changing the estimated expenditures and there's Suffolk money in 2010 to continue funding the necessary supervisory structure.

P.O. LINDSAY:

So we did our part. The money is in there to make the promotions, it's up to the Executive.

MS. VIZZINI:

The money is there.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. And the last issue raised by Mr. Smith from Dolan, we did restore by Budget Review's recommendation \$595,000. Is that correct?

MS. VIZZINI:

I think it's 559, but, yes, additional funds are provided so that Dolan would not make the necessary curtailments in service delivery.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. With that, could you give me a synopsis on Budget Amendment Number 1 and 2 so we can start with the process?

MS. VIZZINI:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. First of all, I would like to thank the Working Group for their commitment to the fiscal discipline which made the 2010 Operating Budget a fiscally responsible document with an emphasis on public safety. If this omnibus is adopted, the recommended 2010 budget will be more fiscally responsible by reducing overly optimistic sales tax revenue by over \$10.4 million dollars, or 1%. The emphasis is on public safety. There are sufficient appropriations

provided by recurring revenue with a property tax increase in the Police District of 3%. This provides \$13.3 million for which we will provide sufficient appropriations for two police recruit classes. A class of 100 is funded in -- that could start as early as April of 2010, and an additional 100 in approximately September, October of 2010.

You did this because the total number of sworn officers is at its lowest point since 1993, and the number of active Police Officers is at its lowest point since September of 2000. This also includes, as you asked my earlier, Mr. Presiding Officer, sufficient monies to make necessary promotions to provide the supervisory structure.

The omnibus also includes 20 new positions of Correction Officer and over \$2 million for two classes of 40 each; one in January and one in September. This schedule is essential if we are to meet the mandates of the Commission on Corrections for trained officers on the ground and running in anticipation of the opening of the replacement correctional facility in the fall of 2011. The omnibus also includes appropriations for the District Attorney to fill existing vacancies for criminal investigations.

In order to come up with these monies, aside from the recurring revenue in the Police District, this omnibus makes \$12.4 million in expenditure cuts. Those cuts, over the 2009-2010 period, include certain surplus appropriations as identified in our report to you, \$3 million in health insurance, \$800,000 in Social Security, 3.1 million in debt service, and 3.2 million in surplus appropriations in Social Services program cuts. Other cuts included across-the-board overstated supplies. We brought certain line items down to the 2009 estimated expenditures in supplies. We have abolished additional vacancies, a little bit more than 26 vacant positions that are not -- have no authorization to be filled. This saved about one million dollars. And we also abolished \$220,000 in new positions that are recommended, including two deputy slots.

The reprioritization, the increases --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Excuse me, let me just stop you. Not Deputy Sheriffs, Deputy Commissioners.

MS. VIZZINI:

Deputy Personnel Officer and Deputy Director of Labor Relations. We do reprioritize, providing sufficient appropriations for certain contracted services, including for, as a speaker indicated, the Touro program for mortgage counseling and bank -- mortgage foreclosure counseling and bankruptcy. It is funded, the County share of 22,000.

The hotel/motel revenue is included in the omnibus. We actually reduced hotel/motel revenue by a little over \$500,000 to reflect the State of the economy. We also specifically identified those cultural, historical and museums that will benefit to maintain our cultural and historic services during this very challenging economic time.

That is basically the synopsis of what the omnibus does. You have before you an index of each of the line items as is required by Charter. The omnibus must be broken or any budget amendment that has a mandated component or discretionary component, the omnibus is broken into the mandated and the discretionary. It is intended that both of these be taken together. The mandated reduces property taxes by \$4.6 million dollars in the General Fund. The discretionary balances that.

P.O. LINDSAY:

That's it?

MS. VIZZINI:

(Nodded yes).

P.O. LINDSAY:

Before we start the debate on 1 and 2, does anybody have any questions of Gail? Do you want some time to talk, or what do you want to do? Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

Hi, Gail. And Deputy Presiding Officer Vivian Vilorio-Fisher just told me that speculative income for the privatization of the marinas is out of the budget?

MS. VIZZINI:

That's correct. The working group struck the \$300,000 enhancement related -- directly related to marina privatization. It does render your stand-alone in conflict since it is that same \$300,000.

LEG. ALDEN:

Now I plan to withdraw it, so, you know, that was put in there before I knew that that speculative income was actually included. There's a couple of things in budget that --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Alden, before you get off that subject, if I could just interject.

LEG. ALDEN:

Sure.

P.O. LINDSAY:

What the Working Group did is they removed the \$300,000 of revenue and they took a series of recommendation by the users group, the boating association that use our marinas, on how we can raise certain fees, how we can raise more revenues, but keep it within the County's purview. So we added back about \$220,000 in revenue which we think is real.

LEG. ALDEN:

Sure.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And it's based on the recommendations of the users and Legislator Vilorio-Fisher is going to follow it up with legislation to accomplish some of these changes. I just wanted to clarify that.

LEG. ALDEN:

Good. And if she does it this year, I'd be more than happy to work with her. But the language that would dictate the privatization has been stricken; is that correct?

MS. VIZZINI:

Well, the revenue associated with it, yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

Right, because then it would be almost like a fait accompli. If we leave that revenue in there, then you have to privatize because the budget --

MS. VIZZINI:

Yeah, there is no basis for that revenue because --

LEG. ALDEN:

Good, okay. There's -- if I may

P.O. LINDSAY:

Go right ahead.

LEG. ALDEN:

A couple of other areas that I'm just very much concerned with. When Bay Shore Health Center

closed, that's years ago, and it was for the right reason, there was always the intention to reopen it. As a matter of fact, for a number of budget cycles I had the money put in to actually go and rebuild the building and reopen that center. There was more than 12,000 patients that went to that center. They dissipated. Some of them show up in Amityville, some of them show up in Brentwood and some of them don't show up at all. I'm going by the files, because the files would have to be transferred. But they do, however, show up at Southside Hospital and Good Samaritan's emergency room, which kind of clogs it up and actually makes it almost unusable for other people.

So I have a deep concern with the closing, at this point, of the Central Islip Health Center with the intent that all those people that go -- and it's more than 12,000 that go to C.I., would be accommodated in Brentwood. Brentwood I understand is almost to the point where they're going to start renovations, but renovations don't happen overnight. Neither do the appropriations to do renovations. If that building had been renovated and could accommodate the number of people that we anticipate going there I might have a different thought on this. But at this point in time to close C.I. is premature because you're going to set up a situation where we had testimony at a civic meeting that we're not going to expand the hours at Brentwood. That in itself is problematic because right now people stand on line. Some of them have to wait outside, some of them jam the one or two little waiting rooms that are in there. And we had testimony also at the civic meeting called for by Legislator Montano, that people can't even get an appointment for a number of months.

If we think we're going to cram more people, even though we've crammed the 12,000-plus from Bay Shore into the Brentwood Center, if we think we're going to cram another 12,000 into the Brentwood Center, we are sadly mistaken. What it's going to relate, and actually it translates into a loss of service for the people that would rely on that type of preventative medicine or that type of medicine. They will go get their services, they'll go by ambulance and they'll go to Southside Hospital, which will put a immense amount of strain on the ambulance companies and the fire companies that provide that service.

So, again, we're going to be doing more than a million dollars worth of disservice to the community, and the burden that we're going to put on Southside, the burden we're going to put on the local ambulance corps, is going to be way more than that million dollars. So is there somewhere that we can make an adjustment because I heard testimony that 559,000 is going to go to the Dolan Center.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Could I just interrupt you again, Legislator Alden --

LEG. ALDEN:

Absolutely.

P.O. LINDSAY:

-- how procedurally I'd like to handle this. Legislator Montano has a stand-alone resolution. Mr. Miner from the Health Department is here. I'm going to call on him when we get to Legislator Montano's resolution because, you know, there's a lot of people that have a lot of questions of where we are in this process of consolidation, whether we're ready to close it or not close it. So, if you would allow us to handle that under that stand-alone, it's the only way we can go right now.

LEG. ALDEN:

Absolutely. The last point that I'd really like to bring up, and the question goes to Budget Review, and if you can think about it, if there's a solution to this, we are very grossly underfunding and under-providing services that were provided by Legal Aid. And also, that Senior Citizen Division that was established in Legal Aid now looks like it's being transferred over to Touro. It's grossly underfunded and that's going to translate again to our senior citizen population in Suffolk County being underserved. So, if there is some way that we can restore some of that funding, and again, maybe not on the senior -- the senior end of it we'll just pay for that with suffering and deprivation of their -- basically their human dignity and their rights that the seniors will go through because they won't have that type of representation.

But on the other end, the Legal Aid Society, they provide -- I'm going to call it one of a number of pieces in our legal system that allows our legal system to actually work properly. And if we don't pay for the proper number of attorneys to provide -- and I know it's not sexy to be a defense attorney, but anyway, if we don't put the proper number of defense attorneys out there, the court will assign through the 18B, they will assign much more expensive type of attorneys and legal representation, because the system doesn't work unless there's both sides, and that's the prosecution and the defense side.

So if there's some way we can fix those two numbers, and I'm talking about the defense side of it, and I'm also talking about the senior citizen representation side, I would really like to explore an avenue to try to fix those two. Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Eddington.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Yeah. I want to refer to DO20, and where it talks about the two classes of a hundred police recruits. And I want to thank the Budget Review Office for telling us what almost everybody knows, that we're down lots of Police Officers and we've been down that amount since -- did you say 1997 or '93?

MS. VIZZINI:

1993.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Since. 1997.

MR. LIPP:

Three.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Three. Oh, I guess I don't even want to believe it, but okay. And then I see here it also says Sergeants promotions, funding Sergeants promotions. So we're funding two classes and we're funding some promotions to Sergeant.

MS. VIZZINI:

That's correct.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Okay. Now, how do we keep this from being a dream sheet and making it a reality? Because I think I've been down that road already.

MS. VIZZINI:

Well, the first -- there's only so much that the Legislature can do unilaterally. The first order of business is the money there. The money is there. In terms of filling of positions, that is at the discretion of the County Executive, so there needs to be authorization to fill positions. And then there is the Civil Service matter.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

So that if we were going to approve the budget today, if we got somebody from the County Executive's Office to make a commitment on the record that this will happen, that would be a good thing, then.

MS. VIZZINI:

You definitely need the cooperation of the County Executive when it comes down to the filling of

vacancies.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

This is the international sign for yes. (Nodding head). Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I know Ms. Corso wanted to fill out a card and pulled back the card and there's some mixed signals here, but I think it's probably appropriate that if you chat with us now.

MS. CORSO:

Well, thank you for recognizing me, and I have to say I imagine this was a very difficult omnibus to put together so have to commend you on all the hard work that you've done. Obviously I haven't had proper, you know, a significant amount of time to look at it. I do feel that on first blush I do have a few issues that I just wanted to make you aware of.

One of the things is that, as Gail pointed out, there were -- the abolishment of non-authorized positions, they're not authorized to be filled, therefore, they're not funded. So, in our opinion, that would be like a million dollar hole, another push up of turnover savings. And while we're fine with that, and we'll live with that, there's also a cut of a million dollars in supplies. So, again, we'll live with that, but we really don't want to hear during the year that, you know, departments don't have the resources necessary to get through the year, especially when there are cuts to Consumer Affairs. I think I've been through many hearings where we say Consumer Affairs is not properly staffed, and then to see two positions abolished from there. I just -- I just want to say that we agree with you, but we don't want to hear during the year that there are issues.

Another thing that really is a big problem is --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Connie, before you go further, let me just take them piece by piece, if you don't mind. Although we did cut two positions from Consumer Affairs, we left many, many unfilled positions that in that department that haven't been filled for a long time, so just to make you aware of that.

MS. CORSO:

Okay, thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

The other thing is, you know, the million dollars from supplies, or whatever, I agree, you know, some of the decisions we made this year are decisions that a couple of years ago we wouldn't even thought about making, but because of the dire shape of what we're in, but the point is we didn't spend that money.

MS. CORSO:

I commend you for that.

P.O. LINDSAY:

We used the bulk of money to reduce sales tax.

MS. CORSO:

Right. But I just --

P.O. LINDSAY:

If you guys' sales tax projections -- and what we tried to do is pick a point in the middle. Budget Review was projecting two and three-quarters or seven-eighths or whatever. You guys were projecting five. We lowered it to four. And I hope you're right, because if you're right, then we have the money. But the point is we didn't spend the money.

MS. CORSO:

And I really appreciate that. I'm just trying to set the stage for the 2010, where we all agree that we're living within a tight budget.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah.

MS. CORSO:

One of the other main issues here is the \$500,000 that was removed from the Law Department's budget. I just want to make you aware that we still have that expenditure. That doesn't go away because Legal Aide is going to take over part of that because when it -- say two people get arrested, Legal Aid is only allowed to cover the one person. So I still have to pay those lawyers and all it's going to do is just come mid-year I won't have enough money to pay those lawyers and that expense just gets moved forward to 2011.

Also of concern to us is the rental line in DPW. We feel we may have an issue there to begin with, and to have another \$500,000 or so moved from there I think will just further exacerbate the problem. So that again will just be a hole.

The other thing is there's a position removed from the Sheriff's Department, the Purchasing Agent. That Purchasing Agent was going to be responsible for the ramp-up of the jail, and there's over \$8 million of purchasing that needs to be done for that ramp-up. So I don't know if we could change it or change the consideration there, but that is also going to cause a problem.

And again, that -- you know, at first blush that is it, we will live with this budget. We do have some issues. We do feel that there's some implicit holes starting the beginning of the year for the things that I mentioned, and I just want to say thank you to everybody.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Between the 18B and Legal Aid, the pot of money hasn't changed, it was just moved from one line to the other with the theory that Legal Aid could do it cheaper than 18B. We realized -- we think the whole thing is underfunded and we're not going to have enough money to fund attorneys for people that can't afford one. We understand that, but we didn't spend any more money there, we just moved it from one line to another and we realize as a whole there's a hole, whether it be in 18B or Legal Aid.

MS. CORSO:

Right, it's just a shifting. And the other part of it is when you move it out of the Law Department to Legal Aid, we're also going to lose the State aid. We would get State aid if it is in the Law Department. We're not going to get State Aid when you move it to Legal Aid.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Connie, we talked about that at length, as a matter of fact, in the Working Group, and my understanding, when we had spoken about this, was that the reimbursement on the 18B funding was a lump or cap, the flat amount. Three million of that four million that's in that line is reimbursement that comes from the State. However, it was not represented to us that that was a percentage on gross expenditure and that -- so that if we reduced or shifted -- I'm sorry, not reduced, but shifted, moved from the one category to the other, we didn't have a net decrease in receipt.

MS. CORSO:

No, it's based -- it's actual -- it's based on claims. It's actual -- based on actual expenditures. I

only know that because I signed off on that report.

MS. VIZZINI:

Connie's right. It is based on a percentage of expenditures, but it does not matter whether those expenditures are from the County Attorney or through Legal Aid, as long as they're eligible expenditures.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So, in total, Gail, then there is no reduction in the gross amount of return or reimbursement that we should receive cumulatively.

MS. VIZZINI:

Well, there is a concern in that the County Attorney may be exceeding the expenditures that were left there, but that was, you know, the area that we reduced in order to make Legal Aid closer to whole.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I understand. My other question is just a simple procedural question. Do you do any communication in the beginning of the year to the administrators of 18B or to the bench regarding what's been adopted for 2010, and the parameters in which we might ask them to live with?

MS. MALAFI:

Can I answer that?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Anybody who wants to jump in. When the 18 --

MS. MALAFI:

Yes, I communicate with 18B panel administrator David Besso through my contract with the Bar Association to run the 18B Panel as to what we have. He -- it's hard for him to control his expenses because he -- right now he's reimbursed \$50,000 for what he does and that's only for his time and his secretary's time. Their 18B Panel does not have office expenses and things like that, so it's really just the hourly attorneys' fees that are submitted. If you take 500,000 out of my line item for that, what's going to happen is I'm going to be \$500,000 in the hole at the end of this year because we can't control those expenses.

I keep very close contact with Judge {Lease}, the Administrative Law Judge for Suffolk County, on making sure that Judges do not bypass Legal Aid, to make sure that every case that can go to Legal Aid goes to Legal Aid first before it goes to the 18B Panel so we can keep cases low. The problem is is that Legal Aid -- Legal Aid and I do not control everything that goes to 18B Panel, because if two or more people are arrested for the same crime, by attorney ethics, Legal Aid can only represent one of them. So every crime where there's more than one person arrested, every burglary, every assault, every murder, anything where there's more than one person arrested and they all need Legal Aid -- I'm sorry, indigent defense cost paid for by the County, we only -- only one of them goes to Legal Aid, and the rest of them wind up at 18B Panel. And there's nothing that can be done to control who gets arrested and where the conflicts are going to be.

