

**SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

**GENERAL MEETING**

**SIXTH DAY**

**April 27, 2010**

**MEETING HELD AT THE EVANS K. GRIFFING BUILDING  
IN THE  
MAXINE S. POSTAL LEGISLATIVE AUDITORIUM  
300 CENTER DRIVE  
RIVERHEAD, NEW YORK**

**Verbatim Minutes Taken By:**

**Lucia Braaten and Alison Mahoney - Court Reporters**

**Verbatim Transcript Prepared By:**

**Lucia Braaten and Alison Mahoney - Court Reporters  
and**

**Kimberly Castiglione - Legislative Secretary**

*[THE FOLLOWING WAS TAKEN AND TRANSCRIBED BY  
LUCIA BRAATEN - COURT REPORTER]*

*[THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 9:32 A.M.]*

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Good morning, Presiding Officer.

**(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk)**

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Present.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

(Not Present)

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Here.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Here.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

(Not Present)

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Here.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Here.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Here.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Here.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Here.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Here.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Here.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Here.

**LEG. STERN:**

(Not Present).

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
(Not Present)

**LEG. COOPER:**  
(Not Present)

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**  
(Not Present)

**P.O. LINDSAY:**  
Here.

**MR. LAUBE:**  
Twelve. (Not Present at Roll Call: Legs. Schneiderman, Losquadro, Stern, D'Amaro, Cooper and D.P.O. Viloría-Fisher)

**P.O. LINDSAY:**  
Could everyone rise for our salute to the flag, led by Legislator Eddington?

*(\*Salutation\*)*

If everyone could remain standing, and I'd like Legislator Eddington to come forward and give the introduction of our visiting Clergy.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**  
Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. I have the honor to introduce the Reverend Edward J. Kealey, Ph.D., the Vicar of Saint Sylvester's Church in Medford. Reverend Kealey has been the parochial Vicar of the Saint Sylvester's Church in Medford for the past 16 years. He earned both a Masters and a Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. Reverend Kealey has experienced a remarkable journey to his calling, and I'd like to just share a little bit of the highlights.

For a period of 24 years, he held the position of Professor of History at the College of Holy Cross. In 1964, he acted as a lay missionary for immigrant -- for migrant workers in Texas. He was a labor relations consultant at the University of Massachusetts. He also was an archeologist. He's a senior member of Saint Edmond's House, Cambridge University, and he's the author of three academic books and over 250 articles, and essays. And during this extraordinary professional achievement, Reverend Kealey must have received a calling, because he chose to answer it, and on May 27th, 1989, he was ordained a priest; very fortunate for the residents of Suffolk County and Medford, and I'm pleased to introduce him this morning for our invocation.

**MR. KEALEY:**  
Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm very grateful to Legislator Eddington to ask -- asking me to pray with you. I'm delighted to pray with people all the time, and it's very good to pray with people who are devoted to the common good. Maybe I could ask you to sit down for a moment and relax; okay? Just I'm going to pray in a different way with you; all right? It's only going to take 45 minutes. Just relax, okay?

*(\*Laughter\*)*

You know, we can pray -- we can pray with the formal words that so many of us use, and I think that's fine, but I think sometimes it's also worth praying with some of the stories of our own life. So I'd share with you two very brief stories from my own life, because I help -- I think they sort of illustrate what I think is important and what I hope you think is important, too.

When I was a boy, the times in which I grew up are remarkably like those right now. I made my First Communion during the Second World War, and during the Second World War, so many parents were troubled, worried that something would happen to their children. So what my parents did was they went out and they purchased a medal, and the medal has two parts to it, and the first part's a representation of the Virgin Mary. The second part swings apart, has on it my name, my address at the time, and my birth date. And the idea was that if anything happened during the war and I was lost or separated from my parents, I would always be wearing the medal and they could trace where I was, or I could find my way back home. And when my parents decided to give this to me, they decided to do it in a little ceremonious way, which is hardly the thing we ever did at home, but maybe it's the reason I remember it. I had at that time two brothers, I have three brothers now, so the three of us all lined up in the dining room in front of the buffet, and my father came along and he took the medal and the chain, sort of like an Olympic winner does now, and he put them over each of us in turn, one after another. And then he said, and this is what I remember, he said, "Your mother and I want you to grow up to be good Christian gentlemen," and my mother said, "And we want you to do good for others and not to let anyone ever push you around." And I think they're probably the pillars of the platform of my life, that I really do try, as many of you try, as all of you try in your own way, to try to do good, to try to understand the very real role of the Lord in our lives, to be a gentleman and to be courteous in the dealings that we have with others, to genuinely try to help other people, and never to let anyone push you around.

My father died a few years later, and at the wake, people would come up to my mother -- my father died right before Christmas, and people would come right up to my mother and they would say to her -- you know, no one knows what to say at a wake, and that means that most of us say the worst possible thing, because we are trying to comfort somebody and we don't know how to do it. People would come up to my mother and they would say, "It's really terrible that your -- that you cannot keep Christmas for your sons." And after my mother heard this about five or six times, she yelled out -- my mother was a very gracious woman, but her voice filled the whole room, and she yelled out, "My sons and I will keep Christmas this year because we must know that the Lord came among us to save each of us, and this is why I trust that my John is with God forever and this is the lesson for my four sons.

The day after my father's funeral, in keeping to that idea that we would have Christmas, my three brothers and I, we went to buy a Christmas tree. At that time, we were living in Queens and it was sort of an isolated little area with a great big farm at one end and what's now the Long Island Expressway at the other. But to buy a Christmas tree, we had to walk about a mile. So we all went, we bought the biggest Christmas tree we could find, and then we came down carrying the tree, walking back a mile -- a mile out, a mile back, carrying the Christmas tree. And when we came to the long block where we lived, my little brother, who was only seven years of age at the time, was by this moment really pretty tired, so Jack and I sort of took turns -- Jack's my older brother -- took turns carrying my smallest brother home. And when we were halfway down the block, little Donald says to me, he says, "Eddie," he says, "everybody is looking at us behind their curtains. They're all saying, I think, 'The Kealey boys will keep Christmas.'" And, yet, no one came out to help us, and then we walked all the way home. And Donald said, when we came within sight of the house, "Now put me down. I'm going to walk the rest of the way on my own."

Now it seems to me that we live in a difficult time. It is a time somewhat like the war in that terrorism is a real problem, a real worry for all of us. It's a time when some of the courtesy of life, particularly in American political life, seems to have disappeared. It's a time, I think, when we do have to try our best to do the good, and sometimes we have to pick up the tree, whatever the project is, and carry it alone. And most of all, there are times when we have to pick up somebody who is helpless, like my brother, like the poor, like the immigrants, like the ill, and we have to carry them. We have to carry them. And I think that's your high calling as Legislators, that you have to try in the depth of your heart to do good, and you have to do it regardless of what the people behind the curtains thinks, or do, or say. You have to find within yourself the courage to examine what comes forward and then to try to do the best that you can. That's what I'm praying for you now, that's what I'm praying for you throughout your life in public service. And I think that's what all the

people of the County and, indeed, all of the people of the nation pray for you. We pray that you act with integrity, that you act to protect the helpless among us, and that you try to do the very best that you can.

Now, if you'd stand, maybe we will have a blessing after all. When I was some years ago in -- you know, you always learn something every day. And years ago, I used to be in Syosett and I would go to the hospital there, and one of the things I would do would be to go to the intensive care unit and I would go around and speak to everybody who was in intensive care, and it was very easy to tell who were the Jewish patients in intensive care, because the local synagogue always gave them a single rose. So I would go around and talk to everybody, and I came once one day to a woman who was holding a single rose. And she was a delightful person, so we chatted about all sorts of things. And then she said, "Will you give me a blessing now?" So I started in the way that was, I thought, acceptable to her and kind of a general blessing for all things, and she yelled out in the hospital room, she yelled out, "Stop." She said, "It's only important to me if it's important to you, so I want you to bless me from the depth of your own faith." And that's what I do now, I bless all of you and your families, and I bless your important work from the depth of what I believe. I bless you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen. Thank you all. Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

If everyone could remain standing for a moment of silence. Could I have everybody's attention, please? Let us join with Suffolk's Polish community, which is very much represented in the Town of Riverhead, in memory of the President of the Republic of Poland, Mr. Lech Kaczynski, and the First Lady, Mrs. Maria Kaczynski, and the government leaders who tragically lost their lives on April 10th, 2010.

Let us also remember:

Joseph Janoski, who served as Riverhead Town Supervisor from 1979 to 1995, a record 16 years.

Army Ranger, Sergeant Jason Santora, 25 years old, of Farmingville, who died last Friday after a fire-fight with insurgents in Logar Province, just south of Kabul. Sergeant Santora enlisted in the Army in 2006. He deployed twice to Iraq and once to Afghanistan before shipping out again about two months ago.

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\*)***

Okay. We have a series of proclamations, and the first two proclamations are presented by our Deputy Presiding Officer, Vivian Vilorio-Fisher.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Could David Lawrence come up here, please?

Okay. Look, you know, I'm just going to congratulate Mr. Lawrence, who is an Intel Semifinalist. And he was just telling me a little bit about his project, which is entitled "A Simple Method to Characterize Charge Diffusion in CCDs Using X-ray Illumination." It's imaging, right.

**MR. LAWRENCE:**

Yes.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

And it's imaging for what? Come up -- come here so that you can -- thank you.