Without -- this year the four million I have, I've asked for the same amount both for next year that I paid for this year. Right now, I believe the 4 million will take me through mid-December. If that 500,000 out of my budget for next year, I believe I will have to stop paying Legal Aid bills -- I'm sorry, 18B Panel bills in August some time, and I will still be in the hole. We will still owe it and it will not be calculated into the cost that we report to New York State for reimbursement. So that 500,000, even though we still owe it and have to pay it, will not be part of the formula that goes up to the State.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Christine, let me just ask one other question, and I don't have a full familiarity, but I thought that there are 18B attorneys who also get assigned for matters other than criminal matters. Do they do work out of the Family Court, or in other courts or is it only out of the criminal part?

MS. MALAFI:

No. They do work for Family Court also, but that is paid, I believe, out of a separate line item budget.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Oh, it's not out of this item?

MS. MALAFI:

I don't believe -- it's not paid out of this. This is only the criminal indigent defense. The Family Court 18B work is paid for, I believe, out of Social Services. There's money in either Social Services or the court fund. I didn't look that up so I can't tell you exactly. I know it's not part of this four million.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Will Mr. Besso give you -- as you go through the calendar year, at what point -- how best to phrase this. Do you get tracked? In other words, do you have a monthly accounting of where the expenditure is going? Will you get a snapshot in March or in June, or will you know how the draw-down is going, or is it something where all of a sudden we just hit a goose egg and that's it?

MS. MALAFI:

No. For Mr. Besso's expenses, he submits monthly vouchers. He's asked for a raise for next year because it actually costs money to run the program. He doesn't get paid enough to cover his secretarial and office expenses to run the program. I get monthly vouchers from him.

With respect to the cost for the 18B Panel lawyers, I get them regularly. I can tell you, as he looks at them, he has to approve them first, and then my office, I have two people who double-check the numbers on his -- make sure nothing was miscalculated. And, yes, I get them monthly. I can always tell you about where I am, and I know -- I think now we're slated to run out of money sometime in December. As we get closer to December, I'll be able to tell you when in December.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Gail, just a question or two. Under DO20, which is the 200 new Police Officers, there's DO21, which increases real property taxes for the people of Suffolk County in the Police District by 3%. Now, the CPI, as I understand, is flat. I mean, you're a Social Security recipient, you're not getting an increase this year. Yet this tax is going to go up. It's going to generate \$13,362,342. It seems to me without this tax a lot of these other spending programs would be in jeopardy. The bottom line, though, is that the people that I represent, the middle income taxpayers, they pay the bottom line on these property taxes. This will now increase, it puts an added burden on them. I guess my question is this is a definite, right, if this goes through, Police District real property taxes go up 3%?

MS. VIZZINI:

It's \$30 in terms of the average taxpayer. This provides close to 9 1/2, 10 million dollars for the two classes, and it allows us to reduce the overly optimistic sales tax that is supporting the Police District. Without that recurring revenue we could not do that.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I understand. I understand the rationale behind it, but that's another \$30 in a long list of taxes that appear on a property tax bill, and my people are screaming about this. They're already spending 4 1/2 months in Suffolk County paying taxes of one type or another without putting a single penny in their pockets, and yet we turn around and we increase police taxes by 3%.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Anybody else? Nope? Okay. I am going to make a motion to approve Budget Amendment No. 1.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second, Mr. Chairman.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Second by Legislator Losquadro. What's your pleasure? Voice vote, roll call?

LEG. ALDEN:

On the motion.

P.O. LINDSAY:

On the motion, Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

Does 1 include the Legal Aid, or is 2 Legal Aid?

MS. VIZZINI:

One includes the -- it doesn't include Legal Aid. Legal Aid is discretionary.

LEG. ALDEN:

I'm sorry, Legal Aid is what?

MS. VIZZINI:

In 2. Legal Aid's in 2.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Discretionary.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Opposed.

MR. LAUBE:

Sixteen. (Not Present: Leg. Cooper)

P.O. LINDSAY:

And on the accompanying Budget Amendment No. 2, I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Second by Legislator Losquadro. Any questions?

LEG. ALDEN:

On the motion. I know we're going to put it off until we go into the -- I guess the other numbered resolutions, but does No. 2 include the health center?

MS. VIZZINI:

No. 2 includes additional funds for Dolan. It does not include funds for Central Islip, if that's your question.

LEG. ALDEN:

Right. How much is included for the Dolan Health Center in additional funds?

MS. VIZZINI:

In addition to what the County Executive recommended, an additional 559,000.

LEG. ALDEN:

And what was the -- what was the logic behind that?

P.O. LINDSAY:

It was recommend by Budget Review.

LEG. ALDEN:

By what?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Budget Review recommended it.

MS. VIZZINI:

The short of it is the County Executive brought Dolan's funding down from, you know, close to 3 million to 2.3 million. So had Dolan been funded similarly to other County operated health centers percentage-wise, the 559 would be what would be the number.

LEG. ALDEN:

But that doesn't work. That ratio doesn't work when you include Brentwood and C.I., because obviously if Brentwood and C.I. is being cut one million dollars, then that whole ratio is pretty much out the window.

MS. VIZZINI:

Well, again, it's slightly different --

LEG. ALDEN:

Then they would actually -- that new ratio would warrant an additional cut to Dolan.

MS. VIZZINI:

No. Brentwood was included in the calculations, but not Central Islip.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. So Brentwood was increased?

MS. VIZZINI:

No.

LEG. ALDEN:

No.

MS. VIZZINI:

Not in the omnibus.

LEG. ALDEN:

So that ratio, there's no resemblance to what we're doing in the budget. And if it was used as a justification for more money to go to Dolan, that's not justification at all, because we're actually defunding completely the C.I. Health Center without a replacement for it. So that -- as far as that ratio and that justification, that's no good.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I tell you, it might be a good time to hear from Mr. Miner from the Health Department about this whole issue. I know --

LEG. ALDEN:

Good, no that's good.

P.O. LINDSAY:

You know, it might add some more light to the whole thing. Matt?

MR. MONTANO:

Mr. Presiding Officer?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yes.

MR. MONTANO:

A question before he starts. I had actually requested the Commissioner of Health, as well as Dr. Pigott, who's the Office of Minority Health, to attend the meeting. And I'd like to know whether or not they're present, because we had some questions from them. Matt?

MR. MINER:

No, I'm representing the Health Department today. I know that Dr. Pigott has another meeting, and I know that Dr. Mermelstein, the Acting Commissioner, is involved in H1N1 right now, in some conference calls, and logistical issues.

LEG. MONTANO:

Well, this is the same issue that we had when I asked Dr. Pigott to attend the Public Hearing that was held in Brentwood with the State Health Department, and at that time I asked you whether or not Dr. Pigott would be there and you told me no. And, you know, from what I understand, he was not allowed to be at the meeting. And what I'm asking you point-blank is, was he also told that he's not allowed to be at this meeting?

MR. MINER:

Dr. Pigott has other meetings today, and I'm most familiar with Central Islip closure, the closure plan. Dr. Pigott does not represent patient care. He's Minority Health.

LEG. MONTANO:

Right. But Dr. Pigott, in my opinion, has relevant information with respect to minority health. In fact, that's his position, so I would like to hear from Dr. Pigott. Can you tell me what meetings he has that are so important that he can't come before the Legislature when he's been requested by letter?

MR. MINER:

We can try to get him over here.

LEG. MONTANO:

All right, would you? And then when we discuss the stand-alone I would like to have him here. Is

that nod a yes?

MR. MINER:

Yeah. Do you want me to make a call now or do you want me to answer other questions?

LEG. MONTANO:

No, no. I just want to have some words with Dr. Pigott, and we didn't have that opportunity at the public hearing, and I would like to have that opportunity today, if necessary.

MR. MINER:

We're making a call to him now.

MR. MONTANO:

Got it.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Matt, could you go through the plans with Central Islip? I wanted to put it off until the stand-alone, but it involves -- it's involved in the whole thing, so maybe you can go through --

MR. MINER:

Sure.

P.O. LINDSAY:

-- where we are with the whole thing.

MR. MINER:

Yeah. First, just to take a step back, the Central Islip Health Center is not approved as a full-time health center by the State of New York. It does not have a CON to operate a full-time clinic. That's very important. We are not in compliance with the State right now. In addition, it does not meet Article 28 standards, and that's what we're licensed under. So we have a license for a part-time clinic, we do not have a license for a full-time clinic.

We also have several issues with the building with respect to Article 28 and the local Fire Marshal. The fire Marshal has told us that we need to vacate from having full-time staff in the basement. We have a number of full-time staff in the basement. In fact, I was just told today that there's a County ordinance, I believe still on the books, that prohibits that. But we have medical records staff, the Medical Director, nursing staff, and on occasion we do have patients going into the basement. So, if we were to put -- if the Legislature put Central Islip back in, we have an immediate issue that we're in noncompliance with the Fire Marshal and noncompliance with the State.

Putting that to the side, we have submitted a closure plan to the State of New York for the closure of Central Islip. We have approval to close the WIC Program, and we have approval to close the PCAP Program. I just received the PCAP approval this morning. The only other license that we have, and I'm having this double-checked, for the part-time clinic is Family Planning, and we do expect to get that closure or that approval any day now.

The State was out on Monday, did the survey of Brentwood. They raised a few minor concerns. We're waiting for their inspection report. We will then address that -- those concerns with our General Operations people in Public Works. I've already reached out to Public Works to have them on standby, so we should be able to very quickly address any concerns and get the final approval from the State of New York to close the facility.

Again, Central Islip is only two miles away, and we did -- to accommodate the volume. First, there was a number of references to 12,000 patients. It's 12,000 visits; it's about 4,500 patients. We relocated both Employee Health Services and the Chest Bureau out of Brentwood. We moved those to Coram where we had extra space. That will free up sixteen additional consult medical treatment

exam rooms to accommodate the volume from Central Islip.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Could I, before I recognize you guys? When is the work going to be done that we'll be able to accept patients there, the additional influx of patients?

MR. MINER:

We're just waiting for the final inspection report from the State because they may make us do a few changes. DPW is on standby to go forward and make the very minor modifications to Chest and Employee Health Services. Again, those were exam rooms. We didn't see patients from the outside, but they were exam rooms, so we're talking about very minimum modifications, and Public Works estimates that it will only take about one to two weeks to complete those renovations. That would be expected to be done prior to December 1st, and then we would be positioned to move in on or about December 10th, December 11th.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Is there any plans for additional waiting areas, because I understand that was a major problem over there.

MR. MINER:

In the back area, and that's one of the minor modifications that we're doing, there will be a waiting room area in the back. It's relatively small where Chest and Employee Health Services was. Now the waiting area, and that will be expanded, and that's part of the, again, the minor work that has to be done.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Legislator Alden, you had some additional questions.

LEG. ALDEN:

Matt, what accommodations or what consideration was given for the additional patients that would have come from the Bay Shore Health Center that was never reopened?

MR. MINER:

In terms of?

LEG. ALDEN:

Did you expand hours? Did you put more doctors in there? Did you put more staff in?

MR. MINER:

Brentwood has longer hours than CI now and --

LEG. ALDEN:

No, not in C.I., but what existed?

MR. MINER:

C.I. staff is moving over, 25 of the 30 people are moving over.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. But your testimony was that the Brentwood operating hours were never expanded, so when Bay Shore closed, and to accommodate that influx, Brentwood never expanded their hours to accommodate those people. So do you have a plan now to expand hours?

MR. MINER:

Bay Shore closed before I came in the County, so I'm not sure when the hours were back then. Right now there are no plans. When C.I. consolidates into Brentwood, we do not believe there's a need to expand the hours.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. And as far as a Regional Center, because that what's been told to the people in Bay Shore, "Don't worry, it's coming. It's going to be planned out, the Health Department's right on top of it. So what are the plans right now for the Regional Center, because I understand the plans were yanked, we're not going to do a Regional Center.

MR. MINER:

No, that's not correct.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. What's the correct information then?

MR. MINER:

We received a five million dollar grant from the State of New York to support a Regional Center. We did issue an RFP. The Space Committee did reject the results of the RFP and have yet to decide, and I believe that's going to be in the September meeting or November meeting. They're going to decide whether to reinvest into the Brentwood Facility and invest that five million into Brentwood or to build a stand alone building rather than leasing, which is what the RFP said to do. So as soon as the Space Committee makes the decision, I believe they're going to do that this next meeting, the Health Department is prepared. We did petition or request the State for approval to renovate Brentwood and use the HEAL money. They have approved that, so if we go that direction, we can start spending that money immediately on the renovations.

LEG. ALDEN:

What's the anticipated impact on the ambulance corps and the fire departments that supply transportation, and Southside Hospital and Good Samaritan Hospital, their emergency room with the closure of C.I.?

MR. MINER:

Southside and Good Sam are both aware of the consolidation.

LEG. ALDEN:

I'm not talking about them. I'm talking about you. You said you have a plan. What's Suffolk County's plan to handle those people that will now call 911 and request an ambulance to go to the hospital rather than go to the clinic?

MR. MINER:

I'm now sure why they wouldn't come to the clinic. If it is an emergency they should be going to the hospital. If it is for standard care, they --

LEG. ALDEN:

There was testimony -- you were there. There was testimony that some of the people that use the clinic walk to the clinic --

MR. MINER:

That wasn't my testimony, sir.

LEG. ALDEN:

-- and they do not have the transportation available because the transportation plan hasn't been modified to accommodate that at this point. So what's your plan?

MR. MINER:

The two buses that serve Central Islip also serve Brentwood. It's the next stop down. The railroad also serves there and there's plenty of parking, so there's plenty of room for Central Islip to be accommodated into Brentwood.

LEG. ALDEN:

Oh, okay, but that's contrary to your testimony to the people of the community, which you stated --

MR. MINER:

No, it's not, sir.

LEG. ALDEN:

-- there was no update on the transportation to get people on the transportation plan to get --

MR. MINER:

No, I read in there, and I can show you what I read. I read the fact that there was two bus lines that support Central Islip that or the same two lines that support Brentwood. There was other testimony in the community, but not by me, sir.

LEG. ALDEN:

Well, actually it was, but that's all right. Now, you stated again that you didn't really look at the impact on ambulance corps or that the Southside Hospital or Good Samaritan other than they're aware that C.I.'s going to close.

MR. MINER:

Southside has not indicated or Good Sam have not indicated there is any impact.

LEG. ALDEN:

No, what's our plan. I don't care what their plan is at this point. I care what our plan is.

MR. MINER:

Emergency care would not be done at our facility. We are primary care.

LEG. ALDEN:

So, no one that would need primary care ever takes an ambulance and goes to an emergency room, is that what your testimony is?

MR. MINER:

There may be times when the health center, when a patient comes in, they believe it's important for them to get to the hospital, so we do call an ambulance.

LEG. ALDEN:

So your testimony, though -- let me get this straight. Your testimony is that no one from those communities would call 911 and go to the hospital, they would all come to the health center or now they would go to an -- actually, take an additional ride or additional length of time to get to another health center.

MR. MINER:

They may use an ambulance for transportation, but it's not for emergency care. If they have emergency care needs, they are going to go to a hospital.

LEG. ALDEN:

Didn't you look at the issue -- the people that went to the Bay Shore Health Center, didn't you look at the issue where they showed up? They showed up at the emergency room. Instead of going to the Bay Shore Health Center, which they were used to going to, to provide their primary care as you put it, they take an ambulance and go to an emergency room. You didn't look at that issue?

MR. MINER:

A significant number of patients go to the Brentwood and C.I. Health Centers from Brentwood. I'll get you those numbers in one second. Five thousand patients out of the 20,000 patients that use

Brentwood are from Bay Shore, and 400 are C.I. out of the 4,500.

LEG. ALDEN:

And from Bay Shore, what was the total number of patient visits and patients before the centers shut down that had to be accommodated up into Brentwood?

MR. MINER:

I only have recent data, I don't have the old data.

LEG. ALDEN:

Recent data is no good, the old data would have been a little bit more indicative of what was a need in that area.

MR. MINER:

I'm talking about Central Islip and Brentwood, not Bay Shore.

LEG. ALDEN:

Bay Shore is closed. That's not part of your plan to accommodate those people?

MR. MINER:

The Regional Center does that, sir.

LEG. ALDEN:

Right, but dragging your feet is a term that comes to my mind when we talk about a Regional Center. Bay Shore Center has been closed for how many years, sir?

MR. MINER:

It predates me. I don't know.

LEG. ALDEN:

Right. But how long have you been in your position?

MR. MINER:

Three years.

LEG. ALDEN:

Three years. So Bay Shore Center hasn't existed for three years, yet there's people that live in that area, that catchment area, and they need health services. That's not something you looked at in your plan?

MS. CORSO:

When Brentwood -- sorry, it's Connie Corso. When Brentwood -- when Bay Shore closed there wasn't an influx of people going to the emergency room. There wasn't an impact on the ambulance community. They absorbed -- there wasn't a single person that complained that they didn't get health care when that place closed and that was a much bigger center.

LEG. ALDEN:

Can I interrupt you? Where's your statistics on no impact for the ambulance services? Did you take direct --

MS. CORSO:

Wait. Where was yours? Did they ever come here and speak to you and say that there was a problem? The answer --

LEG. ALDEN:

Actually, you missed it. You missed the meeting that was just a couple of weeks ago where they said it was absolutely going to be a problem. So, obviously you didn't speak to anybody from the ambulance services, so don't come and quote anything. Thank you.

MS. CORSO:

All I can speak from is past experience, and the past experience is a much larger and fully licensed facility closed in Bay Shore and there was no impact on the ambulance company, there was no impact on the hospital.

LEG. ALDEN:

Good. I'm glad you stepped up. What's your budget analysis, then, as far as for the need for the Bay Shore, Brentwood and C.I. area for a --

MS. CORSO:

I believe that those people deserve a state-of-the-art health center.

LEG. MONTANO:

Point of order, point of order.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Everybody, be quiet. Everybody, be quiet. One at a time.

LEG. MONTANO:

Point of order, Mr. Presiding Officer.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Please, modulate your tone.

LEG. MONTANO:

With all due respect, Connie, I believe my colleague was in the process of questioning Mr. Miner. I don't know how you were invited into this. I think, if you want to speak, you should wait until we're done, and then, if anybody wants your opinion, we'll ask for it. So I would ask you to sit down, and I want to hear what Mr. Miner has to say.

P.O. LINDSAY:

All right. Are you done? Are you done with your questioning?

LEG. ALDEN:

He didn't give me an answer to the last.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Do you have an answer, Matt, to the last question?

MR. MINER:

I apologize. Could it be repeated?

LEG. ALDEN:

Actually, one of the last -- and there's a couple of questions that weren't answered. But the analysis for the catchment areas, and as far as for the -- this mega-center, or whatever you want to label it, what was the analysis as far as impacts? How many people from the Bay Shore area is it going to impact again? And I'll ask the same question. Does it impact, the lack of a center, does that impact on the ambulance companies and their transportation, the burden that you're putting on them to and from the hospital?

MR. MINER:

There's two issues. There's the closure of Central Islip and then there's the Regional Center. The

Regional Center, when we did the RFP, we had a primary catchment area, a secondary catchment area and a tertiary catchment area, trying to encompass the communities of Bay Shore, Central Islip, and Brentwood. All right. The Space Committee has not made a decision as to what direction to go on that. Once they make that decision, we will build a facility to accommodate those three catchment areas.

LEG. ALDEN:

So therein lies my problem. Until that facility's built, you're overburdening the Brentwood Center.

MR. MINER:

No, we're not, because --

LEG. ALDEN:

But you are --

MR. MINER:

Because we've added sixteen rooms by the vacating --

LEG. ALDEN:

Your testimony was that you didn't even take into consideration the people from Bay Shore.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay.

MR. MINER:

No, sir. The Bay Shore --

P.O. LINDSAY:

I'm going to stop everybody right now. You asked the question, he answered it. You're not happy with the answer, so let it go.

LEG. ALDEN:

All right. I was done with that. Now, just one final thing, then. The 559,000 going to Dolan, is that your recommendation?

MR. MINER:

That was BRO's recommendation, sir.

LEG. ALDEN:

Not you. So your recommendation from the Health Department is no \$550,000 going to Dolan; is that correct?

MR. MINER:

We've reviewed BRO's --

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

You've got to hold the button down.

MR. MINER:

I apologize. We've reviewed BRO's analysis and we can support that.

LEG. ALDEN:

So now you support it. It wasn't in your original budget documents, right?

P.O. LINDSAY:

That was his testimony.

LEG. ALDEN:

What?

P.O. LINDSAY:

That was his testimony.

LEG. ALDEN:

I'm just trying to get it clear.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. That was his testimony.

LEG. ALDEN:

Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

Mr. Miner, actually, I believe that the Presiding Officer said that we would discuss this when the stand-alone resolution came up and I think that is the better procedure, but I just want to clarify one or two minor points -- well, not minor, major points.

P.O. LINDSAY:

If you would suffer an interruption. That was my intent, but it was raised under Budget Amendment No. 2, so I wanted to get the input at this point.

LEG. ALDEN:

That's my fault.

LEG. MONTANO:

But do you want to do the full -- my understanding was that there would be a break. Do you want to do the full questioning now? Because if we have an opportunity to discuss it, it may be able to save time that, you know, from later. In other words, I would like to revisit this issue when the stand-alone resolution comes up for a vote.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And that's my intention.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay, good. So, just very quickly, Matt, you obviously were at the Public Hearing that was held in Central Islip that was called by Assemblyman Ramos, and myself and the State Health Department. I don't think my colleagues are aware of what came out of that meeting, they may be later. It was very clear to me, and I believe to you, that at that point the State Health Department said that it had not granted approval for the closure of the C.I. Center. That was subsequently conveyed by the Commissioner, State Health Commissioner, to the Suffolk County Commissioner, and you received a copy of that which verified that there had been no closure plan approved. In fact, I believe that the memo said that one was not submitted.

Now, you said earlier that the Health Department was here on Monday, and I know for a fact that they toured the Brentwood and the C.I. facility with yourself and other people. At this point -- and I heard you say earlier, and I just want to get this on the record, you do not have State Health Department approval to close the Center, is that correct?

MR. MINER:

We have approval for the closure of the WIC or relocation of WIC.

LEG. MONTANO:

WIC was --

MR. MINER:

We have also now received today the approval to close PCAP, the PCAP Program, and move that to Brentwood.

LEG. MONTANO:

I would like to see a copy of that.

MR. MINER:

It's on my Blackberry. I got it today, I will get you a copy.

LEG. MONTANO:

All right. You can get me a copy before the break. But you would agree that you need the State Health Department approval before you can close the center, would you not?

MR. MINER:

The only approval that we're lacking, as far as I'm aware at this point, is Family Planning. Again, we do not have approval to operate a full-time clinic in that facility.

LEG. MONTANO:

Just let me -- you remember when this issue first came forward back I believe in April, where the County Executive introduced a resolution when we appropriated -- this Legislature appropriated \$30 million from tax stabilization, and there was a resolution introduced which had some clauses in there to close the C.I. Center. You appeared before the Budget and Finance Committee on April 21st, and I showed up at that meeting. I just want to read you one sentence and your response, because I'm not clear on what you're saying today. And the issue was whether or not the Legislature would have any further control over the procedure to close the center if we had passed that resolution and the clauses that involved the C.I. Health Center were ultimately removed from that resolution. But this testimony was done prior.

I asked you, I said, "I don't see anything in there that requires the Health Department or the County Executive's Office -- in the very -- in the least consult with the Legislature once we sign-off on the resolution," meaning to close the Center, which is what is being done budgetarily. "We have yielded complete administrative and all other control to the Executive Branch to simply close the hospital. I mean the center." Your response was, "We would have to get approval from the State Department, actually. We're regulated -- Article 28." Are you telling me today that you don't need the approval?

MR. MINER:

No, sir. We need the approval to close the part-time sections that we have approval for. We operate a facility beyond what we're licensed to operate. There are three areas that we have a license, WIC, PCAP and Family Planning. We have approval by the State to close two of those three.

LEG. MONTANO:

When will you get -- that's an issue of contention and I don't want to get into technicalities.

MR. MINER:

We don't have a CON for a full-time operating certificate.

LEG. MONTANO:

I don't want to get into technicalities. You make statements about, that the Fire Marshal spoke to you verbally. That doesn't carry any weight with me whatsoever, I want to see it in writing. All

right. You told me at the prior meetings that you had approval from Southside Hospital. I've met with Southside Hospital and I'm very clear that they did not approve this, they are not on board, but I don't want to get into these kinds of accusations. What I want to do is I want to see the proof and I want to see it in writing. Now, when --

MR. MINER:

And I shared with you the WIC approval, and as I said, I will give you the PCAP approval that came this morning.

LEG. MONTANO:

I didn't interrupt you. The WIC approval I received a copy of, and that was explained at the public hearing that it was granted because you need 90 days to close the program. So we are on board with that. The other approval that you say you received you are going to give me a copy and I can read it for myself and I'll understand it when I read it. When I read it, then I'll make a decision as to what it says.

Now, the third point is that you don't have -- whatever else you need, you don't have it yet, but you say that you anticipate receiving it; is that correct?

MR. MINER:

That's correct, based on --

LEG. MONTANO:

When do you anticipate receiving it?

MR. MINER:

Any day.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. So, procedurally, if we were to refund the C.I. Center today and it was vetoed by the County Executive, we would come back in two weeks to make a determination as to whether or not we wanted to override. So it's conceivable that because of the technicalities we can actually pass this resolution today, wait for you to -- wait for the County Executive to veto it, and take up this conversation in two weeks, by which time you may have State Health Department approval in total; is that accurate?

MR. MINER:

Yeah, I believe so.

MR. MONTANO:

Okay. Thank you.

MR. MINER:

I don't know the full process.

MR. MONTANO:

Then I'll have further questions when we debate the stand-alone.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I thank you, Mr. Miner. And I'd like to call Ms. Corso back. You were in the midst of adding some fiscal background to this debate. Is there anything you want to say about this?

MS. CORSO:

I mean, I really just want to say that, you know, I feel for you, but I believe the people will get a more state-of-the-art and a -- if you've ever been to C.I., it's really in dire straits. And I think that the people of those communities deserve a better health center and that's what we're trying to do.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Thank you very much. Did you want to say -- Mr. Heaney, you want to say something?

MR. HEANEY:

If I can just augment some of those comments. The Central Islip facility, as you've heard, was never licensed to be a full-service center. It's a 13,000 square foot center; 3,000 feet of it is in a basement. We have successfully applied for a \$5 million HEAL Grant that can be used in a very positive way to make improvements to a 50,000 square foot building, a central building that can serve three communities, with the ability to improve upon existing services and have enough room for potential to expand on the potential patient services that can be provided. I think those points have to be said.

Finally, moving forward, we have only until September of 2010 to act on that HEAL Grant or we will lose that \$5 million. So those are the points that I'd just like to add to this.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Thank you.

MR. HEANEY:

Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. With that, I am going to take up Budget Amendment No. 2. Ms. Vizzini, do you want to go through that? We have a motion and a second. And you went through it already; am I correct?

MS. VIZZINI:

I covered this in my overview. If there's any specific questions --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Why don't you do it again, because there was a little bit of time in between and we don't have much retention this morning, so do it again. If you repeat yourself, that's fine.

MS. VIZZINI:

Well, in the -- you know, in the mandated component, we decreased property taxes by \$4.6 million. This would counter that, so there would be no net increase in the General Fund. This is the portion that increases the Police District property taxes to provide the recurring revenue for -- among the following things: The Police Officer class in the General Fund; you have the reduction of the marina fees to seek alternatives to privatization; you have the two Correction Officer classes; you have the necessary \$12.4 million in expenditure cuts; you have the health center funding for Dolan; you abolish the seven new positions; you reduce sales tax -- this is the discretionary police portion. The reduction of a sales tax will bring it down by 1%. This is the transfer of 13 of the I.T. positions. Probation, Public Works, FRES and Parks will be going back to their respective departments.

P.O. LINDSAY:

No, no, no, no. Probation? Oh, back to their respective -- yeah.

MS. VIZZINI:

The I.T., the I.T., yeah. Fifty-thousand for {VEEP}, 200,000 for the D.A. to fill investigative positions. This does include the Touro Law School line item. It provides \$500,000 for Legal Aid's main program. It provides the changes to the hotel/motel funding where we're reducing the overall revenue by the impact of the economy and we're designating specific agencies. It includes \$50,000 for medical transportation because of the mammography issue. There are certain contract agency funding for the continuation of service delivery. And that's basically it.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

I have a question.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Alden. Not Alden, Eddington. I'm sorry.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

You didn't mention the Probation positions. Was that in Part 1?

MS. VIZZINI:

I just want to make sure you're clear. There are no additional Probation positions, but the I.T., the five that are supposed to come organizationally to I.T., are restored. We put them back in Probation.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Right. There was elimination of three positions that are vacant and I forget what they were called. I think Gail mentioned them before.

MS. VIZZINI:

We did not abolish positions in Probation, we the Legislature, in the omnibus.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Okay. Okay. Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

What is -- what's the specific mechanism we're going to use for the transportation money regarding the mammograms or the funding in lieu of the mobile mammography unit? How will we wind up -- what's the process?

MS. VIZZINI:

Right. The first order of business is we put the money in. In terms of effectuating eligibility for that, or what have you, that will be promulgated by the Health Department. What we did was that line item that was reduced for the mammography, we increased it by 50,000. That will have to be worked -- worked out.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Could I just add something to the discussion, because I've had further conversations with the Health Department about this. And for my colleagues that weren't on the Working Group, the money was taken out of the South Brookhaven Health Center for the mobile mammography unit that we have been not using as much for the simple reason that the technology isn't as good as the digital units that are stationary. So the Health Department came in and talked to the Working Group about what they would like to do.

They would like to have people go to stationary places to have a digital mammography and they are contracting with hospitals that aren't in our health center network to do digital mammographies for our patients and then we pay the tab. And the issue came up as far as availability and the Working Group added \$50,000 for transportation to get people that are poor that don't have a vehicle to get to these digital units. And that will be accomplished through a combination of either a contract with a taxicab carrier or else that we would give chits that they could use County transportations. And did I leave anything out, Mr. Miner? Is that pretty much --

MR. MINER:

No, that's accurate.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Okay. Any other questions? Yes, Legislator Alden. I called on you when you didn't want to be called on, and I keep forgetting to call on you when you do want to be called on.

LEG. ALDEN:

Pretty soon you don't have to ever call on me. Just to follow-up quickly.

P.O. LINDSAY:

How do you know I won't call on you for advice?

LEG. ALDEN:

I'm available any time, Bill.

P.O. LINDSAY:

On how to putt.

LEG. ALDEN:

Exactly. To pick up on just something that Legislator Eddington was talking about before. In our Probation Department, do we still have unfilled positions that are in the budget?

MS. VIZZINI:

Sure, there are vacancies. There was recently a dozen SCINs approved for the hiring of additional Probation Officers. But, generally speaking, the staffing in Probation is fairly flat.

LEG. ALDEN:

I'm not sure whether you said it's been flat or --

MS. VIZZINI:

There's usually about -- between 416 and 420 filled positions. It dipped down, then they approved more SCIN forms.

LEG. ALDEN:

But do we have the ability in this budget to hire more than our traditional number of Probation Officers? And I'm only going by the testimony about the Rockefeller Drug Laws and if they change them we're going to have more people out here that we're going to have to supervise.

MS. VIZZINI:

As far as we could determine, that was not specifically addressed, and, unlike last year, we did not add appropriations to Probation to fill additional vacancies.

LEG. ALDEN:

So we don't have the ability to fill on this budget for 2010, we don't have the ability to fill additional vacancies should the workload skyrocket?

MS. VIZZINI:

Not that I can determine, no.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Don't we still have vacant positions?

MS. VIZZINI:

We have vacant positions and --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Are they funded?

MS. VIZZINI:

Some of them are, yeah. We will probably be relatively flat.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. But we have vacant positions in that are funded.

LEG. ALDEN:

That would only bring it up to our traditional number of P.O.'s, right?

MS. VIZZINI:

As far as we can determine, yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

All right. That's going to be a problem. But then my last question is, is there any ability to do something different for the Public Defender? And I'm going to phrase it because there's two questions there. The testimony we heard before was that the senior citizen program in the -- in that department is being transferred to Touro, will result in three or four people being laid off. So, pretty much, if we do that transfer, we're doing away with that program. Is that the essence of what happens if we approve this budget?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Would you mind if I just filled in the pieces there of the thought process of the Working Group? We just don't have money to fill all the holes that we normally -- I mean, for years we've always filled Legal Aid's hole after the Executive sent us over the budget. This year we just didn't have the money. Legal Aid was looking for close to a million dollars and for new positions to restore them to make them whole for a big increase in their healthcare again, which this is the third year in a row where we've had that discussion with Legal Aid. Their healthcare went up 28% this year, which is just confounding.

We've had talks with them and it still is way above what healthcare increases are traditionally.

We kept the same fund for the 18B in Legal Aid. We moved money out of 18B into Legal Aid with the premise that it's cheaper for us to deliver services through Legal Aid than through 18B, you know, and knowing that probably we're not going to have enough money to do that and it's going to cause some kind of crisis later in the year, but we didn't have the tolerance for adding more money, because we don't have -- we don't have the money. And nobody has the tolerance for raising taxes or raising fees, or, you know, we had a whole host of issues that we looked at to get greater revenue and nobody wanted to do that. So we have to live with a budget that's underfunded. I don't know what else to say.