**MR. LAWRENCE:**

Does this one work? This one works.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Oh, yes, you could sing in that one.

**MR. LAWRENCE:**

I was working on a telescope that's being designed called the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope that's going to be located in the Andes Mountains in Chile. I was doing image quality analysis with some prototype sensors.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Okay. We're very proud of him, right?

*(\*Applause\*)*

Congratulations, Mr. Lawrence. And what are your plans now? What year are you in in high school?

**MR. LAWRENCE:**

I'm a senior.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

You're a senior. And you have decided where you're going to college?

**MR. LAWRENCE:**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

He's going to be going to MIT. Well, lots of luck there. Thank you very much. Thank you very much.

*(\*Applause\*)*

And we'll take a picture outside with your parents. I don't see Laura Hirsch here. Okay. We'll wait until she gets here. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Next up is Legislator Stern, with two procs, right? Two -- huh, just one?

**LEG. STERN:**

Just one. Good morning, Mr. Presiding Officer, my colleagues, and everybody with us today. One proclamation, but two announcements. First of all, it is really a pleasure for me to welcome from the Half Hollow Hills School District a great representation of community leaders, along with some of our outstanding children who together make up the Half Hollow Hills Legislation Committee. They do such a great job in looking out for all of us within our community. So, please, everybody, join me in welcoming them here with us today.

*(\*Applause\*)*

And a proclamation to a very special gentleman who has had such a tremendous impact on our youth in the Half Hollow Hills community. It is my pleasure to welcome Dr. Jeffrey Morris with us today.

*(\*Applause\*)*

Maybe, Dr. Morris, can come on up. This is a Legislative proclamation for Dr. Morris to congratulate him on receiving the outstanding Social Studies Supervisor Award in recognition of Exceptional Social Studies Supervision at the Elementary and/or Secondary Level by NYS4A, the New York States Social Studies Supervisory Association. It's a tremendous honor. And it really is a privilege for me to welcome you, Dr. Morris, to be with us today to receive this Legislative proclamation, because I know, as I know all of the students know, that you are one of those very special educators, one of those very special people who years from now our children are going to remember and say that it's Dr. Morris that played such a compelling and meaningful role in our lives. So it is my privilege to say congratulations to you, but, most importantly, thank you.

**DR. MORRIS:**

Thank you very much. I'm deeply honored.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. We have, I think, two other proclamations, but we're waiting for the people to be back in the auditorium. So, in the meantime, this month is Volunteer Recognition Month. It was done by Resolution No. 272 of 1997, established a Volunteer Recognition Program whereby each Legislator has the opportunity to formally recognize one person in his or her district for their outstanding service to the community. I'll now read into the record the names and a brief description of each of the District's designated volunteers.

From the First District, Legislator Romaine has nominated Kathleen Johnson. Kathleen Johnson has been an active volunteer and community member for many years, and for the past 10 years, her focus has been on the creation and maintenance of a center for our youth. In 2000, Kathleen was instrumental in establishing the Moriches Community Center, a multi-purpose agency that offers a safe, well supervised, drug and alcohol free environment to all local residents with opportunities to experience activities that broaden knowledge, enhance self esteem, and promote healthy relationships while strengthening their commitment to the community.

The Second District, Legislator Schneiderman has nominated Jim Gleason. Jim Gleason of East Moriches is being recognized by Legislator Jay Schneiderman as the Volunteer of the Year for the 2nd Legislative District for his outstanding efforts and his exemplary commitment to the community. As the Board of Directors member of the East Moriches Property Owners Association, he has been a strong proponent of environmental protection and ensuring that large-scale development projects have minimal impact and include substantial community benefits. Chief among Mr. Gleason's recent action items is his advocacy for the public purchase of "The Oaks," a 58-acre parcel previously scheduled to become a 62-home subdivision. He was also instrumental in identifying 1,500 supporters of performing a generic environmental impact study of the area. Mr. Gleason is a strong advocate for his community and is worthy of this honor and recognition.

In the Third District, Legislator Browning has nominated Susan Wischusen. Susan volunteers her time and energy locally, nationally, and internationally every year. On the local level, Susan is a member of the William Floyd School District PTO, a member of William Floyd Community Summit Beautification Program, a participant in Long Island's 2-day Breast Cancer Walk, Board of Directors for Save the Forge River Incorporated, member of the Mastic Shirley Chamber of Commerce, and a member of the Board of Directors for the local food pantry. On the national level, Susan has volunteered as a Rotary Club District Chairperson for Polio Plus, which works with rotaries across America to eradicate polio. She also traveled to New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina to work de-mucking houses. Internationally, Susan has hosted group exchange programs from India, bringing 5 young professionals to America to stay in her home, has traveled to India twice to participate in National Immunization Day, and has helped construct a computer and vocational school. Finally, on one trip to India, she helped to construct a check dam outside of a rural farming village, helping to bring water to the village.

The Fourth District, Legislator Muratore has nominated Kevin Burke.

On January 19 through the 25th, Kevin traveled to Haiti to ensure that 2,000 bottles of water and 20,000 MREs were delivered to the earthquake victims. During Christmas last year, Kevin assisted in raising money to donate approximately 1,000 toys to five area churches, which he delivered to each Church with Santa Claus. Kevin is also a member of Riverkeeper, an organization which helps support the clean and commonsense use of our water resources. He is also involved with the Pentecostal Church of Hempstead with Pastor Reyes, assisting in various ways with projects. In April of 2009, he assisted Sonny Garguilo with his Horse Ride for Autism from Montauk Pt. to Sands Pt.

In the Fifth District, Legislator Vilorio-Fisher has nominated Larry and Yvette Hohler. Larry and Yvette Hohler serve on the Board of Directors of Hope Children's Fund, Ltd, a not-for-profit organization dedicated to protecting and improving the lives of orphans in Kenya. Larry serves as Hope Children's Fund Board Chairman and President, while his wife, Yvette, is an active and committed board member. Since its inception, Hope Children's Fund has taken 57 young orphans off Kenyan streets and provided them with the necessities of life and the opportunity to pursue an education in. This nation, where current estimates put 45% of the 30 million citizens at being 14 year of age or below, and where AIDS pandemic has ravaged much of the country, thousands of children are faced with homelessness and must fend for themselves. Unemployment in this nation is well over 50%, and the per capita income has recently -- has fallen recently to under \$600 a year. In support of their dedication to the Hope Children's Fund mission, Larry and Yvette have organized an ongoing book drive for the children of Kenya, sending shipments of books to the children of this impoverished nation. Additionally, every Spring, Larry Hohler unsuccessfully, as he jokes, races in the Kenya-USA Bi-Continental Run against his Kenyan counterpart to raise funds for the organization's program. More locally, Yvette Hohler also serves on the Board of Directors for the Port Jefferson Rotary Club.

In the Sixth District, Legislator Losquadro has nominated Fred Drewes.

Fred Drewes of Mount Sinai is the 6th Legislative District's Volunteer of the Year. Mr. Drewes has been awarded Professor Emeritus status as a retired faculty member of Suffolk Community College and volunteers countless hours, and has served on many community organizations boards, including the Mount Sinai Harbor Advisory Committee, Heritage Trust, Mt. Sinai Hamlet Study, and the Mount Sinai Civic Association. Fred's current project is at the Heritage Park in Mount Sinai where he has established an Avenue of America, and is currently working on planting trees and raising flags from all 50 states. His goal is to create a destination point for citizens near and afar.

The Seventh Legislative District, Legislator Eddington has nominated Joff Sahin. Joff Sahin is the owner of Pita House and Global Sports Café' in the 7th Legislative District. He's a representative of the Suffolk County Downtown Revitalization Citizens Advisory Board. Joff has helped to organize the Play for Peach Soccer Tournament, has hosted numerous charitable events in his restaurants, and is always willing to contribute to local youth and fundraising efforts.

In the Eighth Legislative District, Legislator William Lindsay would like to recognize all the fine work James Cassarra has done for the Reflective Gardens at Common Ground, Incorporated, in Sayville. Jim is the Treasurer of the group and is responsible for all the grant work of this wonderful organization that he helped incorporate. The Common Ground in Sayville has evolved into a central place for the local citizenry to gather. Jim has worked on the magnificent labyrinth, the benches, and handicapped gaming tables, the gardens and shed, the decorative lighting, the sound system and lights for the bandstand, and many other projects. Jim has been a music educator for over 40 years and is in charge of all events and concerts at the Common Ground. Jim has performed with the Atlantic Wind Symphony at Common Ground. Jim Cassarra is a gifted musician and a world-class volunteer. Without his efforts, we would not have the beautiful park we have today at Common Grounds in Sayville.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

In the Ninth District, Legislator Montano has nominated Iris Santiago. Ms. Santiago has been volunteering at St. John of God Roman Catholic Church for well over 11 years. She currently volunteers four days a week, about 22 hours each week. She is 78 years young and a great role model for the students and parishioners at the church. She also volunteered at Pandora's Box at Southside Hospital from 1998 to 2005, until the program closed down. She was there 6 days a week for 10 hours a day.

In the Tenth Legislative District, Legislator Cilmi nominated Elizabeth Mayott. Did I say that correctly?

**LEG. CILMI:**

(Nodded Yes).

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Legislator Tom Cilmi has chosen Elizabeth "Liz" Mayott as the 10th Legislative District "Outstanding Volunteer" for this year. Mrs. Mayott has been an active member of the community for many years. Much of her involvement has been focused on the youth of Islip and East Islip. In addition, Liz is a Board Member of the Islip Chamber of Commerce. She is one of those rare individuals who never says no. She is a valued, respected member of the Islip community, who is well deserving of this honor.