As far as the senior program is concerned, the County Executive put it in at 218, which was portrayed to us that it's just enough money to keep two lawyers, staff lawyers on the phone. They would not be able to go to court. All they could do was give advice, and we weren't happy with that. And again, we didn't have the money to put back, so we entered into discussions with Touro, and actually Legislator Stern handled that, to see if we could use some of our staff people, move them to Touro and have them operate in conjunction with law students to try and fill in the gap. And it sounded like the best we could do with a bad situation. Okay.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. The testimony we heard, though, is that the end result in that senior program is going to be the firing or laying off, whatever way you want to phrase it, of two or -- two, three or four of the staff attorneys that are currently working on that. And while Touro is a great institution, and their whole thing with these clinics, though, is you get students involved with an advisor and the students are very limited in, number one, their knowledge, but number two, the scope of services that they can provide, whereas the difference, and it's going to be a huge difference, between having four staff attorneys and having eight or ten, or whatever number of students that would be working on

these type of cases. That's going to be a problem going forward, because it's a diminishment of services that we provided to our senior citizen population in the past.

The other thing I'm going to say, there's \$200,000 in the budget for the D.A. for enhanced services or for actually hiring more people. I've worked for the past 12 years to try to see a little bit of parity between Legal Aid and the District Attorney's Office, because the system doesn't work without both. You can't just have the prosecution side of it all ramped up without the defense side of it. And this is a huge step backwards, I think, because, again, we're allocating more resources to the D.A.'s side, we're allocating less resources to the -- and I'm hopeful, though. I did have a conversation with Legislator Kennedy and he's got some ideas on possibly bringing down some of the overhead, which would help on an ongoing basis, but that's not something that's going to help them January 1st. They're going to get hurt January 1st. So I just bring that up as a huge problem I see going forward.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And just the piece on the D.A. The D.A. was asking for a million dollars and we gave them 200,000, and most of it's for Investigators.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. But we've never established parity between --

P.O. LINDSAY:

And we just don't --

LEG. ALDEN:

-- a D.A., an A.D.A. and somebody coming into Legal Aid. We've never established that parity, yet they do basically the same job.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And that has always been the appeal from Legal Aid, and we just didn't have the will to raise the taxes to do that.

LEG. ALDEN:

Fair enough, Bill.

*(The following was taken & transcribed by
Alison Mahoney - Court Reporter)*

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Eddington.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Yeah, I would just like to make a plea that something is done with regard to the Sergeant's list, a definitive statement, whether it's from the Deputy County Executive or the Budget Office, that it just isn't going to fade away. That yes, we're going to fill some or no we're not, because we're dealing with human beings. And I'm concerned because I've got to tell you, I think they're going to start picketing in my driveway because I'm getting calls every day, they're concerned, and I just don't think it's the right way to treat people. Just tell them no or yes, or maybe even, but at least communicate. And I hope that's not perceived as pandering. I'm just -- I'm concerned for people's -- the way we treat people, and we have it in the budget.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Well, that was the reason to put it in the budget, is we'd like it accomplished.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Yes. Hopefully they'll hear very soon.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And the role that we could play is to fund it, we can't sign the SCINS. Anybody else?

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

I'm just going to ask --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I see that Dr. Pigott is here. I just wanted to ask a question of you, please?

LEG. ALDEN:

Where's Ric?

LEG. MONTANO:

I'm here.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

I just wanted to let you know that when you answer, you have to put your finger on the button there, on the mic.

DR. PIGOTT:

This one here?

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Yeah. You and I had an opportunity to meet when you first came on board, and I know that you are an expert in public health and minority health, but you weren't here a few years ago when the Long Island Index indicated that there was a problem with our delivery of service in Suffolk County inasmuch as there were more people using emergency rooms for primary care; I think that was something that Legislator Alden was alluding to earlier. And my concern with the distance between the health centers is that people might revert to using emergency rooms for primary care, and are you comfortable with the transportation solutions that have been presented by Mr. Miner, and will that achieve the kind of level of delivery of care that we want to have here in Suffolk County? I know that I'm asking a few questions embedded together, but I think you know where I'm going with this. Okay?

DR. PIGOTT:

From what I understand, this is a temporary situation that the --

P.O. LINDSAY:

You have to hold your hand on the button.

DR. PIGOTT:

I got it, I'm just taller. So from what I understand this is a temporary situation that the Central Islip facility is insufficient for the amount of patient volume that is there and that the center is in violation of several codes. And the plan, the contingency plan, was to have those patients --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Could someone from the Clerk's Office check to make sure his mic is on?

MR. LAUBE:

It's on.

LEG. COOPER:

He's just too tall.

DR. PIGOTT:

All right, I'll try to stoop down.

(Laughter)

Okay. All right. So from what I understand, the Central Islip facility is insufficient in terms of the amount of volume and it sort of -- it wasn't the building that was designed for that use, the amount of patients that we have as a health care facility. And so that the decision is made to -- that we need to close that center and have the patients brought into an expanded Brentwood facility where we moved out a couple of divisions, like Chest Division, to accommodate the inconvenience while there will be a new Regional Health Center that will be built with a HEAL Grant. And I believe that the Brentwood Health Center is accessible by bus and also by our Long Island Rail Road and that it will be sufficient to meet the needs of the community.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

So you're saying you are comfortable with the plan as it's been laid out by Mr. Miner, that the transportation is sufficient to provide the kind of level of care that we hope for our public?

DR. PIGOTT:

Yes. I know it will be inconvenient for some residents who are comfortable using Central Islip Health Center, but Brentwood is two miles away and it is readily accessible by public transportation.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you, Dr. Pigott.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Doctor, if I could just speak to you for a moment. I'm pleased to have the opportunity. So you actually operate, then, out of the Central Islip Clinic now; do you practice there? Do you see our residents or see patients there?

DR. PIGOTT:

I'm the Director of the Office of Minority Health, and my office is in Hauppauge. I'm in an administrative capacity; I'm not seeing patients currently.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I see, okay. Because I was going to ask you about -- to tell me a little bit about the patients that are actually seen there at this point. Do we have senior citizens, do we have handicapped, do we have minority folks, do we have -- you know, it occurs to me as we're sitting here and opining about the ability to go ahead and get on buses and things like that, I really still have very little information as to whether or not I'm making a decision that affects an 80 year-old rheumatoid arthritic individual or a young mother with several toddlers, or is it an able-bodied, middle age individual? It occurs to me that we're speaking in global terms about these notions of licensure and consolidation, but I think we're losing some of the actual effect or impact as we move into the winter of trying to deliver service to people. Do you have any sense? What's the composition of folks there?

DR. PIGOTT:

I don't have the actual numbers. I know the Patient Care Division, that's what they do in my division, we don't keep track of those particular statistics. I can say that Central Islip and Brentwood are a heavily Latino population.

LEG. MONTANO:

John, if you may suffer an interruption. I have the figures here from the Health Department report, I could pass those over to you.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'll yield.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Are you done?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'll yield, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Doctor.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Montano, you have the floor anyway.

LEG. MONTANO:

Are you done?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'll yield.

P.O. LINDSAY:

He's done, he said he's done.

LEG. MONTANO:

All right. Doctor, you've said that you're the Director of the Office of Minority Health, but you're not at the health center.

DR. PIGOTT:

Correct.

LEG. MONTANO:

And I just want to be clear; your perspective is based on the perspective of the Health Department. You -- and I know very clearly because I called your office and invited you to the public hearing that was held a couple of weeks ago in CI dealing with, you know, with patients, community residents. You were not present and my understanding is that you were not authorized to be present, even though I had invited you, so you really did not get an opportunity to hear from the patients, from the community. You didn't really get a chance to hear about the parking problems at the Brentwood Health Center, you didn't get a chance to hear what the problems were from the waiting room, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. And is it fair to say that you really don't have that perspective because you weren't able to attend the meeting, you don't have first-hand information on what is going on with the patients in CI? Would that be fair or have you -- you know, do you sit there and watch what's going on? I mean, you're the Director of Minority Health.

Let me give you the figures that Legislator Kennedy asked. The Brentwood Health Center and the CI Health Center, sir, and I'm reading from the report that was submitted by the State -- by the County Health Department, allegedly to the State, and I'm not even sure that it got there. But it basically says on page four, "The BHC and the CIHC serve the medically underserved populations of Brentwood, Central Islip and Bay Shore. These three communities, with a total population of 143,000, contain a large concentration of minority, poor and medically underserved individuals. This underserved population is predominantly Latino or African-American. The Brentwood, CI and Bay Shore communities represent of" -- I don't know if that's improperly written, but "represent of 35% of Suffolk's African-American population and over 50% of the County's Hispanic population. Birth from these three communities constitute approximately 15% of all births in the County, while the area constitutes only 10% of the County's general population. The number of HIV/AIDS cases

treated at the two health centers represent approximately one-third of all HIV/AIDS cases treated in the County's Health Center Network. The population of these three communities also experiences a high rate of Diabetes, adult asthma, Obstructive Pulmonary Disease and Bacterial Pneumonia".

I could go on and on. But since you're not aware, maybe -- you know, I think you need to look at this report and familiarize yourself because these centers treat predominantly the minority communities of Long Island. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Do you want to comment, Doctor?

DR. PIGOTT:

No. I will take a look at those reports.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Legislator Gregory.

LEG. GREGORY:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Dr. Pigott, for coming here today. And I have to say that I concur with my colleagues who have spoken on this issue about the closure of the Central Islip Center. Central Islip, being where I grew up, it's of special interest to me. And I'm concerned to hear some of your feedback as to, you know, your position in minority health about access to health care for minorities. I mean, we've heard that this center is operating out of compliance, you know, we have a part-time certificate, if that's license or whatever. But, you know, it was by our choice to operate out of compliance, so to say that I think is a bogus argument.

I have to -- no one has asked the right question, I don't think. In my mind, you know, at some point we had to build Brentwood Center and at some point we made a decision to open a Central Islip Center. Logic would tell you that there was a need there, whether it was ten miles away or 2.2 miles away. And I continuously hear the argument, "Well, we can close CI now because it's only 2.2 miles away and they can go to Brentwood, it's right down Suffolk"; they're using the reverse argument that they used to open the center. So I want to hear what are your concerns about having access to -- for minorities, or significantly a minority population not having access to health care. And what are the issues that you see, particularly working with minority communities, to having access to health care and what this impact will have to them.

DR. PIGOTT:

Well, access to health care, it is a big problem for the minority community. And Central Islip did have a role, but I understand that unfortunately the space there was not sufficient for the patient care that it has rendered there. It's just a temporary solution that we have to have the Central Islip patients brought over to Brentwood, and I believe they will be cared for properly. I believe the providers that are currently seeing patients at Central Islip will be seeing their patients also at Brentwood Health Center, and when we build the new Regional Health Center, that should be able to accommodate everybody.

(The following was transcribed by Kim Castiglione, Legislative Secretary)

LEG. GREGORY:

So as Legislator Alden has alluded to, we have the Bay Shore Center, we've lost whatever the number is, those patients were displaced, now we have a Central Islip Center, part-time satellite center, they're going to be displaced again to Brentwood to be displaced to a future undetermined location in the future. I think it's more logical to keep what we have in place, try to work on whatever code issues that we have and then once we open the new center -- and I think the community supports that, from what I understand speaking to Legislator Montano. Why don't we move, close it once we have the new center instead of moving them to Brentwood to another place

and they've already been moved and we're going to lose people to the system. And overall it's going to cost us more, if you look at the statistics, because people are just going to go to the emergency rooms. Do you have any feedback on that?

DR. PIGOTT:

In terms of the options that were presented to me, I believe the closure of Central Islip was something that would have to be done and I had no input in that. We'll just have to -- it will be inconvenient, but we should be able to meet the demands of the patients.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay. Thank you, Doctor.

LEG. MONTANO:

Doctor, before you leave?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

Thank you. Where do you live, Doctor, what area?

DR. PIGOTT:

I live in Greenlawn.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. I moved recently from Suffolk Avenue, which is right down the street from the CI Center, and I moved to Brentwood.

LEG. ALDEN:

Westchester?

LEG. MONTANO:

No, Suffolk Avenue.

(Laughter)

LEG. ALDEN:

I'm sorry, Ric.

LEG. MONTANO:

Thanks, Cameron. I thought you were my buddy. But what I want to say very clearly is I don't think that you have -- have you experienced the traffic conditions and what it really does take to get from CI to Brentwood, that 2.2 miles? I mean, because I've got to tell you, in all honesty, and I'm not saying this just because it's my health center in my district, but -- and I think Renee is looking at me and she can bear this out; you have no idea of what that traffic is like from CI. Those 2.2 miles really don't translate into 2.2 miles, it's more like 22.2 miles, and that is a major concern. And you know, I toured the Brentwood facility with -- you remember Leave it to Beaver? Well, he was in town last week and we toured the Brentwood Center together.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

He was?

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah. You didn't know about that? Leave it to Beaver was in town; you guys don't read your e-mails.

LEG. ALDEN:

The Beave was here.

LEG. MONTANO:

The Beave was here, I have his autograph. He actually suffers from Diabetes and he has an interest. He came here along with Fernando Ferrer from New York City and we went into the Brentwood Center and we looked at the facilities and there really isn't a stitch of renovation that has -- and I think my colleagues need to know this. There really isn't a stitch of renovations that have taken place. There have been some offices that I think have been emptied out, but that's not really renovation.

And I have to concur with Legislator Gregory. You know, and I'm not opposed to the merger, I'm not opposed to the regionalization or the regional plan, but I am opposed to the process and the method by which the County Executive and the Health Department is proceeding to close this center. I would like to see the Health Department approval, I would like to see the I's dotted and the T's crossed because we're dealing really with a very critical issue. This is not some fly-by-night operation. We're dealing with some very serious health concerns, and you haven't seen the traffic of people walking on Suffolk Avenue to that health center.

So I don't mean this as a criticism to you. What I'm saying is that in your role, you need to get more familiar with what is going on, particularly when it concerns minority health in the County. And I'm sure you will get there, but I don't think you're there yet. Thank you, Doctor.

DR. PIGOTT:

Thanks.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I just had a quick question, and I don't know who can answer it.

I understand that the State hasn't given approval for us to operate this center. But is State approval necessary for -- State approval for a closure plan necessary prior to us closing the Central Islip Health Center down? And if it is, do we have that approval in hand as we vote today?

P.O. LINDSAY:

I believe --

LEG. ROMAINE:

That's a real simple question.

P.O. LINDSAY:

-- that Mr. Miner has already answered that; we have three partial licenses to operate CI.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right.

P.O. LINDSAY:

We have approval to close two of the licenses. They're waiting for approval on the third license.

LEG. ROMAINE:

On the third. Okay.

LEG. MONTANO:

If I may, Mr. Speaker?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Go ahead.

LEG. MONTANO:

We did intend to invite the State Health Department to come down and they weren't able to, we weren't able to get it out but, you know, I would like to hear from the State Health. Because at the public hearing that Dr. Pigott was not able to attend and in my conversations with the Deputy Regional Director -- and I want to say we also, myself and Assemblyman Ramos, had a conference call with the State Health Commissioner's Office prior to the e-mail that was sent by them saying that they needed a closure plan. In fact, I think they gave the County a deadline of three o'clock today, I don't know if that's been done. But we need to hear, I think, firsthand from the Health Department of New York State and I'm willing to reach out, and so is Assemblyman Ramos, to make those arrangements. I don't think that we should --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Well, I don't -- I'm not -- I don't want to hear from them, but I want to see the paperwork that we have to approve to close the place.

LEG. MONTANO:

Well, yeah, I agree with you. One or the other. Either, you know, give it to me in writing or come in here. But I think ultimately you're right, Mr. Presiding Officer, we'd like to see -- skeptical would be a mild word. I'd like to see it in writing.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Thank you, Doctor.

DR. PIGOTT:

Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. And we go back to *Budget Amendment No. 2*; we have a motion and a second?

MR. LAUBE:

That's correct.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Opposed.

MR. LAUBE:

Sixteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. With -- who's missing?

MR. LAUBE:

Legislator Nowick.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Oh, I'm sorry. Here she is. Do you want to be counted, Legislator Nowick, as a vote?

LEG. NOWICK:

Of course I want to be counted.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Opposed: Legislator Barraga).

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. With that, I'm going to ask that we have a very short recess, I just want to review with my caucus the standalones. Thank you very much.

(The meeting was recessed at 1:20 p.m. and reconvened at 1:45 p.m.)

P.O. LINDSAY:

Roll call.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube - Clerk)

LEG. ROMAINE:

Present.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Here.

LEG. BROWNING:

Here.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Here.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Present.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Here.

LEG. MONTANO:

(Not Present).

LEG. ALDEN:

Here.

LEG. MONTANO:

Here.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Here.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

Here.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Here.

LEG. GREGORY:

Here.

LEG. STERN:

Here.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Here.

LEG. COOPER:

Here.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

(Not Present).

P.O. LINDSAY:

Here.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Viloría-Fisher).

P.O. LINDSAY:

Ric?

LEG. ALDEN:

Ric's here.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay, we're going to address the standalones and then we're going to hopefully get through these.

Okay, the first one up is -- I'm going to take them in order. Let's go. Come on, guys, let's get into doing business so we can finish this up -- is **Standalone No. 3**, this resolution adds 40,303 to the 2010 to Pronto of Long Island, Incorporated, to enable the agency to continue its feeding mission for lower income families and \$35,000 in 2010 for VINES, after reductions in State aid, which is offset by reductions of 50,303 in Social Security and 25,000 in the Office of Minority Affairs, for a net County cost of zero dollars. It requires 14 votes to subsidize the loss of State aid to comply with no new mandate law. The action has no property tax impact.

Why this is a standalone, this is -- both of these agencies, it was decided to fund them, but we have a Local Law that we cannot increase funding to an agency to replace State funding, so that's why it has to be dealt with as a standalone. I make a motion to approve.

LEG. MONTANO:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Second by Legislator Montano. Any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Next is **Standalone No. 4**, this resolution adds \$271,120 for permanent salaries and fringe benefits to fill ten critically needed vacancies in Child Support Enforcement for half of 2010, offset with Federal and State aid of \$216,082 and reductions of 55,038 in fees-for-services for net County cost of zero dollars. This action is a recommendation of the Budget Review Office and it's in the Budget Review recommendations on page 333. This action has no property tax impact. Legislator Gregory, you wanted to speak on this?

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes. This --

LEG. ALDEN:

Do you want to make a motion?

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes. I make a motion, Mr. Chair.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Motion by Legislator Gregory, seconded by Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay. Back in, I would say, June I had discussions with the Commissioner of DSS and we were talking about child support collections, and I discovered that in Suffolk County we have over \$500 million in child support arrears; that's a significant number. As you can tell, it's approximately half of what we collect in sales tax. And our Child Support Enforcement Bureau is the second highest in collections in New York State, only second behind New York City. And BRO has stated that for every dollar that we spend in child support collections, we get \$85 in return. There are 19 total vacancies in the Child Support Enforcement Bureau, looking to fill ten of them. They're 80% State funded.

This will provide an impact for us in several ways. One, we get -- we put positions in places where we can go after these deadbeats so that we can get the money that they need to needy families in Suffolk County, who are going to spend the money on food, shelter and clothing, which will turnaround and generate sales tax revenue. And, secondly, get people off of Public Assistance, because it's almost a third of them are on Public Assistance that have child support arrears. So I ask my colleagues to support it. It's going to be a bill that's going to generate us revenue and get money to needy families in Suffolk County.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

The purpose obviously seems very, very good. The State funding for 80%, very, very good. The fact that for every dollar that we collect this way is \$85 that we save because these people don't -- some of these people can go off Social Services etcetera, very, very good. Any commitment that the County Executive will fill these ten positions?

LEG. GREGORY:

No, I don't have a commitment. I mean, I would hope that the County Executive sees the need for that. I know a few years ago he had -- there was a special unit that he had put together to actually go after people with child support arrears. He disbanded it because of the cost, but we're asking for just a regular, you know, Child Support Enforcement Bureau personnel to investigate so we can reduce the current caseload of the caseworkers.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Through the Chair, if I could ask Legislator Gregory a question. What plan do you have if this is adopted, vetoed, the veto overridden, part of the budget then when the County Executive doesn't fill these positions? What will you do then?

(Laughter From Panel)

LEG. GREGORY:

That's a rhetorical question, right?

LEG. ROMAINE:

I guess you can take it that way. I don't want to put it on your plate. But my question is if we think this is worthwhile and if we vote for this and the Executive fails to fill this portion, we should have action that is immediate, swift and right in your face, because I am not going to vote for this unless we have that type of action, immediate and swift action. If we think this is a priority and this Legislature comes together on this, and I will remind you of this, I'm sure, I'm hopeful that our Executive will see the light because I think what you've done is made an argument that we can save money, we can get people off Social Services. This is 80% State funded. But I've seen these arguments made before. I voted for funding under the premise that, yes, it seems worthwhile and nothing happens. So I'll be happy to sit down with you and talk about what I mean by immediate and swift.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay, thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Vilorio-Fisher.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes. Legislator Romaine, you have a good point. And thank you, Legislator Gregory, for introducing this because when I would meet with the Welfare-to-Work Commission, this is -- this doesn't just impact us directly in Social Services through, you know, TNAF grants, etcetera, but this -- when child support is not enforced there's a tremendous burden on our food pantries, because most of the people who are using the food pantries are single moms and their children. When they don't get this enforcement they have to really put a great burden on the food pantries and other services that we fund through our contract agencies, so it's really critically important for this to go forward.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Any other comments? Okay, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Opposed.

LEG. MONTANO:

Cosponsor.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Opposed: Legislator Barraga)

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Cosponsor.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Cosponsor.

LEG. BROWNING:

Cosponsor.

LEG. COOPER:

Cosponsor.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Budget Amendment No. 5, this resolution restores the MI-HEAP Program in 2010 to its 2009 funding level of \$500,000, which is offset by a reduction in DPW rent for a net County cost of zero dollars. This action has no property tax impact.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Mr. Presiding Officer, could you please remove me as the sponsor? Thank you.

LEG. NOWICK:

Put me back. Put me on that.

MR. LAUBE:

You're on.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Motion by Legislator Horsley.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Motion.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Second by Legislator Alden. On the question? Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm trying to find out -- maybe somebody at the horseshoe knows. How do Suffolk County residents find out about the MI-HEAP Program? Are we advertising this Countywide? Are we seeing participation throughout the County or is it only in specific areas?

P.O. LINDSAY:

It was only -- only existed last year. And from my understanding, there was a limited window of application period that was in November. Am I correct?

LEG. HORSLEY:

No, it was -- we had it -- it's actually I think it's two years now.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Two years?

LEG. HORSLEY:

It's two years. And it was oversubscribed both times. In fact, the limited window, what you are referring to, is that once the season somewhat ended they shut off the funding to it, or at least the expenditures to it. But it was clearly a case of oversubscription, because we've got those people who are just hanging on by their fingernails.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Obviously, Legislator Horsley, there's a great need for this. The question -- my question is are we advertising throughout the County so that everybody who potentially could qualify knows about this program? Are we seeing the people that are taking advantage of this program all coming from, you know, a small cross-section of the County.

LEG. HORSLEY:

No, they haven't, and we can verify this. Well, do you have an answer to this?

MR. KOVESDY:

No, we just have a concern on the offset, sir.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I understand that.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

The wave of the hand said it all.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

You are not pushing the button, Wayne.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay. It is widely subscribed across the County, it is on the website, and that's where most of the information comes from, Jay. I would love to advertise this on a greater number, again, but whether or not -- how quickly it will be run through is clearly a case. But it's been oversubscribed.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I suspect that the people who got it last year are going to ask again for it, and I'm not sure that that's fair. You know, maybe we could disqualify the people who got it last year since there is such limited funds.

P.O. LINDSAY:

How about before we spend the money we make it we pass it first.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I understand that, but I want to make sure that we're passing a bill that is going to be fair and not subject to abuse. I think one way to do that, and we can do this later, is to say, "Look if you got the money last year, you don't get a chance to get it this year." Let somebody else who didn't get it, get it.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I'm amenable to that, Jay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. I just want to weigh in on this issue, and this was an issue that came up before the Working Group and it did not secure enough votes for passage. I supported this I think last year and cannot support it this year because we just don't have the money. It's as simple as that. And it weighed very heavily on us and it's a great program and we help a lot of people, but we just had so many problems and so many holes and not enough revenue. And we, you know, the Working Group at length talked about fee increases and ways of raising more money, more revenue, that we could help more people, and at the end of the day they did not want to raise any fees or taxes any more than we absolutely had to. Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Based on that discussion, Mr. Presiding Officer, I'll ask the Clerk to remove my name as the sponsor. I understand we'd love to do a lot of things, unfortunately we can't always afford to do all the things that we love, and this is a very, very difficult year. And based on your fiscal analysis of this I'm regretfully going to remove my name as the sponsor.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Mr. Presiding Officer, may I respond?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yes, Legislator.

LEG. HORSLEY:

You know, when the County Executive talks about that issue that -- that we often have to say no to -- we often have to say no to responses because we just don't have the money, so that sometimes we can make the decision to say yes to get those things which we absolutely need. We all know

that this is a recessionary measure, that MI-HEAP, the middle income HEAP, is a recessionary measure. We have more people being laid off. Arrow Electronics just announced the other day that they're going to layoff 400 employees. These are people who built Long Island, the middle class of Long Island. The middle class of Long Island, Mrs. D'Amico on the numbered streets in West Babylon. These are the people we're referring to. Those people should never, ever go cold in Suffolk County.

I think it would be irresponsible on our part to not recognize the group that is -- that we sometimes overlook. The people who may be hanging on by their fingernails that have lost a job or had a problem within the family and we could not help them keep their home for the winter I think is something that is just sad. And I think that we should follow the dictate of the County Executive and say yes to those things that matter. And this is one of those issues I believe matter to Suffolk County, that somebody does not -- we don't have some older lady freeze this week -- this year. It is a very important measure.

LEG. MONTANO:

May I say something?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Go ahead, Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

I'm going to ask you to list me as a cosponsor on this, and I just want to say that I know that we're in real fiscal problems, but there are some really needy things out there. I think Legislator Horsley expressed it well. People in my district, which is one of the poorest, are really hurting. You know, to have someone go without heat is something that I just can't accept in this day and age in Suffolk County.

LEG. ALDEN:

Well said.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Anybody else? What I would just like to say, and I don't want to be argumentative or disagree with my colleagues on this because it's not an issue that should be for political fodder, but if we wanted to do this why wouldn't we, why didn't we be honest and raise fees or raise the income legitimately to pay for it? The DPW rent account is kind of oversubscribed and I mean it might be there but -- I'm going to make a prediction that before we get too far into 2010 we're going to have an economic crisis again. There's not a doubt in my mind that this budget is so tight unless things turn around dramatically we're going to have another problem when we get to 2010. I just can't support it, I'm sorry.

LEG. HORSLEY:

With due respect; if not this, then what?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Well, just raise the money for it then and put it in a proper offset in there to raise a fee or raise the money to pay for it. Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Budget Review, I guess, recommended this as an offset.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Vivian, the button.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

My mouth isn't close. You recommend that this is an offset, can you give us the numbers, please?

MS. VIZZINI:

Yeah. The cost is 500,000, the offset is DPW rent. There was 15.1 million in the rental account, this reduces it to 14.6. All of the -- it was very, very challenging to identify offsets. Most of the offsets were used to constitute the expenditure cuts included in the Omnibus.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Gail, what were the 2008 and 2009 actuals for the line for DPW that lead you to the conclusion that we could go into it for the 500,000?

MS. VIZZINI:

The estimate -- the '09 estimate was fifteen-one, and I don't have the 2008 actual, but serving on the Space Committee, and those of you who serve with me know that the real estate market is very competitive right now and those few transactions that we are negotiating to reup or modify, the bids are very, very competitive. On the other hand, in some cases they are outlandish. So it's just another line item in the budget that will be very tight. Anything that is over expended at some point in the year will ultimately come from another line item where there would be a surplus.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Gail, can you just tell me again the estimated in '09 is 15.1?

MS. VIZZINI:

Correct.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

And what was the recommended in 2010?

MS. VIZZINI:

15 -- fifteen one.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Oh, the same thing. So it stayed flat. So you're saying --

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Your light is not on.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

You are saying that we have enough wiggle room to go down to 15.5, which is a half a million less than --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Fourteen-six.

MS. VIZZINI:

It would be fourteen-six.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Right.

MS. VIZZINI:

In 2008 it was actually sixteen-nine. But again, the market is a lot more competitive now for those few instances whereby we are reupping our leases or exploring other space.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

And we have several large leases that we're negotiating -- on which we are negotiating right now?

Is that -- because to realize this kind of impact you are saying we have large enough leases that we would have that kind of wiggle room? Because I find the Presiding Officer's argument very compelling as far as being, you know, running by the skin of our teeth here.

MS. VIZZINI:

It's extremely tight. There is -- it is plausible that this account could be over expended by the time we make those lease deals, but there is some -- there is some fluidity to it.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Thank you, Gail.

LEG. NOWICK:

Bill?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

Gail, what was the budget surplus? So the anticipated, unexpended funds from the 2009 budget was how much?

MS. VIZZINI:

Forty-two million.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay, thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:

You know, I understand where my colleagues are coming from as far as the offsets, but it's November and the oil bills are coming in and I just did some quick math. I listened to Legislator Montano say your district is very poor, but you know what, it doesn't even have to be a poor district. It's any district.

LEG. MONTANO:

Everybody is hurting today.

LEG. NOWICK:

If you do some math and you take a widow who no longer gets a retirement check and maybe gets a Social Security check, maybe \$1,300. And then they are going to pay LIPA 120, they are going to have food, maybe for the month 200, maybe drugs at the pharmacist, another 200. And then lo and behold, the fuel truck comes down the street, \$500. Oil is up again, and of course this is not enough money to help everybody, but there are people that are going the suffer and it's not just a poor district. It is a middle or quote middle class district. So it's November, and while I do agree and I see where my colleagues are coming from, I'm feeling as government we don't have a lot of choice right now. The season is upon us and I'm going to cosponsor it and vote for it.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Anybody else?

LEG. ALDEN:

Did we close on Dick Cavett's house?

(Laughter)

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Schneiderman. God, am I going to miss him, you know?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's certainly a noble program and lots of people would benefit from it if they could. So the people who get it, they're the lucky ones. For each person who gets it there's probably thousands of families who don't get it who could use it. I personally would feel more comfortable if we were spreading this out, basically anyone who is income qualified in this middle income section would have some reduction, because everybody is hurting. That's really -- the offset we can argue whether there's going to be money in DPW rent or not. My concern is that it's only helping a handful of people. And, yes, they need help, but so many more.

LEG. HORSLEY:

A thousand.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's what I'm wrestling with, those thousand families versus probably tens of thousands of families who could use that help right now.

LEG. MONTANO:

Bill, a quick comment?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

I just want to clarify if I gave the impression that everybody in my district was poor, that's not true. We have many middle class people in my district also.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Never doubted that.

LEG. MONTANO:

And a lot of them, they are hurting. So, you know, don't just think it's the poor folks. We have poor, we have people pretty well off and we have middle class in my district.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. And, again, my objection isn't the merits of the program and about providing oil for people that need help. I'm very, very sympathetic to that. My objection is to how we fund it. In the Working Group we talked about raising bus fees; we didn't want to do that. We talked about restoring the increase in Park fees; we didn't want to do that. We talked about increasing Consumer Affairs rates on gas stations; we didn't want to do that. We don't want to make the hard choices and make the decisions to raise the legitimate revenue to fund some of the things we want to do, but yet we want to spend the money. I don't -- at this point in time there's no more fat in this program, in this budget, there's none. I just think it would be irresponsible. Ms. Corso, did you want to say something?

CHIEF DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE CORSO:

Yeah. I just was wondering if -- I have some information that might make this decision a little easier for you. We had just gotten, I believe it was on Friday, notification of additional federal stimulus -- our funds for the HEAP Program. So I just sent an e-mail to DSS to see how much money, additional monies, so that might, you know, relieve some strain in some of this issue that you guys are having. I just figured I would just shed a little light on that for you.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

How much more?

LEG. HORSLEY:

That's LI HEAP, right?

CHIEF DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE CORSO:

It is just additional money, though, for --

LEG. HORSLEY:

To LI HEAP.

CHIEF DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE CORSO:

I'm not a hundred percent sure. I'm getting the information.

LEG. HORSLEY:

It's low income. It's not middle income.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I believe we have e-mail from the Governor's office on our computer about that program.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yeah, it's no income.

P.O. LINDSAY:

It's a different program. Legislator Horsley is pointing out it is a different program.

CHIEF DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE CORSO:

But it's still going to help more people, that's my point.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah. If there's nothing else to be said, let's vote. We have a motion and a second. You want a roll call?

LEG. HORSLEY:

Sure.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Roll call.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube - Clerk)

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Abstain.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Pass.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

No.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

No.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. COOPER:

Yes.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes.

P.O. LINDSAY:

No.

MR. LAUBE:

Thirteen.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

Oh, sorry. Thirteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Sorry, DuWayne, I just couldn't.

LEG. NOWICK:

How much you needed 14?

P.O. LINDSAY:

No, ten, it passed.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Just needed single majority on this one.

LEG. STERN:

Tim, cosponsor.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Six --

MS. VIZZINI:

Legislator Alden withdrew it.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Budget Amendment Number Seven. This resolution adds \$14,000 in 2010 for the Peconic Community Councils Maureen's Haven Homeless Outreach Program, offset by a decrease of \$14,000 in Social Security for a net County cost of zero dollars. This action has no property tax impact.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Motion to approve.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Do we have a second?

LEG. ALDEN:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Second by Legislator Alden.

LEG. ROMAINE:

A very quick explanation. Maureen's Haven is a program that works in the five eastern towns where they send out buses and pick up homeless people, bring them to the various churches, on both the North and South Fork, feed them, give them a place to stay during the winter, it operates from November 1st to March 31st, and then gives them breakfast and then sends them on their way.