In the Thirteenth Legislative District -- you're 12, right, Tom? Are you Twelve? What number?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Eleven.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

You're Eleven. Okay. John, you're Twelve?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Okay, I'm sorry. In the Twelfth Legislative District, Legislator Kennedy has nominated Elaine Renner as his Volunteer of the Year.

Elaine Renner has assisted in coordinating efforts with the major groundwater issues in the Twelfth Legislative District. She is in contact with 5,000 households affected by the groundwater flooding, and helps bring her issues to the forefront of the local municipal government agenda. She has been advocating for the local households with this issue for the past twenty years, putting in countless hours and working around the clock volunteering her time for the betterment of her community.

In the Thirteenth Legislative District, Legislator Nowick has given us the name of Kerry Maher. Legislator Lynne C. Nowick would like to recognize Kerry Maher of St. James as the volunteer for the Thirteenth Legislative district. In addition to working in the family business at St. James Funeral Home, Kerry is a religious education teacher, member of the Catholic Daughters of America, a board member of the St. James Chamber of Commerce, chairs the St. James St. Patrick's Day Parade, and volunteers with Splashes of Hope with face painting at the Care Center at Stony Brook University Medical Center.

In the Fourteenth Legislative District, Legislator Horsley has nominated Joan Weinschenk.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Weinschenck.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Weinschenck?

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Weinschenck.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Thank you. Joan Weinschenk from West Babylon is Legislator Horlsey's pick for Volunteer of the Year. Joan volunteers countless hours to her community through her work at the West Babylon Beautification Society.

In the Fourteenth Legislative District -- Fifteenth, rather, Legislator Gregory has nominated Keith Saunders. Keith Saunders has provided structured programs for local youth, ages 12 to 18. The program is operating two nights a week from 6PM to 9PM at the Peter J. Brennan High School in North Babylon. It has a unique format that accommodates the students' interests, as well as a built-in educational component. From 6PM to 7PM, the students have the luxury of doing their homework, play basketball, chess, and other board games, listen to music, and play table tennis, and many other activities. At 7PM, all students are required to assemble in the gym and listen to a presentation by an invited guest. The guests come from very diverse backgrounds and speak on a variety of issues and careers. There have been lawyers, doctors, businessmen, entrepreneurs, politicians, bankers, etc. Through these speakers, our children have received some valuable information and contacts.

In the Sixteenth Legislative District, Legislator Stern has given us the name of Peter Lombardo. Peter Lombardo has a long history of dedicated service to the community. He is a member of the Coast Guard Auxiliary, part of the Department of Homeland Security, serving and protecting our nation. He also serves the youth of our community as a committeeman for Boy Scout Troop 399. Mr. Lombardo, an electrician, has provided financial support to community organizations through this company, Peter Lombardo Electrical Company, and has donated his services as an electrician to local community organizations. He is a lifelong resident of Deer Park and a member of the Deer Park Lions Club. Additionally, Mr. Lombardo is a pilot, and for the past 15 years has used his personal plane to provide free transportation to patients needing medical care through Angel Flights, a not-for-profit volunteer organization providing assistance to patients who need dialysis, chemotherapy, and other lifesaving care, without a fee to the patient or health care provider. Mr. Lombardo's service to the community is a source of pride to all who know him, to his family, his neighbors, and all of the residents of the Sixteenth Legislative District.

In the Seventeenth Legislative District, Legislator D'Amaro has given us the name of Mary Beth Steenson Kraese. Throughout her life, third-generation Town of Huntington resident Mary Beth Steenson Kraese has devoted her time and dedicated her energy to serving the South Huntington community. A mother of three young boys, she is an 18-year Volunteer Medical Technician and Dispatcher for the Huntington Community First Aid Squad, a Volunteer Firefighter for the Huntington Manor Fire Department, a volunteer of Saint Lutheran's Church and Saint Peter's Pre-School, and a member of the Huntington Station Happy Helpers. She is also a Cub Scout and Boy Scout Mom who has held a variety of leadership positions for several schools in the South Huntington School District. Ms. Kraese's volunteer efforts have also inspired her children, who frequently help her feed the homeless and hungry on Thanksgiving Day and other times throughout the year. She coordinates fundraising and donation programs for the Relay for Life and St. Baldrick's Cancer Awareness charity events, the Toys for Tots Program and our troops overseas. She has also "adopted" several local needy Huntington Station families during the holiday season, providing them with money, gifts, clothes and toys. The entire community is indebted to Ms. Kraese, whose selfless actions directly impact and enrich the lives of local residents.

In our Eighteenth District, Legislator Cooper has nominated Margaret Norton. Our volunteer nominee is Margaret "Maggie" Norton, a native of Cold Spring Harbor. She recently celebrated her 100 birthday, and other than a very recent health issue, she has been a 35-year volunteer at the

Huntington Historical Society's Museum Shop. She has greeted consignors every Tuesday morning, for years, reviewing and pricing their items and completing the paperwork for them. The sales at the Museum Shop are an important source of revenue for the Society. A retired teacher for many, many years, at the age of 97, she authored and published a book entitled *Maggie's Memories...A View of Cold Spring Harbor*. Through her personal recollections, she has been able to bring local history alive to those of us who never witnessed horse and carriages driving on dirt roads. The Historical Society is extremely grateful to her for all that she has done for them, and our office is very proud to have her living in our Legislative District.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. And Legislator Vioria-Fisher's other recipient is here, so I call her to the podium. Legislator Stern, is your other proc recipient here yet? No? Okay.

**LEG. STERN:**

It's done.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Oh, okay, my mistake.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

May Miss Hirsch and our friends from Cornell Cooperative, please, join me here at the podium? And I'm assuming this is still not working, right?

**MS. LOMORIELLO:**

No, it's working.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Is it working? Okay, good. And, actually, Laura Hirsch is going to be presented with this great honor by Cornell, and I guess -- it's Cornell who nominated --

**MS. FLEMING:**

Cornell University.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Cornell University, at the State Fair, but I didn't want to go to Syracuse to bring her this proclamation, so I invited everybody here. Come closer. I don't bite, yet. Okay.

Laura, who lives in my District, has been a tremendous 4-H Club leader for years. In fact, I invited her to come to my church to teach us about plarn. Laura and her 4-H group have taken plastic bags, turned them into plarn, which is plastic yarn, and she has made wonderful bags, and hats, and totes, and all sorts of things out of these plastic bags. And you all know how I feel about the use of plastic bags in supermarkets. And so, Laura, we're going to thank you and congratulate you on this wonderful honor. I know that way beyond plarn and plastic bags, you have just done so much to encourage our children to understand our agricultural heritage, and to also be very involved in community service, and to use our agricultural heritage to have them be a major part of our communities and the health and well-being of our community and our futures. So I thank you so much for all that you do. She is everywhere. Every year she teaches our kids at the high school how to crochet and they create a wonderful flag afghan, which somebody wins every year and they create, too. They raffle off one and one is given to the veterans home as lap blankets for our vets at the Stony Brook Veterans Home. So her community efforts and her work with the kids just reaches far and wide, and we're very grateful to her and. Our, you know, our hearts will be with you in Syracuse when you receive this honor at the State Fair. Thank you very much, Laura, for all you do.

**(\*Applause\*)**

Congratulations. Did you want to say anything? Thank you.

**MS. HIRSCH:**

Thank you very much.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

The last proclamation of the day is for our own Vivian Viloría-Fisher. And I'd like Legislator Montano to join me.

Last week, Legislator Fisher was the recipient of the Somos El Futuro Conference in Albany award that was presented for her years of outstanding civic and political service for the people of Long Island and New York State as a pioneer of Hispanic women, and I'm going to let Legislator Montano add to that.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Thank you, Legislator Lindsay. I attended the conference, although I did not attend the Entre Nosotras lunch, but I understand the pasteles were delicious. This is a great honor to have someone from Suffolk County who's recognized at a statewide level. And, Vivian, you have earned the respect, not only here in Suffolk County, but of your colleagues in the State Senate and in the State Assembly, and also in the Executive branch. The conference was well attended. Your award is well deserved. We congratulate you.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Thank you. Thank you very much, Rick.

*(\*Applause\*)*

Thank you. Thank you very much.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. To the public portion. I'm going to take the first card out of order, Mike Caplice is here for the State Comptroller, Thomas DiNapoli. If Mike could come forward. I believe he has a difficult schedule today and he said that he wanted to speak first. And he had to leave already, I guess. Okay.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

No.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Oh. Come on.

**MR. CAPLICE:**

Well, thanks again for having me back. I know the Legislators have heard my statement, but I just wanted to read something briefly for the people in the room so they understand why I'm here today.

I'm here, many -- as you know that I'm the Long Island representative for the State Comptroller, and one of our priorities is the Unclaimed Funds Program, which Presiding Officer Lindsay might have mentioned is a 9.9 billion dollar fund, with over 23 million accounts owed to people, and stretching back to 1944, when this program was first signed into law. In Suffolk County alone, there are currently 286,947 claims, totaling over 123 million dollars. So this is a free governmental service provided by New York State Law. It's not a scam. And I hope that everyone here will check not only themselves, but their family, their friends and their relatives. It only takes a few seconds and you never know if you have something which could be a paycheck you never cashed, a bank account you forgot about, a utility refund check you never received, and so on. You can also do the same search at our website, which is [www.osc.state.ny.us](http://www.osc.state.ny.us).