Without this program I will certainly insist that Social Services meet their obligation to house these people and feed these people, in which case the County will have a much greater cost. By Maureen's Haven doing this as a not-for-profit, the County saves considerable money. We don't have to house these homeless people and they are given shelter through the cold winter months. The reason that there's \$14,000 in there, they get about \$57,000 now but they are overwhelmed this year by the homeless on the East End.

P.O. LINDSAY:

So we funded this agency in the budget.

LEG. ROMAINE:

It was funded at the same level last year, 57,000. This has brought 14,000 more because of the number of homeless that is showing up looking for food and shelter in the cold weather.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I, again, do not have any fault with this program at all. I hear nothing but good things about them, but I know a lot of us are funding homeless programs through some discretionary money that we have in our districts, so I won't be supporting it for that reason. Anybody else want to comment? Okay, we have a motion and a second. Let's see if we can just do it by a voice vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? I'm opposed. Ten-eight, am I right?

LEG. ALDEN:

You might want a roll call.

P.O. LINDSAY:

All right. Let's do a roll call. Roll call.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube - Clerk)

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

No.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Yes.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

No.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. HORSLEY:

No.

LEG. GREGORY:

No.

LEG. STERN:

No.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No.

LEG. COOPER:

No.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes.

P.O. LINDSAY:

No.

MR. LAUBE:

Nine.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Budget Amendment No. 8, this resolution adds \$1,032,477 in 2010 for the Islip Health Center in order to bring funding back to its 2009 estimated amount and allow the health center to remain open in 2010. The increase is offset by equivalent reductions in permanent salaries and Social Security. This action has no property tax impact. Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes, I make a motion to approve.

LEG. ALDEN:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

If you don't mind, I'm going to second the motion for this very specific reason is I'm hoping -- I'm pretty sure that this resolution will be back before us when we address the vetoes, and by approving it it gives us a couple of more weeks to see what happens with the State Health Department, maybe this whole fluid situation will become much clearer.

LEG. MONTANO:

Fine.

P.O. LINDSAY:

So with that, I'll second that motion.

LEG. MONTANO:

On the motion.

P.O. LINDSAY:

On the motion.

LEG. MONTANO:

I will be in contact with the State Health Department and report back to the members of the Legislature exactly what they say. And in talking with Gail when we did the offset, it's my understanding, Gail, that if, in fact, the State Health Department does approve and we ultimately close, this money can be -- it's not going to be used, it can be returned back to the category from which it came. Is that not accurate?

MS. VIZZINI:

Well, you have the timeframe between the let's assume adoption and veto to determine.

LEG. MONTANO:

That's one timeframe.

MS. VIZZINI:

If it passes and it survives the veto.

LEG. MONTANO:

Right.

MS. VIZZINI:

In other words, if it was effectuated. The line item for Brentwood, you know, the Islip Health Center, that's the line item, will increase by this amount.

LEG. MONTANO:

Right.

MS. VIZZINI:

If it remains unspent you can either amend the budget during the year or it would fall to fund balance.

LEG. MONTANO:

Well, we can amend the budget in February. That would be our first opportunity.

MS. VIZZINI:

The Legislature can amend it four times a year, yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Now, just so I'm clear. If the State Health Department approves it with some condition and it delays the time and we have to spend some money, the remainder, when that time expires by which the Health Department says, okay, now you are good to close, then the balance can be returned to this category by resolution of this Legislature; am I correct?

MS. VIZZINI:

Correct.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. That's what I wanted to have on the record. Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you. I just also have to agree with you and with Legislator Montano as well. I sit on the Space Management Steering Committee as Chair of Ways and Means, and although there is a plan and it's all been laid out, the fact of the matter is, as we heard the testimony today, we don't have all the final approvals in place. This facility is up, it's operating, and it's delivering health care to people who need it and I think we should not tinker with that. If we're going to defund it, it has to be done properly, so I'm going to support this.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Anybody else?

LEG. ALDEN:

I just want to --

P.O. LINDSAY:

I'm sorry, Legislator Alden. I keep forgetting you. I'm sorry.

LEG. MONTANO:

He's preparing.

LEG. ALDEN:

And actually this gives us a couple of more weeks, and Legislator D'Amaro has one leg up on us because he does sit on Space Management. I would actually like to see the plan and I would like to see the timeframe including the plan for the Regional Health Center, which, again, was testified to today that if we don't use the money by next October that we lose that five million dollars, the grant, and it will give us a little time to also talk to DPW and get their timeframe for the construction or reconstruction, whichever way we want to phrase that, too. I think it buys time for a number of different things, but we cannot just do away with this center. There's live bodies that go there every day to be taken care of, so. Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm going to echo the sentiments of my colleagues and I'm going to support this. I'm always going to look at what we've all stated before, but it's actually in the New York State Code of Rules and Regulations that you cannot -- an entity cannot close a validly operating health clinic without consent. So for us to not furnish funding in essence is not complying with the New York State Code of Rules and Regulations. And we have had that conversation, Counsel and I.

The other thing that occurs to me is I've heard about the HEAL Grant now, and I guess it's incumbent on myself to find out. I'm curious as to whether we're going to invest five million dollars on a property that we own or if it's owned by somebody else. It is interesting to see how this is going to go forward. So I need more time to look into this so I'm going to vote to support this. Thank you.

(The following was transcribed by Alison Mahoney, Court Stenographer)

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Anybody else? Seeing none, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Opposed.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Opposed: Legislator Barraga)

P.O. LINDSAY:

Budget Amendment Number 9, this resolution adds \$200,000 in 2010 for the permanent salaries and 45,564 for fringe benefits to provide sufficient funds for the District Attorney to hire Investigators. For example, additional funding would allow for two Detective Investigators grade 26, and two District Attorney Investigators, grade 21, to be filled for three quarters of the year. The costs are offset by reductions in the District Attorney's 2009 estimated budget and reduction in Social Security. See Budget Review Office pages 165 and 169. The action has no property tax impact.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Mr. Presiding Officer, my goal in sponsoring this resolution was to get additional Detective Investigators for the D.A.'s Office. I have spoken with people in the D.A. staff. They indicated they had a shortage and they certainly needed it. My understanding is that the Working Group has restored 200 of the \$400,000 needed. I would like to give the D.A.'s Office more, but I'm aware of your call for watching what we do very carefully. If there's an opportunity later in the year with funding becoming available, I will look to do that. But since 200 of the 400,000 has been restored I

will withdraw this amendment.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Thank you, Legislator Romaine. **BA 10**, the resolution adds \$25,000 in 2010 for IGHL to maintain the Flight 800 memorial and it's offset by a \$25,000 decrease in expenditures for Social Security. This action has no property tax impact.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Motion to approve.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Motion to approve by Legislator Eddington. Do I have a second?

LEG. ALDEN:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Second by Legislator Alden. On the motion. Go ahead, Legislator Eddington.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

I just wanted to do add that they have set up an endowment that so that this will be self-sustaining very shortly, but we have committed to take care of it. Suffolk County has committed to it. The memorial is there, it's beautiful, and I just believe that we must meet our commitments. They do use community service through the courts to help, inmate labor, and seasonal park workers and they do bring in revenue because I think a gentleman spoke that they made like \$200,000 or 200,000 visitors they think come to just see that. So I just feel that it's not time to drop this commitment, so I'm looking for support.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah, this is, you know, even though it's in Jack's district a lot of the people -- I see it also as an attraction in Smith Point Beach. It's a beautiful monument and, you know, I even have constituents who have lost family members, but IGHL does a lot of great work in the communities and this is an opportunity to keep them working. You know, there's certain facilities, certain places in the district that employ them. We have a nursery nearby where they're employed. This is another avenue for them to put the IGHL client's to work, giving them something to do so they're not sitting around doing nothing. And I know that way back Mr. Seaman came and told us that the County Executive made a commitment to maintain this monument. We don't have the Parks employees to do this anymore. They are so short staffed. In fact, my Aide, one of my new Aides, was a Parks employee in the summertime, he told me there's just not enough workers, there's just not enough people to do the work down there right now. It really is a shame. It's a beautiful memorial.

We have made the commitment and before I was even here the commitment was made to take care of this. Sheriff DeMarco is using prisoners, IGHL has stepped up. We're actually saving a lot of money by doing what we're doing. And if we're going to start using Parks employees to do this then we're going to have to hire more because there's just not enough. So I am going to support this. They are working on doing an endowment, but until they can get the adequate funding in that endowment I think we need to do the right thing by them.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I just want to weigh in. This was another issue that came up before the Working Group and the Working Group, again, I mean this is an annual thing that's been coming up before the Working Group almost every year for the last few years and we have traditionally restored this money. This

year we decided not to because of the tight budget and we agreed that it can be restored through some discretionary money. I will be, you know, if this fails I will be happy to commit some of my discretionary money to this project. I think it should be done, I think we should keep our commitment, I just think that was the purpose of letting some of the Legislators decide how to allocate the money that's primarily in their district or in their catchment area.

Does anybody else have any questions? Or want to comment? No? Okay. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Opposed.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Opposed.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Opposed.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Opposed.

MR. LAUBE:

Fourteen.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Let's do a roll call.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Roll call.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube - Clerk)

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

No.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

No.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

Oh God.

LEG. GREGORY:

That's not a response.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

No.

LEG. STERN:

No.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. COOPER:

No.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes.

P.O. LINDSAY:

No.

MR. LAUBE:

Eleven. (Opposed: Legislators Beedenbender, Losquadro, Barraga, Gregory, Stern and Lindsay)

P.O. LINDSAY:

That saves me some of my discretionary money. ***Resolution Number 11***, this resolution reverses the transfer of 12 positions and their associated expenses within the Parks Department from the General Fund to the Hotel/Motel Fund. The General Funds costs are offset from revenue generated by extending the current park fees schedule. This action has no property tax impact.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Motion to approve.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Motion to approve by Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

LEG. COOPER:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Seconded by Legislator Cooper. On the question, Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Through the Chair, may I ask Richard Martin to come up, head of Historic Services?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Go right ahead.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Richard? The reason I'm asking Mr. Martin to come up is because the Parks Department has been stretched very, very thin in its protection of our historic structures, the historic structures as Ms. Spencer pointed out earlier. We all received a report as to the status of our historic structures. These are structures that are on the National Register and we have not been able to maintain them, and we recently saw what happened in Brookhaven Town. It wasn't one of our properties, but you saw the Mott House that just fell in on itself because it had not been maintained. I've asked Mr. Martin to come up because, Richard, I believe in our discussion you mentioned to me a couple of structures at Timber Point that collapsed because they had not been maintained?

MR. MARTIN:

The historic house at Timber Point is known as the Horan House. That is a dedicated Historic Trust property. The roof has failed and it is now coming down. Most of properties, they can be retained until we can gather the restoration funds as long as we keep a roof on them and keep the building secured. That's what we have been using a lot of the hotel/motel funds in the past few years, is to put new roofs on our historic structures.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

But the hotel/motel funds in the last few years have not been sufficient for you to keep up with the work that you need to do on these structures.

MR. MARTIN:

No, it's basically a maintenance tool at this point. We have been receive between I guess 300 to \$500,000 a year under the current funding and we use it for maintenance and additional planning for the restoration of the houses.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. And the last Trustees meeting occurred at the Skully Estate, which is absolutely beautiful, and it's going to be the home of our Interpretive Center and I think John, Cameron and Bill and I were the only people here when we had decided that it was important to have an Interpretive Center. It was part of our Greenways Program. Lo these many years we still don't have an Interpretive Center, and when we were at the Skully Estate I was just amazed at how much work you've done and how much there is still left to do.

For those of you who don't know how this is working, when the County Executive took those 12 positions out of the Parks Department and put them into 192, it really was counter to the legislative intent of the law that was passed in Albany for us to have this Hotel/Motel Tax. I worked a long time with Steve Englebright on this as did the Presiding Officer. The monies collected from the Hotel/Motel Tax was to be used to help maintain our historic structures that are going to be open to the -- that opening to the public is imminent. And some of these 12 employees don't just work on historic structures that are open to the public, they also work on buildings that we rent, okay, so that's a misuse of that money actually. Stop me if I'm misstating anything, Richard, but I believe this is how I understand it. So what's happened is rather than having the additional Hotel/Motel Tax supplement their budget to help them take care of all these very important historic places, it's replacing their department money. So they wind up with no net gain in this area.

So we really, really need to restore this and give the Parks Department the ability to take care of all these buildings, and there are buildings in every one of our districts that need to be taken care of. This is across Suffolk County and it's important for us in the spirit of the Hotel/Motel Tax that we try to make our historic places that our community, that our taxpayers who have paid for them, can use.

You know, one of the Trustees, I spoke with all the Trustees regarding this standalone, and one of them said it was such a shame when we met at Third House that there's still a plywood floor. After all these years there's not a floor at Third House. And, you know, we can tick through every one of the historic places that are really embarrassing at the level of disrepair. You know, you go to Blydenburgh, you see the mill, the homes, there's just so the much work that's needed. We need to put this money in the right place. Richard, did I cover what you guys do?

MR. MARTIN:

Yes, you covered it very well.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Richard appreciates you asking him to come to the mike and just nod.

(Laughter from Panel)

Okay. Legislator Romaine.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

It's not only in the Health Department that we don't want to put people on the spot.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I could not agree more with Legislator Fisher. I've toured many of the historic homes. Many years ago I wrote articles for the The Long Island Forum, which was a historical magazine about some of these homes. My problem is that I made a commitment last year when we raised the park fees that we would do it for one year to help the Vanderbilt, so I will not be voting for this. Not because of the worthiness of this, but because of the source of revenue that we would get.

I will say this; it's something we should consider very carefully. Maybe as a County we don't deserve to have historic homes if we can't maintain them. Why do we take these into our possession? Why do we attempt to save our history if we can't save them. I object to raising park fees because that isn't the way this should be funded, and because I made a commitment to my constituents who were aggravated when the fees went up that I would not raise them again. But I will certainly work with Legislator Fisher if this doesn't pass to find other ways to fund this. And other ways might include having people adopt these historic homes because the County has not exercised good stewardship. It is discouraging to see something that was once part of our proud history crumbling under our ownership. We really don't deserve to own these homes and maybe we can set up a private trust and get private individuals interested in maintaining them because we're not doing a very good job. And it's not for lack of leadership, and that certainly is no criticism, it's for lack of funding that we have. But obviously I'm not going to raise parks fees because I had made a prior commitment to my constituents last year when the fees went up so I regret this. Under other circumstances I would vote if the funding source was different. So thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes, Mr. Chair. If I may, I would like to respond to that. Legislator Romaine, you and I had a conversation about this and I also spoke to the representative from Riverhead who serves as a Park

Trustee, Gil Cardillo. I don't know if he had a chance to give you a call.

LEG. ROMAINE:

No, he didn't.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

He was also opposed last year to the Parks fees increase and his problem and his commitment was to the constituents that he serves is that he was opposed to it going to the Vanderbilt Museum. He was opposed to how it was going to be used. However, when I spoke with him last week he was very much in support of this, because as a Trustee who has met at these various historic sites, he knows the dire need in which we find them, and that we have no other funds on which to draw.

As the Presiding Officer has stated very eloquently, we are squeezing this budget as tight as we can, and when we are trying to find money for the homeless and for old people who are cold in their homes, for people who don't have enough to eat, then I think raising golf fees and camping fees just can't compare with the kind of need that we have in other parts of our budget. And there have been, according to the Trustees, they have not had any complaints throughout this year regarding the fees. And so the commitment that was made by many of my colleagues around the horseshoe was to sunset the resolution that I introduced last year, which directed the fee increase, the revenues to go to the Vanderbilt, and that was the sore point. We would obviously not be directing those fees, those fee revenues to the Vanderbilt, and so I think that those of you who might be concerned about that this releases you of that commitment, because it's a different resolution and it's a different use of the funds.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Maybe this question is for BRO, I'm not sure, maybe for the sponsor. If we do not fund these 12 positions with this and we fund them with Park fees, and I think those Park fees raised what, 800,000, something in that range?

MS. VIZZINI:

Correct.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Then we would -- I guess would have some money then in the hotel tax which would go to Parks still but would go toward historic preservation?

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

So that instead of using it to fund these staff positions we now can fund it. So it would stay in Parks and Parks would make a decision as to how that money were allocated for historic preservation? Is that how this would work?

MS. VIZZINI:

Right now the way the standalone is structured it would be a lump sum in the Park's Department for historic structures.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

And now there already in the hotel tax there is another section of this bill that went towards County Park purchase as well, wasn't there, or just the County general budget at roughly about 1.9 million.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Gail, in the Working Group we worked on those, remember we allocated certain -- to specific historic buildings?

MS. VIZZINI:

That we did, yeah. There's two million dollars designated in the law that goes to the General Fund.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

And not necessarily the Parks Department but to the General Fund?

MS. VIZZINI:

Well, Parks is funded from the General Fund.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. So it goes to the General Fund, but must be used for Park purposes.

MS. VIZZINI:

I believe so, yeah.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Now, in contrast to the other money in the Working Group where certain historical buildings were funded, this would have to be only County managed historical buildings, right, this new money that would be created by not funding these 12 position? Counsel?

MR. NOLAN:

That's correct. It has to be structures or areas or sites that are managed by the Department of Parks.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So this would produce approximately \$800,000 to which -- from Park fees to be used for County owned park buildings -- historic buildings. Okay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

It just kind of seems to me a little bit counterintuitive where we have people that are struggling, we're going to extend an amount of money that we're going to charge them for recreation purposes where they already pay taxes to have, in some cases, acquired those recreational facilities or to support those recreational facilities. We also have a stream of hundreds of millions of dollars that we don't want to touch. To me, again, some of that money, not maybe this new program, but some of the money for open space acquisition went to buy the very properties that we're talking about that we've basically allowed to collapse in upon themselves. Yet, we continually walk away from any attempt to redirect some of that money to even be in compliance with our own laws, which require a certain amount of Park Police to take care of those properties and those structures when we acquire them.

To me, to put another burden or extend a burden onto our taxpayers, who are already paying for these things in the first place, it just seems it's counter what we should be doing. Especially in light of the fact that we've got a stream of a couple of hundred million dollars that can be redirected, even if only slightly redirected. It could just be redirected to take care of some of the properties that we buy with that very same amount of money that we're buying open space and these houses. And I might add, I think it was Dick Cavatt's backyard. Did I mention that at any time?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Not nearly enough.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I just want to weigh in, too. Unlike some of the other standalones, I will support this standalone because it's honest. It's funding it by restoring the fees that we increased last year. I just, you know, if you don't want to do that it's okay and we don't do it, but if we're going to do something, we should pay for it. We shouldn't roll it under the rug. Yes, Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Just very quickly. I agree with you, it's an honest way to do it. And as we discussed in the Working Group, I just -- I think it's something we might want to revisit next year, along with some other fee increases and things that are long overdue, quite frankly, but I just don't think this is the right time to do it. I think we put together a very solid, very tight budget and I don't think that this is the time to be going back on our commitment to sunset these rate increases.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Anybody else?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yeah.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Just one or two comments. I certainly remember the debate last year concerning increasing the Park fees to help the Vanderbilt Museum, and over and over again there were individuals who said that these fees would sunset, would sunset this year. And now we find ourselves diverting monies to another area, the fees will not sunset and those people who use the parks, who have been picking up the freight or initially picked up the freight to help out the Vanderbilt Museum until we put the Hotel/Motel Tax in, they're the ones who are going to get stuck again. All I'm saying is that in this particular case, we should live up to our commitment. We should do exactly what we said we were going to do last year, help the Vanderbilt until an alternative source of funding was put together and then these fees would sunset and that's the end of them. People using the parks wouldn't have to pay the fees. That, I understand, was the commitment, that's what I heard last year, and now we're moving in a completely different direction. We continue to stick the people using the park fees with the fee continuance and, you know, it was if -- you know, the money is there, they're already paying, let's just keep on whacking them and just take the money and put it someplace else. I think it's wrong for this Legislature to do that, because last year I know what the commitment was. Some of the very people today who are advocating this new proposal were the ones who were the chief proponents of helping the Vanderbilt Museum on the premise that these fees would sunset.

P.O. LINDSAY:

The second time around.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

I'd love to --

P.O. LINDSAY:

The second time around. Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Yeah, thank you. And I could not agree with Legislator Barraga or Legislator Romaine more. I know in considering last year's discussion about the Vanderbilt, that was one of the most particular points that for me had to be included in that resolution. The sun has set.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Good. Okay, nobody --

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes, I --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator D'Amaro and then I'll recognize you again.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. I just want to go on the record in agreeing with some of the prior comments. I also recall the representation to the residents of Suffolk County that these fees would sunset, and I think we need to live up to that commitment that we made at that time. And I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

When I introduced the resolution last year, it was not with a sunset provision and so I did not make that commitment.

And I just want to remind my colleagues that during these difficult times when we are -- our budget is so strained, to pay for people's use of our utilities for sometimes many, many weeks in the summer where large campers are hooked up to utilities where they are cooling their campers and running appliances, taxpayers are paying for those utilities. They have no choice but to pay for those utilities.

When we have golf courses that are organic, and those of you on the Working Group, when we went over the cost of the Cornell Cooperative Program on maintaining organic golf courses, you know how expensive that is. Those costs have gone up over these seven years, eight years, actually, now since there was an increase in park fees. Eight years, Ladies and Gentlemen, where people have been paying exactly the same amount of money for these fees. When we raised our golf fees, some of the towns were just waiting to see what we did before they raised theirs. We're still way below what the State charges, we're still below what most of the towns charge. Our camping fees are a fraction of what the State charges for their camping fees. We are offering people a bargain, we are subsidizing their recreation, and this is on the backs of every single taxpayer in Suffolk County, including those people who can't afford to pay for their heat, including those people who have to go to food pantries. We are all subsidizing the recreational pursuits of a small group of people in our County.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have talked to my colleagues about this and I am somewhat disposed to support it. However, I'm struggling with it and I'm struggling with it primarily because it seems that, once again, we are willing to take actions as a result of something that we supported earlier that went awry from the administration.

We talked about this in great length in the Working Group. When the Hotel/Motel Tax was increased, it was done with an assumption that a set stream of funding was going to go specifically for monies to do restoration. And the administration, when it submitted its budget, elected to lump salaries for 12 Parks Department personnel from that category. So we're forced, once again, to look at trying to move past what was basically presumed to be a one-year time period for our parks fees increases because the administration elected, in my opinion, to thwart the intention of the State legislation which clearly was to provide funding for bricks and mortar. It's very much analogous to

the 477 Program which has morphed over to an off-budget payroll project and literally nothing else.

That being said, I can't support this because of a more basic premise which is notice and an opportunity to be heard. And we do this now, we've not given those people that patronize an opportunity. I would support it, as long as it's out in front of our Parks patrons first, let us go through the whole process again. I'll yield.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Vilorio-Fisher.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Budget Review, the park fees that we established last year will not sunset until March. If we were to pass this today, it wouldn't be taking effect until after March.

MS. VIZZINI:

Correct.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

So then there would be an opportunity for people to be heard. And if we had to go back and do a budget amendment in March, and that is one of the opportunities we have or is it February?

MS. VIZZINI:

No, February. Right now the way it is, February is your first opportunity.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Then it could be revisited, but we -- see, this, as so clearly stated, Legislator Kennedy, was a misuse of the Hotel/Motel Tax and it would be like -- it would be analogous to raiding the 477 account --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Absolutely.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

-- for General Fund use, which it wasn't meant to be used for. So please keep in mind that the sunset is not 'til March and so this would not take effect until April.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

So I hope that you could support this, Legislator Kennedy, with that in mind, because it is giving notice, it's giving five months notice.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I just want to say, I think that's the perfect reason not to move forward with this today, give that notice an opportunity. As Legislator Kennedy said, if it's not going to sunset until then, we have that time to bring that information forward, hear from the user groups and decide if it's something we want to do. We don't need to jump in right now.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Anybody else? Okay, let's vote. We have a motion and a second. Do you want a roll call?

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Roll call.

(Roll Called by Ms. Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk)

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes.

LEG. COOPER:

Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

No.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

No.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

No.

LEG. MONTANO:

(Not present).

LEG. ALDEN:

No.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

No.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

No.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay, it fails.

MS. ORTIZ:

Nine.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I'm sorry, what was the count?

MS. ORTIZ:

Nine.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Nine, okay.

Next is ***Budget Amendment No. 12***. This resolution adds \$686,649 in 2010 -- could somebody shut off their phone -- for the Huntington Hospital Dolan Family Health Center to provide a maximum funding level of \$3 million by stipulating that any excess appropriations in this resolution resulting from the adoption of any prior or subsequent 2010 appropriating resolution may be stricken from this resolution. This action has no property tax impact. Do I have a motion?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion to approve.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Motion to approve.

LEG. COOPER:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Second by Legislator Cooper.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

To BRO?

P.O. LINDSAY:

BRO, you want to explain?

MS. VIZZINI:

Yes.

P.O. LINDSAY:

It's very confusing language.

MS. VIZZINI:

Now that the Omnibus has been approved, which restored 559,000, there is a threshold in this standalone that the maximum that the Huntington Hospital would receive is three million. So, in fact, this resolution simply adds an additional 127,511 to the 2.8 plus million line item.

P.O. LINDSAY:

What's the offset? That's what I'm confused about.

MS. VIZZINI:

It will be a reduction of \$127,511 in rent.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Rent, okay. DPW rent?

MS. VIZZINI:

Yes.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah, DPW rent account, okay.

MS. VIZZINI:

It's rent and Social Security.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Mr. --

MS. VIZZINI:

Rent and Social Security.

P.O. LINDSAY:

-- Kovesdy, did you want to weigh in and say something about this?

MR. KOVESDY:

Yeah, just quickly. We took -- the Legislature took \$500,000 rent a little while ago and you had a very good discussion saying that it would be probably be a hole in the budget to 500,000. Again, with no discussion on the merits of it, you're taking another \$100,000 from an account which isn't funded sufficiently.

MS. VIZZINI:

Sixty-five,

MR. KOVESDY:

But we do have problems with the offset.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Who wants to weigh in? Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes, thank you. I wasn't one of the individuals that said that that was an inappropriate offset. I agreed to the offset because it was recommended by the Budget Review Office. And I just want to remind my colleagues that we did take some other votes here today, when we talked about funding real people receiving real medical care. This would bring Dolan up to a level of funds actually spent this year. So this is not just putting money in an account, it's not just making money available in case we need it; this money will be spent and it will be spent on delivery of health care services and I think that's the type of priority we should be funding here today.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

I would almost agree with this addition, except for the fact that other health care centers have actually been cut. So even the restoration of CI, it still doesn't bring Brentwood up to the point where it's going to be able to cover Brentwood and Bay Shore.

And I might remind everyone here that Bay Shore was an operational center with a commitment from this County Executive to reopen it, and for whatever reason, I don't know, that -- I ended up in a position where I didn't go to Space Management because, you know, I was changed from different committee assignments, so I really didn't get there so I didn't hear all the excuses why we weren't going to open up Bay Shore; why this piece of property was too big, this one was too small, this one was too tall, too short, too hot, too cold, but we never reopened Bay Shore. And without that reallocation of that amount of money for the amount of people that are being serviced in that area, I'd also want to hear about the ratios for the other areas of this County that have service provided by our health centers to the people of Suffolk County.

Because this seems like if we were flush, God bless and let's restore it to everybody. But recently, very recently, over \$100,000 was actually cut from Southside Hospital's management contract for the Brentwood Health Center, and that was an attempt to, I guess, redistribute some of that money to a diabetes program back to Cornell Cooperative. But this just -- without the rest of the ratios, without the rest of the restorations to all of Suffolk County, and without that kind of an explanation, I really -- I can't support this. You ended up with most of this money in the Omnibus, and then I have to wonder why all of it wasn't restored then in the Omnibus.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Through the Chair, if I could respond.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you. The -- I agree with you that we have to question how we're funding the health centers and what the priorities are, but I don't think we should pit one against the other. And the problem I had with the Dolan funding this year was what I heard, especially working through the Working Group, was that funding level was determined based upon where do you stand with respect to all the other health centers. And I think that's a very dangerous way to approach funding any health center, whether it's Bay Shore or Brentwood or Huntington.

I think the funding levels should be determined based on need and our ability to pay and meet the need and meet the demand. So I don't agree at all with the level of any funding that went into that budget because I think the formula and the assumptions used to arrive at what the final numbers would be were incorrect.

The other -- there was another point I had. It slipped my mind, So go ahead.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Anybody else? Yes, Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

You know, I just want to hear it again from BRO. I know this is in excess of what BRO's recommendation is, right?

MS. VIZZINI:

Yes, by the 127,000, which would be offset by approximately \$30,000 in aid and the other necessary offsets of about a hundred -- of 96,000 would be split between rent and Social Security.

LEG. BROWNING:

Because I understand -- and again, we don't want to see one place being pit against another. We have County facilities that are being funded and have been cut and I just see this as pitting one against another. I think that everybody has taken their share of cuts. You know, I do think -- I think BRO did a good job as far as how they decided to fund and I think they're basing the funding at the Dolan Center to equate with the County facilities. So I'm not likely to support this.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Anybody else? Okay. I'm just going to weigh in and I'm going to be the bad guy again. This is an issue that was discussed in the Working Group and it was decided by the Working Group that we would go along with the additional funding that the BRO had suggested, but we didn't have the tolerance to go higher. I think the need is absolutely there, just like the need is in the Islip Center and just like the need is in the South Brookhaven Center. And the fact of the matter is we just don't have the money, and the offset, to go back to the rent account again is crazy, just crazy. So with that, we have a motion and a second. Roll call.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube - Clerk)

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. COOPER:

Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No.

LEG. BROWNING:

No.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

No.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

No.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

No.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

No.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. NOWICK:

No.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

No.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

No.

P.O. LINDSAY:

No.

MR. LAUBE:

Five.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Mr. Chair, I just ask that we reconsider 11; Legislator Montano hadn't actually heard the motion.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Reconsider?

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah, I would --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Will you second the motion to reconsider?

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes, I'll second that.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. We have a motion to reconsider and a second to No. 11, Budget Amendment No. 11.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Mr. Speaker, what is the rationale for reconsidering the vote here? I don't quite understand this. We had an in-depth debate on that amendment, we took a formal vote, it failed.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Well --

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Legislator Montano hadn't heard the motion.

LEG. BARRAGA:

He hadn't heard the motion?

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Was he in his seat?

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

No.

LEG. MONTANO:

No, no. I came in and --

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

He had just come in.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah, I was outside when you started the roll call, I came in, I voted no. I said I would reconsider and change my vote. So we need ten votes to reconsider. That's up to you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And just before --

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Well, point of procedure. The motion has to be made by someone on the prevailing side.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Oh, thank you.

MR. NOLAN:

No, it was Montano.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Legislator Montano seconded it.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

No, I thought Vivian made the motion.

LEG. MONTANO:

No, no, I'll make the motion, because I was on the prevailing side, to reconsider.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

My apologies.

LEG. MONTANO:

It's all right. It needs a second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Do I have a second?

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Jon, will you send the reconsider?

LEG. COOPER:

Second.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yeah, I'll second the reconsider.

LEG. MONTANO:

All right, it needs ten votes to pass. If it doesn't pass, then it still doesn't pass.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. So we have a motion and a second to reconsider, both from the prevailing side. All in favor of reconsideration? Opposed?

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Opposed.

(Opposed said in unison)

P.O. LINDSAY:

One, two, three, four, five.

MR. LAUBE:

Thirteen (Opposed: Legislators Beedenbender, Eddington, Alden, Losquadro & Barraga).

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay, so it's back before us, No. 11.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Motion to approve.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Motion to approve by Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

LEG. COOPER:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Do I have a second?

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes, Cooper.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Cooper, second. Roll call.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube - Clerk)

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes.

LEG. COOPER:

Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

No.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

No.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

No.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

No.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

No.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

Nine.

P.O. LINDSAY:

It still fails. Okay.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Who did I lose?

P.O. LINDSAY:

I don't know.

LEG. MONTANO:

Don't look at me.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Who fell off?

LEG. ALDEN:

I think it was Romaine.

LEG. MONTANO:

Don't even go there.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay, let's move on. *Budget Amendment No. 13* restores 60 filled Police Officer positions, overtime and benefits in relation to the concession agreement between the County of Suffolk and the PBA mandated. When combined with a companion discretionary resolution, the resolution -- the reduction in both the General Fund and the Police District contingent salary accounts will provide \$12 million in appropriations. This resolution decreases the General Fund mandated property tax by \$1,194,370 for a savings of \$2.17 for the average homeowner. The companion discretionary resolution increases the General Fund discretionary property tax by an equal amount for a net property tax impact of zero. And you see the Budget Review Office Report, pages 264 and 271.

In layman's language, what this does, what this does is -- we're all aware that the PBA and the Executive have signed off on an agreement to provide \$12 million in deferred money to help with our budget problems. The County Executive sent over a CN to change his own budget, and the opinion we've gotten from Counsel is that the Executive can't change his own budget. So instead, myself and Legislator Losquadro have offered a resolution, this one and the next one, to do the same thing. I urge you to pass this, because if you don't pass it, it blows up the deal with the PBA, and God, I don't want to go through that again.

(Laughter)

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Neither does Jeff.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Is somebody going to make a motion. Bill, are you going to make the motion?

P.O. LINDSAY:

And to complicate things, this -- they tell me this is a 14 vote resolution. All right?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

You make the motion, I'll second it?

MS. VIZZINI:

Actually, it's the next one, but they should be --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Oh, it's the next one.