And, of course, a reminder to all the Legislators that I'm available for programs in your respective Districts, for senior centers, health fairs, office hours, or anything else you might have in mind. And, in addition, if you have any questions, concerns, pension issues or constituent issues that pertain to our office, I'd encourage you to, please, reach out to me. I'll give you my phone number, again, which is 631-952-6433, and that goes for anyone else sitting in the room.

And I did want to mention that, you know, I know a couple of the Legislators have taken advantage of this program in either bringing it to their District or trying to get the word out to their constituents. I guess a year or two ago, Legislator Stern had me for office hours and we found many claims for people in his District. And then, going back a few years, actually, when I first started this position, maybe about three or four years ago, I worked with Legislator Kennedy and we found -- we actually found money for a homeless veteran that had been evicted from a trailer park, and it was actually in the range of -- we managed to track him down, thanks to Legislator Kennedy, found him at the VA Center in Northport, and he actually had a claim for -- I think it was about \$12,000. So, you know, at the time, that was a really, really great thing. So, you know, once again, you never know if you have something. I'd encourage all of you to come out and visit with me. I'll be outside, you know, for the duration of I guess the next couple of hours, and if not, you can always check our website. And, you know, once again, if any of the Legislators want to have me, you know, I'd be happy to come to your District.

So thanks again for having me, and I look forward to continuing to work with all of you. Thanks a lot.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Thank you, Mike. I don't think I've ever forgotten to cash a paycheck. Edward Weinkauf. Weinkauf.

**MR. WEINKAUF:**

Good morning, everyone. It is a pleasure to see you in person. I have spoken to staff members of every Legislature represented here today. I am here today to speak about Mr. Levy's wanting to sell John J. Foley Skilled Nursing Facility. I am 100% opposed to that, and I'll tell you why.

My wife has been in John J. Foley since February 7th, 2003. She's in there a little over seven years. Yesterday, unfortunately, she had a slight seizure. I go to my wife every day. I don't go and say hello and leave. As most of the people who work at John J. Foley know, I go there around 11, 11:30, and leave around 5:30, 6 o'clock, 7 o'clock at night, take care of my wife. In the seven years that she's been there, one year -- one thing I have not seen at all in John J. Foley is abuse by any of the workers. It is a wonderful, wonderful nursing home.

When my wife first went into John J. Foley, my brother and sister-in-law came to visit her. My sister-in-law's father was in a nursing home in Connecticut, they live in Bethel. One thing they mentioned to me was, "My God, this place is so clean." And my sister-in-law said to me, "Ed, the one thing I don't notice in here is the normal smells in a nursing home," and I'm sure you all understand what I mean by that. The one thing I do see in John J. Foley, though, is wonderful, wonderful care by all of the nurses, by all the aides, the compassion they have for their charges. I have never seen anything except hugs and kisses for some of the people that they are there caring for. Everyone there is wonderful.

I am wholeheartedly 100% against this sale, the lease or privatization of John J. Foley. Please, in some way, keep it. It should be always kept, owned and run by the County of Suffolk.

And I wish to thank you for letting me get up today and speak to all of you. And, like I said, I've called all your offices. The only office I have not called is Mr. Ed Romaine. Ed Romaine is a friend of mine and I've known Ed for quite a few many years when I was a Grand Knight of Queen of All

Hearts Council in Center Moriches. And thank you very much.

I love you all, and that is the one thing my wife and I have always been. We've been married 54 years now. On January 14th we celebrated our 54th wedding anniversary, and that is the one most important thing in our lives is love, love for everyone. And although I've just met you, and like the people in the nursing home, I put my arms around everyone. If I had time, I would love to put my arms around all of you, and all of you back here also. I love you all.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Thank you, Ed.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**MR. WEINKAUF:**

And thank you very much.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Thank you very much.

**MR. WEINKAUF:**

Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Good-bye. Moke McGowan.

**MR. WEINKAUF:**

I am going to go see my wife now.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Good. Say hello for us all.

**MR. WEINKAUF:**

May I say one other thing?

*(\*Affirmative Response From Audience\*)*

Not only am I speaking as a family member of someone in John J. Foley, on November 18th I was taken to Stony Brook Hospital. The surgeons at Stony Brook called the nursing home and got the phone numbers of my daughters, called my daughters, and told them to come down immediately, I most likely would die that day. That was November 18th, a little over five months ago. I had a blood vessel in my brain burst. After three hours of surgery, when I woke up, I had 55 staples in my head. I went to Saint Charles Hospital for rehab, then they sent me to John J. Foley for rehab. And let me tell you, Saint Charles Hospital is noted for their rehab. I think, after going to rehab at Saint Charles and John J. Foley, John J. Foley's is just as good as the rehab in Saint Charles. When I spoke to my surgeon, I said to him, "I was told I almost died. I want to hear it from you." He said, "You came as close to dying as anyone could." And the recovery is about a year, so I won't be recovered from this until -- fully recovered until sometime in November.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Thank you, Ed.

**MR WEINKAUF:**

Thank you very much.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**MR. MC GOWAN:**

Good morning. I'm Moke McGowan, President of the Long Island Convention and Visitors Bureau, and I'm here this morning in opposition of I.R. 1366, which ostensibly seeks to maximize the tourism promotion program by capping the LICVB's administrative expenses to 20% of our funding.

I've asked to distribute to you the results of the most recent annual survey of the New York State's Convention and Visitors Bureau as it relates to their budget allocations. This information provided covers the size of the Bureau's budget, hotel rooms, lodging taxes, staffing levels, relatively self-explanatory. I think you'll find the information both enlightening and informative. But I think that you'll also see that the LICVB is very much in line with the standard business practices and acceptable budgetary allocations of tourism promotion agencies throughout the State. But I think, more than anything else, this survey also points out that one of the most important assets of any tourism promotion agency can have is its human resources, because tourism is such a competitive industry, it is essential to have a knowledgeable, experienced and professional staff in both marketing and sales, and we're fortunate to have both at the LICVB.

You know, as you know, we are charged with not just marketing Suffolk County as a tourism destination, but as a site for meetings, conventions and sporting events. I think it's important to remember that over 60% of the hotels in Suffolk County are highly dependent on corporate meetings and conventions for a significant portion of their business. It's also important to remember that these properties are open year-round, 24/7.

In 2009, our sales team generated 179 sales leads for meetings, conventions and sporting events; 106 of those leads converted to definite business, representing over 14,000 room nights and direct expenditures of 13.4 million dollars. Now, that said, on average, our sales managers are paid about 20% less than their counterparts in the very hotels they book business into. Three weeks ago, unfortunately, we lost one of our sales managers who in 2009 personally generated 49 business leads that converted to definite business, representing over twenty-eight hundred room nights and direct expenditures of 3.6 million dollars. And I would submit, that's not a bad return on investment for her annual \$58,000 salary.

Let me assure you that our phones are not ringing with calls from meeting planners wanting to come to Long Island, it's our sales team who are ringing their phones and making the pitch. As I said earlier, our most important asset is our human resources, and any reduction in this valuable resource will not maximize, but greatly diminish the Bureau's ability to provide a quality return on the County's investment in tourism. For those reasons again, we greatly oppose I.R. 1366.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Thank you, Moke.

**MR. MC GOWAN:**

Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Christopher DeStio.

**MR. DESTIO:**

Good morning to all the honorable Legislators here. My name is Chris DeStio. I'm an employee of the John J. Foley Nursing Home, and also a resident of Suffolk County for 40 years. I'd like just to hash over a couple of things that I brought up at the last Health Care Committee and add something to it.

You know, you hear all these numbers coming out from the County Executive's Office and I really think we need to do our homework here to see how credible those numbers really are. As an example, on his website for Governor, he said we're losing 15 million a year at Foley. In the last Health Care Committee, it was mentioned we're losing 7 to 10 million a year, and last night on News

12, he said we're losing 9 million dollars a year. So what's the correct number here? He wants to sell our facility for 36 million, and he estimates its value at 31 million. The Budget Office comes out with the market value of this facility at 53 million. That's over a 20 million dollar gap, big difference. What number do you believe? He said we will net 20 million dollars from the sale of the facility. The fact is, is that the 16 million dollar bond must be satisfied, along with 12 1/2 million dollars that the County's responsible for the retirees in the next five years. And it's also mentioned that 50 people will be eligible for retirement if the facility is sold. That's one thing I say is true. However, that brings up the amount of money that the County must subsidize for its retirees. The lag payroll is higher than I previously thought, and so is the vacation payouts also. We are still working on those numbers.

We must also understand here that if the facility is sold, the County has a huge payout to its employees, its retirees and the barn on the facility. And there's one thing I'm not sure here, but I hope I can get an answer from the Legislators. If you look into, is there still a bond on the daycare facility and the Physical Therapy extension that was built about two, three years ago? I -- for some reason I can't find out, but if there is a bond still on that facility, I don't know if it was added to the 16 million dollar bond, or whatever it is, but I think we need to find that number out.

The Foley Nursing Home was built back in '95 for 39.5 million dollars, just the building, not the land. That's 15 years ago, and he wants to sell it for 36 million. And I believe it's 14 acres. I still can't get the right number on that either.

I need to ask a question here. Have all the upgrades, the extensions of the facility, the equipment, especially the price of every bed at Foley, have all these things been factored into the sale of the facility? And when you hear the County will be saving over 20 million dollars in revenue over five years if the nursing home is sold, I find that untrue also. That 20 million dollars will be absorbed by what the County must pay out to its retirees at Foley.

Of what I see here is that the County Executive is paving his road to Governorship on the backs of the residents of John J. Foley. And how can a public official say that, "If you give me the nursing home, I can hire more cops." I find that statement totally repulsive, disgusting and totally disrespectful to the residents of our nursing home. And I thought that the police class was already in our budget.

We all should be on a fact-finding mission here and get the true facts concerning our nursing home, not the numbers that continually change every time the County Executive speaks. He should be this ambitious on putting Foley on the right track as he is running for Governor. Thank you.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Thank you, Chris. Okay. I have Christin and Christopher Griskie.

**MS. GRISKIE:**

Hello, everyone. My name is Christin Griskie. I'm the founder of the Golden Soldier Project. I live in District 18 in Centerport, New York, and I've had the pleasure of starting a 501c(3) called the Golden Soldier Project that was recognized federally as of November of '09. We are a good press company, and what I do is I work with children, teens and adults to create publications that are given for free to our U.S. military, unless, of course, the U.S. military actually wants to support the publications themselves.

I'm here today because I wanted to inform you of two current projects that we have underway. One is entitled the Golden Soldier's Rock, where we've had over eleven hundred people personally touch the book and put their first name on the book, as well as color and work on the 32-page full color book that will be given. The book will not be sold in stores or anything like that, it will be given as a show of gratitude in support for U.S. military.

Sunday evening, Assemblyman Raia gave a Certificate of Merit to sixteen kids in one school in my home for their efforts since last June in working on this project, and I'm proud to announce that we will be inviting up to 800 more people to touch the book on May 15th, Saturday, at the John Engeman Theater in downtown Northport, before and after the Seussical performances.

I'd like to introduce my son, Christopher Griskie. He is a Ninth Grader and Harborfields High School. He's been instrumental in keeping this project technically relevant by helping to support us on the web and with E-mails, so that we can correspond with our supporters, as well as with our -- the servicemen as needed. And he would like to just read a little bit of a conversation that he had with one serviceman showing the need and the need for support and to remember them as they continue to serve.

**MR. GRISKIE:**

What I would like to read here is an Instant -- is part of an Instant Message conversation I had with an Air Force serviceman currently stationed in Kansas. He specifically said that -- well, we started talking about the project, because I brought it up, and he specifically said that every time someone else would get a letter, he -- even if he didn't, he would turn around and tell them that somebody loves them, and I replied that that's the kind of stuff that keeps people going. And he says, yeah, getting packages and letters really makes them want to keep working for the military and such. And so that just shows that projects like the book really do help, like, as a moral booster.

**MS. GRISKIE:**

Okay. So I just would like to thank everybody for this. Our website, if anybody is interested in following us more, is [www.thegoldensoldierproject.com](http://www.thegoldensoldierproject.com), and our E-mail is [infor@thegoldensoldierproject.com](mailto:infor@thegoldensoldierproject.com). And I will leave some fliers up here if anyone wants to take anything with them home for today. So thank you very much. And, please, keep us in your hearts and prayers as we move forward supporting the U.S. military.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Thank you, Griskies, and thank you for what you do for us. Dot Kerrigan.

**MS. KERRIGAN:**

Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Legislature. My name is Dot Kerrigan. I'm here as a nurse from John J. Foley, and as an Executive Board Member from AME. And I have a lot of questions to ask, and one I'm just going to start, is the glass half full or half empty? Is the County Nursing Home a burden or an asset? Is Steve Levy a good leader or a misleader? Has Steve Levy been working hard to help Suffolk County taxpayers or is he working against us? Do we need parks, marinas, health clinics, safe neighborhoods, drug eradication? This County Executive put a target on the County's only nursing home the day he took office.

Thirty-six of New York State's 62 counties do provide long-term care to their County residents through County facilities such as John J. Foley, and Suffolk County has provided this service to taxpayers for over a century. And for 36 million dollars, less than it costs to build it, we should give this service away to a multi-million dollar nursing home mogul who is buying nursing homes in a depressed real estate market all over the metropolitan area? And Mr. Levy is going to also give away 14.06 acres of County-owned property as surplus land? This is a major issue because of laws applicable to so-called surplus land? In my opinion, Mr. Levy is doing a good job, a good job of keeping 80% of the wealth in this country to 2% of all Americans.

Currently, John J. Foley Skilled Nursing Facility provides long-term care for Suffolk County residents, who, unlike patients in proprietary homes -- did you know that 36.9% of John J. Foley's residents enter as full Medicaid patients, compared with only 7.7% at private facilities? And did you know that 42% of John J. Foley's residents are under the age of 65, compared to private facilities with only 6.3% of their residents under that age?

Last year, as part of AME's alternate budget plan submitted to the County Legislature and to the County Executive, we proposed a sliding scale fee on County contract vendors based on dollar values of contracts to generate about five million dollars per year in revenue to the County. Interestingly enough, yesterday Mr. Levy proposed the same plan to pay for election campaigns. We call on Mr. Levy to use the vendor administrator fee to maintain public health and public safety services as it was originally suggested.

One more sentence. AME, under the leadership of Cheryl A. Felice, will always try to work with our local leaders to do our best to contribute to the solutions. Thank you for listening.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Barbara Schnitzler, and followed by Frank Casiglia.

**MS. SCHNITZLER:**

Good morning. Barbara Schnitzler, Chair of New Suffolk Waterfront Fund.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Lift the microphone up first.

**MS. SCHNITZLER:**

Do I have to do something?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

No, you just have to speak closer.

**MS. SCHNITZLER:**

Okay. I appreciate the chance to address the Legislature on Resolution 1348, authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of property in New Suffolk. For the past 25 years, our tiny community has been fighting inappropriate, large-scale development on a site in our downtown. We decided a few years ago to get more proactive in our fight and we created a 501(C)3 to acquire the property. We enlisted the aid of the Peconic Land Trust and they were actually able to negotiate a bargain sale and pre-acquire property. It's a sensitive parcel of land, 3.4 acres located right in the middle of our downtown hamlet; downtown is sort of overestimating it. The town only has 350 houses in it. It is located adjacent to the Peconic National Estuary. It's the site of the first historic submarine base, and also has two historic listed houses -- buildings on the property. It would provide public access to the waterfront and scenic vistas.

We have done our planning with a large amount of community support. We've had seven community outreach meetings. We put out a newsletter. We have a bulletin board and a website. The property is easily divisible into north and south portions. We're asking the County to help us acquire the south portion. We've already raised over half of the money that we need to acquire this property, and we are pledging to manage the entire property. So we ask your assistance in this acquisition. Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Thank you very much, Barbara.

*(\*Applause\*)*

Frank, followed by Tim Mooney.

**MR. CASIGLIA:**

Good morning, Mr. Presiding Officer, and Honorables, all. My name is Frank Casiglia, and I'm Secretary of the Association of Municipal Employees, and a 32-year veteran, Suffolk County employee.

I came up to primarily speak about the County Exec's expertise in the field of privatization. Now, we could start with the Bergen Point Golf Course, and that worked out real well, resulted in indictments and convictions, or his giant investment pool that nearly bankrupted over a half a dozen states. It imploded, costing taxpayers billions of dollars. So, of course, privatization of the John J. Foley Skilled Nursing Home, under that sort of expertise, is sure to follow.

Many of the labor titles within John J. are unique to John J. They're simply going to be terminated. Most of the individuals working there are in Grades 6 and 9. How much lower can you pay someone to perform the duties that they do?

I've had the pleasure of spending a great deal of time out there and meeting a lot of the individuals who work there and reside there, and it's a very special place. And if everyone -- and I know a great number of our Honorables have been out there and have seen the relationship between the staff and the residents. That's not employee and patient, they are family out there. And if I ever, hopefully never, fell into a situation where I needed that sort of care, I would hope that John J. is still here so I could be there. And those who have had family there know what I'm talking about.

We put millions upon millions of dollars into this facility just to make it viable for sale. One of the individuals spoke about the variances in the cost factors, ranging from -- it used to be 15 million, then it was 12 million, then 10 million, then 9 million, and nobody really has a handle on it, but we'll give credence to the 10 million dollar yearly figure. If a private company came in and managed to slash that in half, just cut everybody's salary by 50%, the entire cost, why would they want a facility hemorrhaging five million dollars a year? Nobody buys something knowing you're going to lose money. Are they buying it as a tax write-off? Those residents are not tax write-offs. Many of them at one time were very viable, hardworking taxpayers of Suffolk County and their taxes over the past years have gone to support John J. Foley. Now they're needed to be in John J. Foley, and we have a County Exec saying, "Sorry, thank you for paying for it all these years, we know you need it, but" -- well, we've read articles lately that explain privatization on the part of the County Executive and the reasoning for it.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Frank, you're out of --

**MR. CASIGLIA:**

Don't let them be tax credits.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

You're out of time, Frank. Can you wrap up?

**MR. CASIGLIA:**

I'm sorry, Presiding Officer. Save John J. Foley, please.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Tim Mooney, followed by Thomas Dean.

**MR. MOONEY:**

Good morning. My name is Tim Mooney. I'm President of Fire Island Ferries and Fire Island Water Taxi. And what we have being laid on the table today are two resolutions, 1413 and 1414. One is a license renewal for the Fire Island Water Taxi, and the second is a fare increase for the Fire Island

Water Taxi for both cross bay and lateral service along Fire Island.