MS. VIZZINI:

But they should be -- they are considered a package.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay.

LEG. ALDEN:

So how many for this one, ten?

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Eighteen.

LEG. ALDEN:

This is ten?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Ten.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Bill, why is it 14?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Because -- don't ask me to explain it, but they tell me that it's a cap issue.

MS. VIZZINI:

Ten for this, 14 for the next one.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I mean, we're taking -- in a nutshell, we're taking \$12 million from the salary line that's freed up because of the deferral of money and moving it in to fund positions of 60 Police Officers that we were going to lay off.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Right.

P.O. LINDSAY:

All right? It's a technical thing. That's the best I can do with it.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Good enough. Don't worry about it.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I'll make a motion.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Seconded by Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. MONTANO:

Explanation.

LEG. ALDEN:

Explanation.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Thank you. Jeff thanks you.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Jeff's going to Hawaii.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay, and the accompanying 14 restores the 60 filled Police Officer positions, overtime and benefits, in relation to the concession agreement between the County of Suffolk and the PBA, discretionary. In the Police District, there is no property tax impact. In the General Fund, when combined with the companion mandated resolution, the next property tax impact is zero with 1,194,370 increase in the General fund, discretionary property tax at a cost of \$2.17 for the average homeowner. This is offset by an equal decrease in the General Fund mandated property tax.

This is the companion resolution and this is the one that needs 14. I'm going to make -- but I just want one further explanation. If you examine, this is the one where we added a clause; am I right, Gail?

MS. VIZZINI:

Yes.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. We added a clause here asking the Executive Branch and the PBA to sit down and to see if they can negotiate a reduction in the starting salary of our rookie Police Officers.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

And to examine --

P.O. LINDSAY:

And to examine the length of time it takes to get from --

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Base to top.

P.O. LINDSAY:

-- when you start to top step. And the reason why we're doing this is because in Nassau County, this was done a couple of years ago and the starting salary in Nassau is like \$20,000 less than our rookie cops, and instead of six years it takes nine years to get to top step, although the top steps are very, very close. But what that does is it -- the average Police Officer cost in Nassau is now \$11,000 less than in Suffolk. And besides the great deal of money that this would save us, it would certainly create an incentive to hire Police Officers and get them on the street, which we feel we desperately need.

So I made the motion. Legislator Losquadro seconded it. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Again, I thank you.

Okay. We have some side issues that -- let's just get to them.

Okay, we have a Procedural Resolution, authorizing funding for contract agencies pursuant to Local Law -- okay. And what this Procedural Resolution is about, it's in your packet, 27-2009. Motion -- could you guys just pay attention? Because we've got -- you know, we really have to get -- this is an important piece of information.

The five agencies in this resolution were all approved by the Working Group. The problem here is our own particular Local Law that says that when an agency's administrative expense is more than

20%, that it takes a super majority to approve them to the budget. So all five of these agencies, their administrative expense is above 20%, so, therefore, the need for the separate Procedural Motion listing them. Any questions? Yes, Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I just want to make --

P.O. LINDSAY:

All right. I'll make the motion, you second it, all right?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

On the motion?

P.O. LINDSAY:

On the motion, Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I just want to point out for those who did not attend any of the contract agency, not-for-profit hearings that we had here. Sometimes it's very difficult for these all-volunteer organizations, or mostly volunteer organizations, when there are very few paid employees, to account entirely for the salary of those individuals. Those individuals many times work on the programs that they are administering. So we have a couple of groups here with administrative expenses that are 21, 21.6%, and I think if they were able to -- or had the accounting resources to be able to better break down what their administrators were actually doing, being that they work on many of the programs within those organizations, those numbers would actually reflect far lower. But even with that, they're only marginally over our threshold.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And the other thing that I would like to point out is the other circumstance is that there's a couple of very large organizations here that our funding is minimal to their overall operation and their salary for their executive staff is above the level. I mean, the Hauppauge Industrial Association, we help to finance their trade show which is an important economic engine in Suffolk County, but yet that isn't their core mission; their core mission is to represent that industrial park. You know, and Guild Hall, again, we fund them minimally. Their budget is probably ten times what we contribute to it and their top salaries are high. So that's the reason for the Procedural Motion. Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

These are in Omnibus?

P.O. LINDSAY:

They're in Omnibus, but they're a standalone resolution. We didn't approve them yet because of the difficulty with our Local Laws.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

They are part of the overall numbers that Budget Review did work out.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. Because there's no numbers --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Right.

LEG. ALDEN:

-- with these.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Right, but --

LEG. ALDEN:

So it was in Omnibus, now we just have to -- because of the procedural thing?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

The executive compensation?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Correct. This isn't adding any more money to the budget.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. Was this in the proposed budget?

MS. VIZZINI:

Some of them are included in the recommended budget?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Some of them are included in the recommended budget, yes.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Some are and some aren't, some we added.

LEG. ALDEN:

All right. Thanks.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Any other questions? All right, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. I have on this one -- this sheet I guess everybody has of the agenda. We pick up at No. 4, to consider and vote on ***IR 1958-2009 -***

Tax Anticipation Note Resolution No. -2009, Resolution delegating to the County Comptroller the powers to authorize the issuance of not to exceed \$360,000,000 Tax Anticipation Notes of the County of Suffolk, New York, in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied or to be levied for the fiscal year commencing January 1, 2010, and to prescribe the terms, form and contents, and provide for the sale and credit enhancement of such notes (County Executive). Oh, and this is -- it's one of the Certificates, it's one of the CN's, I'm sorry. All right, it's 1958-2009. I'll make a motion.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Second by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Next one is *1956-2009 - Accepting and appropriating additional 100% Federal Aid from the New York State Department of Health to the Department of Health Services, Division of Public Health for the Public Health Emergency Preparedness Program for H1N1 Implementation – Phase 3. (County Executive).*

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Motion.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Motion by Legislator Viloría-Fisher, second by Legislator Alden.
All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

1957-09 - Accepting and appropriating 100% Federal Aid from the New York State Office of Homeland Security to the Department of Health Services, Division of Public Health for the State Local Health Department Program to support the Public Health Emergency Preparedness Program (County Executive). Do I have a motion?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Motion.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Motion by Legislator Losquadro, second by Legislator Alden.
All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

MR. NOLAN:

They withdrew 1965.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. 1965, I'm being told, was withdrawn, so we don't have to deal with that. And is there a 66?
I go to 67 next; is that right?

MR. NOLAN:

No.

P.O. LINDSAY:

There's a 66?

MR. NOLAN:

I've got two 67's.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I've got just 68 and we're done.

LEG. ALDEN:

Sixty-seven.

P.O. LINDSAY:

All right, *1967-09 - Declaring as surplus Suffolk County Police Helicopter MD-902 Serial No.*

900-00084 (County Executive).

And I need an explanation.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Another surplus helicopter?

MR. BROWN:

Good afternoon, Mr. Presiding Officer. Stu Cameron is here from the -- he's the Chief of Special Patrol with the Police Department, but I'll give you a brief background.

Very recently the Suffolk County Police Department received a trade-in offer on the MD-902 helicopter. As many of you know, that's the Medevac helicopter and it has a poor reliability history. So the opportunity presented itself where this helicopter could be traded in and then ultimately it would go to a subsequent purchaser because the purchaser is operating a Medevac contract overseas. And because he needed this special type of helicopter, it was a very attractive offer to the Police Department and the Police Department would be able to trade the helicopter in to American Eurocopter and get an A-Star 350, I think it is, which is currently in the fleet and it can be converted to Medevac purposes. The idea of using it for Medevac purposes has been discussed with Joe Williams of FRES and he's approved -- he's on board with it. I don't have any further details. I'd be happy to entertain any questions and either myself or Detective Inspector Cameron would be able to answer the questions.

P.O. LINDSAY:

What's the net cost to us?

MR. BROWN:

Zero. I'm sorry, I left that point out. Zero.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. So we're just swapping one helicopter for another.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

For a better one.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Not for a better one.

MR. CAMERON:

Yes, sir, we're swapping one for another at no cost to the County.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. And the one we're getting, isn't that the smaller helicopter that we've used for pursuit in --

(The following was transcribed by Kim Castiglione, Legislative Secretary)

MR. CAMERON:

That's correct, sir. As this legislative body is probably well aware, both the 902's have proven themselves to be very troublesome. We traded one for another twin engine, toward the purchase of another twin engine in 2007, and that purchase has worked out very well. Just this past year to date the M.D. has been in service about 38% of the time, whereas the new Medevac aircraft has been in service 87% of the time.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. The new one we're getting, is that a twin engine or a single engine?

MR. CAMERON:

That would be single engine, sir, and there is still a proposed capital for 2011 to acquire another twin engine Medevac helicopter. It is just such a drain on us to continue -- -

P.O. LINDSAY:

How many -- if we do this, how much single engines and how many twin engines will we have in the fleet?

MR. CAMERON:

If we're able to pull this off -- so we'd have one twin engine helicopter and we would have three single engine helicopters. That would be an interim fleet until the 2011 capital.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. I think that's a problem. But go ahead, Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

That was the gist of my question, but if then in 2011 we're seeking to purchase a new twin engine, which is I think that's what we should have for Medevac, what would be the plan then, to maintain a five chopper fleet or go back down to four by trading one of the single engine for a new twin, is that the plan?

MR. CAMERON:

That's exactly what we would do. We would trade one of the single engine, the older single engine helicopter, which is a 2000 A-Star. And our expectation is that that single engine helicopter would have a much more stable trade in value in these three years. This may be the best offer we ever get, and it's twice what we got for the prior trade in in 2007 for this aircraft, which has had a very unstable value due to unreliability throughout the time that we've owned it.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

Just let me start by saying you have a very nice last name. But what is the cost of maintenance for the MD-902 as opposed to what a normal cost and maintenance schedule should have been?

MR. CAMERON:

Just to give you some indication of the problems we've had, just one part, we continually get reoccurring failures in the same parts over and over again. One part, an upper rotor hub, that was originally supposed to last 10,000 hours, is failing at 100 to 200 hours. Almost every time we come into an inspection we have to replace this part. We're spending in the neighborhood of 100 to \$300,000 in repairs. And it's also mandated by our insurance company that for every airframe type that we operate we send our pilots to the training school every year, so it's costing us about \$200,000 a year to train our pilots to fly this aircraft. Continued operation is, to some degree, negatively affecting our safety. I say that because due to the continual maintenance problems of this aircraft it slows down our throughput and maintenance and impacts the amount of time our pilots can fly. Obviously we want them to fly enough to maintain proficiency. This aircraft also goes down for months at a time so that the pilots have not had the opportunity potentially to have flown this aircraft for several months, and the first time they're flying it it may be they're jumping in it at night to do a Medevac and they're not as familiar as we'd like them to be. It is both a monetary issue and a safety issue for us.

LEG. ALDEN:

Do we do the maintenance and the replacement of that hub, we do that ourselves or we have to ship the plane out?

MR. CAMERON:

We acquire the parts, sir, and our County mechanics replace it.

LEG. ALDEN:

And you said before that this thing has an uptime of 38% of the time or downtime of what?

MR. CAMERON:

It's -- so far year to date this year, sir, it's only been up 38% of the time in service.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. Good. Thank you.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Bill?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yes. Legislator Eddington and then Schneiderman.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

What I'm hearing is the M.D.'s are unreliable and they put our pilots in danger, and yet, I mean, I've been out to inspect them. The AirStars, you have to take the seat out so you can put it in so you can't bring an EMT. So that it sounds like that you are not providing as much service for the injured people. So both of them don't sound like a good way to go.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Guys?

MR. CAMERON:

As a matter of fact, the 38 -- down 38% of the time, the vast majority of the time from the East End base we are providing Medevac service with the A-Stars. And you are correct, the co-pilot seat must come out, and once we land at the scene of the Medevac, the transport portion to the hospital is done without the co-pilot on board. However, there is a paramedic. There is room for the paramedic. And we did run this by Stony Brook, who supplies the paramedics to the County, and due to the continual problems that they're well aware of with the M.D., they support this trade.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

So you are saying that the co-pilot is not there, but they have an EMT or paramedic there to help provide service.

MR. CAMERON:

Yes, sir. We have paramedics that are supplied by Stony Brook University Hospital, and they are on board for all our medical transports, even in the A-Stars.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let me start by asking, because this is like *deja vu*. I remember this argument -- this discussion several years ago. I thought it was the A-Star that we were having trouble with and then, you know, besides the fact that they were not Medevac helicopters, they were being modified, they were, you know, hot pursuit helicopters, and that's when I think we bought the other helicopters, maybe the MD-902's, or maybe one of them we bought. We were originally going to buy two of

them and we ended up buying one; is that correct?

MR. CAMERON:

Both MD-902's were purchased in 2001. It became readily apparent to us after we bought them, shortly after we bought them, that they were unreliable.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

What is the helicopter that we bought years later, maybe 2004, five six, somewhere in there?

MR. CAMERON:

If you recall, sir, back in 2005, because of the problems with 902's, we had no aircraft to fly as of January 1, 2005, and we had to have the New York State Police come down to supply Medevac services. After that occurred we added a fourth aircraft to our fleet, which was a second A-Star. So our fleet is now an EC-145, which is twin engine Medevac, which replaced one of the MD-902's as a capital project in 2007, the MD-902, which was also a twin engine, and two single engine A-Star helicopters. If we conduct this transaction, our fleet would be the EC-145 and three A-Stars with the department's support of the 2011 capital to trade the older A-Star in, in which time our fleet would be two twin engine EC-145 Medevac aircrafts and two A-Stars.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

So is the EC-145 that we bought a few years ago to replace the MD-902?

MR. CAMERON:

Yes, that's correct.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay, and we didn't buy two, we just bought one. And I thought the goal was to get -- we'd end up with two of the E-145's. You are saying that's going to happen in 2011?

MR. CAMERON:

Yes, sir, that's correct. There was not sufficient money even with this lucrative trade in offer to jump to the EC-145 at this time. There's no offsets.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

So it was the MD-902 that had the rotor problem. Can you just tell me the value of the MD-902 versus an A-Star? Because the MD-902 is a twin engine you said, so that's kind of apples and oranges. We're trading one in, we're trading a twin engine in for single engine? What makes you feel like that's a good deal?

MR. CAMERON:

Shortly after we bought both 902's we were offered, we paid about -- the County paid about nine million dollars for both of them. Shortly after we acquired them we were offered two million dollars for both of them. When we traded the one in in 2007, the best we could get was 1.5. Normally helicopters are very stable and hold their value very well and when you trade them in after you've owned them for numerous years very often you'll get back what you paid for it, in inflation adjusted money. This aircraft just has not held its value because it's pretty well known throughout the industry that the company is struggling financially and may or may not go bankrupt.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

So what's the value of the A-Star? We're getting a brand new A-Star or are we getting a used A-Star.

MR. CAMERON:

Sir, we're getting a brand new A-Star and it should be pretty much on par. The cost of the A-Star should be very close to what we get as a trade-in so there will be no cost to the County.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Do we have an independent appraisal on these -- the value of these helicopters?

MR. CAMERON:

No, sir. We just have the offer. We have actually two offers now to purchase it.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

It seems like something of that value, you know, since we paid nine million for it originally, that we ought to have some independent person determine the value before we take a million-and-a-half for it, don't you think?

MR. CAMERON:

We're actually -- we paid nine million for both of them, so we paid approximately four-and-a-half million and we're getting back three million. Three million is the offer.

MR. BROWN:

Can I answer a couple of questions? Legislator Schneiderman, just to amplify a little bit. The County Charter does permit after property is declared surplus that instead of doing it for auction, which is why we come to you with this resolution, that it can go to a direct sale in terms of trade in, but because of the very short timeframe and because of the dollars involved, we didn't want to come to you and ask for your legislative approval on it.

One other thing that I think you should know is that prior to -- during the negotiations, during this transaction, the Police Department did look into purchasing a larger Medevac helicopter, but I think that would have resulted in a cost to the County of approximately \$5 million.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

On a related question. The helicopters now, we have two stationed out at Gabreski currently or are they at MacArthur?

MR. CAMERON:

Sir, although we have a fleet of four, it's rare that we ever have four helicopters in service. There's usually at least one down for maintenance, and due to the MD there's generally two down for maintenance, so generally we have one in service in Islip and one in service at Gabreski.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. And the hangar, the new hangar is not completed, right, at Gabreski that we are supposedly building?

MR. CAMERON:

We are in a leased hangar as we have been since we started. In the capital to build a new hangar has been terminated.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Any other questions?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion.

LEG. GREGORY:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

We have a motion by Legislator D'Amaro, seconded by Legislator Gregory. I think everybody's heard enough about helicopters. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. I don't have any other business. With that, I'll accept a motion to adjourn.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Motion.

LEG. GREGORY:

Motion.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Motion by Legislator Losquadro, seconded by Legislator Gregory. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? We stand adjourned.

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Again, I thank everybody for their cooperation in putting together this difficult budget.

(THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 3:33 PM)