And to give you a little background, 2004, we purchased the water taxis from Dave Sanders, who had been operating them on the bay for quite sometime. At that time, we signed up for a one-year license. We renewed it in 2005, and that license expired in March of this year, so we're on a license renewal process at this point. We've requested an average fare increase of 17%. This is the first increase we've requested since the 2005 renewal. And some of the things that we've done is we've changed our pricing structure to reflect more of the distance we travel, as opposed to these arbitrary zones we set up back in 2004 when we purchased the company, and now it will reflect more the distance traveled, as opposed to the zone criteria that we had set up originally. And what we are doing is we're going to change from an on-demand service to more of a scheduled service, because we'll get more efficiencies with the equipment and the movement of the people.

During that time, since 2005, we've built two brand new vessels, one at the cost of about \$270,000, another one at \$200,000, and we also repowered all the equipment that we picked up from Dave Sanders at the time for a cost of about \$300,000. As a result, the safety, reliability and the integrity of the fleet was increased quite substantially. And the cost was not cheap, though, and, as a result, in 2008, the water taxi service lost about \$311,000, and last year we lost about \$299,000. So the fare relief is something that we need desperately at this point.

And, as you all know, we're very sensitive to the weather. Last year we had a June that was a complete rain-out. We had two hurricanes off shore at the end of August that blew out two weekends for us. So, you know, weather, weather will never go away as an issue that I wish the Legislature could help us out with at some point. Even with the fare increase, we're projecting a loss of this year at \$140,000, but we have some new plans in place. We're also picking up a new stop in Sayville for cross bay service, and we're -- you know, through diligence and operational efficiencies, we're going to bring that number down to a profitable situation.

We need to continue to improve the operations. I think our service on the beach is much better than it's been. At any point in time we have the equipment and the staff to do that. We're going to increase our advertising and promotional efforts, and our best efforts can all be countered by bad weather. So, if everybody can -- if we can have the Father say a prayer for us for weather, that would be great.

So that's it. I just wanted to let you know, this is on the table, and we'll see you at the next meeting for the Public Hearing. Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Thank you, Mr. Mooney. Thomas Dean, followed by Alice Peltz.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**MR. DEAN:**

Good morning to all. Thanks for allowing me to speak. I'm a nurse at John J. Foley. Questions, questions that you should be asking as Legislators: Why is the building being underutilized the way it is? Okay. We have been cleared to take care of TBIs, traumatic brain injuries. There are grants that are associated with this through the Federal government; none of this is being addressed. These are questions that you should be asking. Why is the building being so grossly underused? Physical Therapy Department, maybe 55%. Nurses being moved forward. They're already in the retirement and they're not being utilized. We're using agency nurses, which is okay, we need them, but they're not -- we're underutilizing nurses that we could bring forward. These are questions that you have to be asking. Thank you.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Alice Peltz, followed by Nanci Dallaire.

**MS. PELTZ:**

Good morning, Legislator Lindsay, and other honorable Legislators. I'm Alice J. Peltz. I'm Second Vice President of AME. I'm a Public Health Sanitarian in the Department of Health Services. I'm here to talk to you also about J.J. Foley.

For your information, HIV and AIDS have not gone away. It is just that those who are very sick with this horrible disease are being cared for in a compassionate manner in our County-run facility right here in Yaphank. Diseases like AIDS don't go away. According to CDC, HIV and AIDS have claimed the lives of over one half million Americans. Currently, about one million Americans are living with HIV, and, sadly, about 25% of those affected are unaware of their infection.

In 2006, the State of New York was cited as having the highest number of AIDS cases, over 5,000, while New Jersey was number ten with about 1,000. Why the difference? It's not even the difference that makes -- that really matters. Society tends to learn more about important issues, and in learning more about these issues, they try to help the people who are afflicted. Our own history has proven to us that Americans never run away from adversity, we face it, we address it, and we learn how to deal with it. In this case, we help Suffolk County residents as best we possibly can.

In July of 2008, our own Legislator John Kennedy received the George W. Bush Presidential Award for community service in recognition of extensive work over his career advocating for those afflicted with HIV and AIDS. Legislator Kennedy utilized the spotlight to draw upon attention to this issue he described as a serious need. The issue that he is referring to is who will provide the much needed care for our family, neighbors and friends who suffer from HIV and AIDS if J.J. Foley County Facility is privatized? Do not think that the private nursing homes will do this, because if you do you are wrong. J.J. Foley has 12 designated HIV/AIDS beds. The good news is that back in '95 there were 24 designated beds, so it seems things are getting better. The bad news is that J.J. Foley regularly takes HIV/AIDS patients and no one else does. We can count on J.J. Foley Skilled Nursing Facility to help us. Some patients need hospitalization for a short period of time, others need it for a longer period of time. The bottom line is Suffolk County provides a public service to its residents and taxpayers, and if nothing else, we, as taxpayers, owe each other the responsible guarantee, because it could be any one of us or someone in our family who needs the help. Thank you.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Thank you. Next speaker is Nanci Dallaire, followed by Steven Searl.

**MS. PELTZ:**

I have copies for everyone.

**MS. DALLAIRE:**

Thanks for allowing me to speak today. Another proud worker at John J. Foley. I know this facility is so much more than the nursing home, and I'd like to thank you all for your time and efforts.

You know our plight, you've heard our appeals, but we're not being heard. We've held demonstrations, we protest, we've gotten hundreds of signed petitions, and we've pleaded to this Legislature and still we are not being heard. As County employees we have given back to help our County. We know it's tough economic times. Since I'm at John J. Foley, we have cut, we have saved, and we have put changes into place to keep beds full and payments made all in the last three years. Please understand our frustrations.

As taxpayers, we deserve to know the truth. From what I've seen of the resolution, selling off our nursing home, there's a few discrepancies, or maybe the figures are just from the past. But I first must ask, the State of the art facility that's equipped to be an evacuation center, God forbid we suffer disaster here in Suffolk, is only worth 36 million dollars? Another question I have is the number included in our adult day care program is 24? That number is over 40. Then the amount of acres sold off along with this historic treasure, five or 14?

As one who's faced with becoming another unemployed, uninsured American, I need to know the facts. We may have allowed Mr. Levy to sell off some of our County land, but I cannot sit silent and allow him to sell off a home that belongs to all our citizens as well. The public should have a say as to what is done with our County-owned properties, facilities and parks. These precious places are the public's wealth, we cannot afford to sell them off now.

I make a request to anyone who might be in favor of this deal. Please look at all the facts today. Visit the facility. Find out all the services available for our benefit. Look into the successful day care program that runs six days a week. Discover our nursing home that will accept us, regardless of our social or financial status. We the people should ask could we afford not to have this County facility? Thanks for listening.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Steven Searl, followed by Tom Wickham.

**MR. SEARL:**

Good morning. My name is Steven Searl. I'm Project Manager with Peconic Land Trust, and I'm here to speak today in support of Resolution 1348, authorizing planning steps for the possible acquisition of open space in New Suffolk in the Town of Southold.

I'd like to just fill you in on some of the background on the New Suffolk project, and specifically the role of the Peconic Land Trust. Members of the New Suffolk Waterfront Fund, a local 501(C)3 nonprofit organization that we have partnered with on this conservation project, are also here today and are also speaking in support of this.

For over 15 years, the Peconic Land Trust has been working with the New Suffolk community to conserve a 5.5 acre waterfront parcel, a parcel which represents for many in and around this small close-knit community, the hamlet center. Since the 1980's, the community has been active in opposing various development proposals, including boat racks and expansion of the existing marina.

In two thousand -- in December of 2007, after years of negotiations with the former landowners, the Peconic Land Trust was able to pre-acquire this waterfront property using our revolving fund and other trust assets. The revolving fund is restricted to priority conservation projects with a requirement that these monies be repaid within three years. It enables us to act quickly and act as an intermediary while we search for an end buyer. We have used our revolving fund on several other priority conservation projects, though primarily farms and farmland.

This project is especially exciting because we have worked closely with members of the broader community and the New Suffolk Waterfront Fund to raise funds for the acquisition and carrying costs to design and develop a community conservation plan for the property, to reach out to potential conservation partners, and to manage the property. During this process it became clear that the New Suffolk Waterfront Fund was an integral part of this project, and in June of 2009, the Trust entered into a contract with the fund to purchase the New Suffolk Waterfront property.

I'd just like to conclude by saying that we'd like to support this planning steps resolution and the possible acquisition of the southern beach portion of the property by Suffolk County with an understanding and the expectation that the New Suffolk Waterfront Fund would manage this portion

of the site as a hamlet park and purchase and conserve the remainder of the property. Thank you for your time.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Tom Wickham, followed by Andrea Spilka.

**MR. WICKHAM:**

Good morning. Tom Wickham is my name. I'm a former Supervisor and Town --

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Speak a little closer to the mic.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

There you go, Tom. Thank you.

**MR. WICKHAM:**

That's if you're six feet five inches tall.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Right, that's the problem.

**MR. WICKHAM:**

Tom Wickham is my name. I'm a former Supervisor and Town Board Member of the Town of Southold, and I'd just like to read very briefly -- and now I'm Secretary to the Board of the New Suffolk Board Waterfront Fund. I'd like to read briefly from our local Waterfront Revitalization Program, which the Town adopted five years ago. This is from Section 2JB, etcetera, etcetera.

The Town of Southold has identified underutilized sites within Reach 8. One privately-owned parcel in particular is considered underutilized and in need of revitalization. This 3 1/2 acre site once housed the Holland Torpedo Company, which designed and built some of the first submarines ever built in the United States. That was exactly 100 years ago, and Holland also designed the Holland Tunnel in New York. Previous redevelopment proposals have been dropped due to potential environmental problems and constraints on the site. Redevelopment action in this area should seek to maintain the marine-related character of the New Suffolk Waterfront and the continuance of water-dependent uses, but at a scale appropriate to the community.

Future development also should be consistent with the property's Marine 2 zoning designation. Towards that end, the New Suffolk Civic Association has drawn up land use plans to be used as a guide for interested developers. These plans call for a mix of public and private uses which would permit shorefront access. This is the plan that the New Suffolk Waterfront Fund, Incorporated, has adopted. We are an outgrowth of that New Suffolk Civic Association and we sought to purchase the property when it was under threat of whole scale large development. We didn't have the funds at the time. We engaged the Peconic Land Trust to pre-acquire it. We are in the process of raising those funds now, and we have over 380 donors who have contributed 1.3 or four million dollars as we speak. That last tranche, that last bit would be -- would be found if the County could approve this resolution and ultimately appropriate the funds to buy the southern portion for about 1.3 as a hamlet park.

We invite you to come out and look at the site. Visit it, see what it looks like and how it fits with your priorities. And we encourage you to support resolution 1348 this afternoon. Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Thank you, Mr. Wickham.

*(\*Applause\*)*

Before we go to Andrea, I need a motion to extend the public portion.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

So moved.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

So moved.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

By Legislator Losquadro, second by Legislator Romaine. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legs. Barraga, Cooper and D.P.O. Vilorio-Fisher)

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Andrea, followed by Erica Chase.

**MS. SPILKA:**

Good morning, everyone, and thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Andrea Spilka. I'm the President of the Southampton Town Civic Coalition. I am the designated representative today to thank Presiding Officer Lindsay for what we read in the newspaper and what we think is a better solution to the problem of the trailers for the homeless sex offenders in our area. It's a very difficult problem. There is absolutely no easy solution, but the current situation of having them all in one town, spending over a million dollars to transport them back to their original area, is definitely not the answer.

At our January, 2009 forum, we had over 300 representatives from the area come out in a snowstorm, and what they were asking for is an alternative. We asked the County, the State and the County Legislators to keep looking for alternatives. From what we've read, Presiding Officer Lindsay's suggestions are a definite step in the right direction and an improvement over the voucher system. We ask you, please, to keep moving forward on these recommendations. It's too great a burden to have in one place if we keep the status quo. It's too large a concentration of predators in one area. No matter how much you think they're supervised, they're not, they're roaming around at times, in the hospital, whatever, and it's too inefficient an expenditure on transportation.

As the Minister this morning so eloquently said, "Protect the children." As the weather is getting better, more and more children -- not just from this area, but from all of the communities in Suffolk County -- will be spending more time in this area in close proximity to the trailer. You've got the Aquarium, you've got the Peconic where people are going to be boating, you've got Tanger Mall, which, frankly, is a destination all times of the year. We ask you, please, to keep moving forward, keep working with the County to come up with a solution, and, frankly, the sooner the better. Thank you very much.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Thank you, Andrea. Erica Chase, followed by Dominick Ogno.

**MS. CHASE:**

Hi. Good morning. My name is Erica Chase and I am the Director of the Smart Government for Strong Families Coalition, a project of the Health and Welfare Council of Long Island.

Yesterday I called many of your offices and will continue to reach out to you, so to set appointments to talk with you more in detail of why I.R. 1415 and I.R. 1490 are so important to be supported by this Legislature.

The prompt payment and prompt contracting policy bills will be laid on the table today. I came here and asked a few agencies to come and share their stories with you, so to set the foundation for why there is a need to set these policies. As the coordinator of 96 Suffolk County not-for-profit contracting agencies, I will organize others to come to testify on the May 11th public hearing and other times when appropriate, but I would like to mention that all members of this coalition are supportive of these measures.

You may have heard that there have been improvements in the contracting process and this is true. We have been successful working with the Administration in making the contracting system for many better, but not better for all. We are grateful for the changes made to date, but we are looking to work toward a functional and responsible system for contracting and payments for services rendered, that will be across all County Departments, and that will become standard practice for how the County conducts their business with their not-for-profit partners. We believe these two bills will make this a reality and we urge you to support these initiatives.

I hope that you will allow time to meet with me in your District Office, as I can explain more in detail of the Coalition's history and to share our thoughts about how these bills will expand the Administrations current efforts, and the importance to set policy for long-lasting efficient and effective partnership between the County and their not-for-profit health and human service providers. I really look forward to working with you in the weeks to come, and thank you for your time this morning.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Thank you, Erica. Dominick, followed by Josephine Passantino.

**MR. OGNO:**

Good morning. My name is Dominick Ogno, a proud worker at John J. Foley Skilled Nursing Facility for over four years, and a volunteer for fifteen. I'd like to start off with a quote from Thomas Jefferson, which says, "The care of human life and happiness and not their destruction is the first and only object of a good government." For our Country was found on these beliefs, why does County Executive Steve Levy go against these ideas, pinning our residents at John J. Foley Skilled Nursing Facility against our police force? One day this -- one day Steve Levy says he is a Democrat, the next he's a Republican. One day he says that we don't need Police Officers, the next day he says we need them. How can you trust or even believe in a man who contradicts himself? We don't need to pin a nursing home against our Police force, which is already in the budget for over 200 new Police Officers. We need to work together to be a better and stronger government. So I urge you, think morally. Mr. Levy might think 36 million might be enough for our state-of-the-art facility and the acres in which the facility owns, but he would be ripping off the taxpayers and the proud residents at John J. Foley who call this building their home. Thank you.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Josephine, followed by Linda Ogno.

**MS. PASSANTINO:**

Hi. Good morning, Legislature. As you know, my name is Josephine Passantino, and I'm AME's First Vice President. I am here today to speak on behalf of AME. Cheryl Felice, our President, is unable to be here today because she is in Albany fighting for our members.

I'm speaking on running Suffolk County or politics, which comes first? The Association of Municipal Employees is in complete dismay that the public health of our County residents is being compromised by the hasty sale of John J. Foley Skilled Nursing and Rehabilitation Facility, a sale which includes 14 acres of pristine wooded land that surrounds the facility and belongs to the County and its residents, at the cost even Mr. Levy himself has admitted that 36 million is less than its full worth. Why are we doing that?

In the light of the recent public revelations as to the selection process involved, we, as County taxpayers, also must ask, what is -- who is Kenneth Rosenberg? What is Kenneth Rosenberg's Centers for Specialty Care? Could this be the same Kenneth Rosenberg who was reported on October 1st, 2008 by the New York Daily News to have laid off 20% of an East New York nursing home staff? In fact, also reported was residents of the same nursing home telling the Daily News that without adequate staff, they often would sit in their own waste for a whole day. These -- the residents who said prior to the layoffs, that they just didn't have enough help here. "You can ring the bell all day and no one shows up," says a 69-year-old woman from that facility.

According to the SEIU, Local 1199, Mr. Rosenberg laid off 53 workers out of a staff of 257, which is a decrease of the staff of over 20%. How do you do more with less when you are carefully spoon-feeding the Alzheimer's patient? The Union reports that patients are not being bathed regularly and are not being fed appropriately, and do we want that to happen here? And do not get changed when needed, and the danger goes beyond discomfort. Patients have developed ulcers and bed sores. Is this the same Kenneth Rosenberg who also owns and operates for-profit nursing homes in the Bronx and Rockland County? It has been reported he is a businessman from New York City, but no facts have been provided.

In this time of Mr. Levy's seeking a higher political State office, one is left to ponder, is he another political friend of Steve Levy's? What role, if any, did pay-to-play have in the process of finding a private vendor to sell off our County-owned facility? Thank you.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Linda, followed by Ken McDermott.

**MS. OGNO:**

Good morning. I've spoken before this Legislature before. I did want to thank Mr. Losquadro, who's not here right now. One of our resident's families had come in to see him and spent quite a bit of time, over an hour with them, and he did try to reassure him about John J. Foley.

You've heard all of us before, you've heard the whole rhetoric of us coming in here, what to say, you've heard it from soup to nuts. It was once said that the moral test of government is how the government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children, those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly, and those who are in the shadow of life, the sick, the needy and the handicapped. I believe that this is your moral test about John J. Foley and I hope you pass it. Thank you.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Ken McDermott, followed by Kathy Malloy.

**MR. MCDERMOTT:**

How do you do, Ladies and Gentlemen. My name is Kenneth McDermott. I'll be speaking about I.R. 1474. Good morning.

Unlike the people here who are trying to save John J. Foley who work there, I'm an inmate there. When I was out -- I was formerly a Detective in the District Attorney's Office. I'm a lecturer at Suffolk County Police Academy; I'm an expert on documents. Unfortunately, my illness caused me to lose my job. I went to Suffolk welfare and could not get past the front gate, literally. They'd schedule me for a meeting and I'd go back into the hospital, and then miss the date and start again. Until I went into John J. Foley, there was really no care for me that took care of me. I had two ulcers that wouldn't heal; I'm a diabetic. I had acute renal failure, but nobody knew it, nobody detected it. Today I'm happy to say that I'm headed out of John J. Foley. I'm a diabetic in recovery. Since my stay there, I've -- it is like a family. That's not, you know, a chain rattling, that's the absolute truth.

I formerly drove an ambulette in Nassau County and I know a little bit about their nursing home, and it's despicable, in plain English. And I know what it's like to lie before the chamber, so I'm sure you'll quote me directly, "despicable". I've seen AIDS patients there, it's just -- it's just horrible. John J. Foley is a shining example of what a nursing home should be, and that goes for every single person there. I haven't found one person, not one -- and I'm a crank, trust me -- I haven't found one person who's not loving and caring for at least that seven-and-a-half hours.

So, to sum up, I'd like to say that I was dying, there was no two ways about it. I was in a wheelchair, I'm no longer in a wheelchair. I walk now. I walk a little crooked, but I have a bad back, even before I went into John J. Foley, and a bad knee. My sugar is right. Sometimes I cheat. They'd send two nurses to watch me in case I went for Twinkies.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

And we even have an outreach now, there's a 12-step Program at John J. Foley, can you believe that, reaching out to the community for whatever 12-step programs do.

So I thank you for listening to me, and please listen to the people who work there. They're fighting for more than just their jobs, they're fighting for a terrific, terrific place. You should visit sometime. Thank you very much.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Kathy is up next, followed by Christine, looks like {Epifina}. Maybe I'm mispronouncing that, but, anyway, go ahead, Kathy.

**MS. MALLOY:**

Good morning. My name is Kathleen Malloy. I'm a Suffolk County retiree after 34.5 years, a Suffolk County AME employee, and a 57-year resident of Suffolk County.

When did politics become more important than health care? When I want to vote, I go to a voting machine. I study the issues and I make my vote count. But when I am sick, I go to a doctor. If I'm very sick, I go to a hospital. And if I need any type of rehabilitation, I go to a facility. When one of my relatives needed nursing home care and all she had was SSI, Social Security, Medicare/Medicaid, I was surprised that some private nursing homes simply said no, but John J. Foley Skilled Nursing Facility said yes and she was there within a few days. My mother-in-law is there today since 2007, safe and sound and as healthy as an eighty-two-year-old woman in a wheelchair can be. And now our County Executive wants to be our next Governor, so he holds a press conference in his office, and I'm not invited, and he meets with private nursing home owners and offers a County facility for sale, the one where my mother-in-law lives, and I am not asked my personal opinion or my input, nothing.

I am concerned. Among my husband, my brother-in-law and I, Mom has visitors almost every day. We have never seen Mr. Levy there. We just know about all the workers by name. They provide excellent care for my mother-in-law there and they have become more of her family than I am. I would think that any sensible businessman would seek information and especially personal opinions from people who are personally involved with the John J. Foley Skilled Nursing Facility before he goes and makes a big mistake in selling off a County asset at far less than even the market says it's worth, or is this just another one-shot deal to patch up the holes he claims are in his County budget to cover another year so he looks better next year for the voters who are voting for the Governor. Sooner or later, there will be nothing left to sell or give away, and there will be no more one-shot deals of revenue sources left. What will he do then? Oh, wait, I forgot, he'll be gone, but I will be here. And as a retired County worker and a County resident, everything Levy has done or failed to do will end up being a consequence to me and to my family, and don't forget my mother-in-law at John J. Foley. I already know from experience that she will not be accepted anywhere else, so she needs to stay put.

Do you know about the 50-mile Medicaid rule? I know Levy keeps saying all the patients will be taken care of. However, when a patient's only insurance are Medicaid and Medicare, or some of them who are too young and they have just Medicaid, the only guarantee that Medicaid provides is that, "You will be institutionalized within 50 miles of your last permanent." My mother-in-law lived in Bay Shore. Brooklyn is well within that 50 miles, so is Queens --

**(\*Timer Bell Sounded\*)**

Oh, I have about two seconds left. So is Queens, Westchester and Staten Island. And I just wonder how many visits we will all be able to make then and how well my mother-in-law will do when we're not there every afternoon. All you need to do is the math and to get the actual facts. Thank you. I have information.

**(\*Applause\*)**

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Christine, followed by Noel DiGerolamo.

**MS. EPIFANIA:**

It's Christine Epifania, and I'm here wearing three hats, first, as the Executive Director of Alternatives Counseling Services of Southampton and Riverhead, also as a member of Smart Government for Strong Families and the Quality Consortium, and I'm here in support of I.R. 1415 and I.R. 1490.

Alternatives Counseling Services is a stand-alone not-for-profit agency that has been serving the East End of Long Island for over 40 years. As a New York State OASAS licensed 822, Medically Supervised Chemical Dependency Treatment and Prevention Program, we presently serve approximately 160 treatment clients per month at our two offices in Southampton and Riverhead. We also provide prevention services from Hampton Bays out to Shelter Island and here in Riverhead. We also provide services at the Shinnecock Reservation. And if it were not for our local bank, we would not be able to operate. Let me tell you why.

During my tenure as Executive Director of Alternatives, and notwithstanding the agency's relationship in prior years with Suffolk County, the County has been inconsistent in providing timely signing of contracts, processing of budget modifications, and payment of submitted vouchers. Now I know that we've made some progress on this, but we have a way to go. We have been successful as an agency in maximizing revenue through the self-pay fee Medicaid and third party insurance payments, which account for approximately 20% of our revenue stream. The largest portion of funds for operating the agency is the deficit funding grant we receive from New York State OASAS in Suffolk County, the entire amount of which is managed through our contract with Suffolk County.

Alternatives must maintain a credit line of a quarter of a million dollars in order to operate. This is necessary to cover the time lapse for voucher reimbursements that often take from 90 to 120 days. Some examples of this include the fact that today, April 27th, we are still awaiting payment for January, February -- we wouldn't expect March now -- voucher of all of which has been submitted. The total amount of that funding due us is over \$300,000. In essence, we are carrying three months of expenses for services rendered, in addition to the expenses already incurred and being incurred for the month of April. If it were not, again, for our local bank, we would not be able to operate. This does come with a cost and it's called "interest payments".

I think that this is really an important issue and I hope that you will look into it further. I am available, as are members of the Quality Consortium, in order to speak to you about this. I thank you for your time, and again, impress upon you, support us as your nonprofits, because we're supporting the people of this County. Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Thank you, Christine. Noel.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**MR. DIGEROLAMO:**

Good morning. Noel DiGerolamo, Second Vice President of the Suffolk Police Benevolent Association.

I'd like to start by saying that I'm very happy to be here today acknowledging the County Executive's press release and his appearance on News 12 stating that he finally needs Police -- he's finally admitted that he needs the Police Officers that you budgeted to hire this year. So, knowing that he's coming open with that, I look forward to those classes getting in so we can start to provide the public safety services that we've been wanting to.

What I also want to make perfectly clear here is that the resources needed to hire those Police Officers have already been allocated in the budget. This Legislative body has already put funding in place to hire 200 Police Officers this year. For the County Executive to try and hold hostage public safety for his political game that he's playing right now is both unconscionable and immoral.

The Police budget in 2007 had over eight million dollars in surplus. The Police budget in 2008 had over 20 million dollars in surplus. Where's the money? Why didn't we hire then? What is the County Executive doing with the funding that's being put in place by the budget that this Legislative body passes when he refuses to hire those resources? That's a question that each and every one of you need to ask before he convinces anyone to sell off a County asset in order to fund something that the people have already paid for.

*(\*Applause\*)*

I could sit up here all day and talk about the County Executive and his fabrications, and then his changes that he decides one day is different from the next. That won't serve any good at this point. All I ask is that each and every one of you take all of the facts into consideration; the fact that the money is there, the fact that you put it there, the fact that he hasn't spent it, and that there were surpluses in the budget, and that this County should not at any point cease services that's provided for something that we've already paid for. Thank you.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Thank you, Noel. That's the end of the cards. Is there anyone else that would like to address us under the public portion? Is there anyone else? Not seeing anybody, I'll accept a motion to close the public portion --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Motion to close.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

-- by Legislator Eddington, seconded by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

And that's a little bit surprising, we're done this early with public portion. Let's see how much of the agenda we can get through. Okay.

*(The following testimony was taken by Alison Mahoney - Court Reporter  
& transcribed by Kim Castiglione - Legislative Secretary)*

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Mr. Presiding Officer?

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Yes, Legislator Gregory.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

I would like to make a motion to take IR 1228 out of order.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

What page is it?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Page ten.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

What committee is it?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Public Safety.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Is there someone in the audience that makes this a pressing issue that you wanted to see the vote?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

There are some interests here that wanted to see it earlier.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. We have a motion to take 1228, a Local Law to expand Suffolk County law against bias acts before us. Do I have a second to taking it out of order?

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Viloría-Fisher. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

It is before us, *1228-10 - Adopting Local Law No. -2010, A Local Law to expand Suffolk County's Law against bias acts (Gregory)*. Do I have a motion?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Motion.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Gregory, seconded by Legislator Losquadro. Is there any discussion on the issue? Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

I would just like to say that I'd actually just had an incident in my district recently. I'm sure you probably read about the individual who was charged with vandalizing, throwing motor oil, on a Jehovah's Witness hall. It happened up in my district. I think the Police responded wonderfully. I spoke to the officer who responded, recognized it immediately as a bias crime, that the individual had targeted that facility because of issues that he had with that religion. So I just want to applaud the Police Officer who recognized that immediately and I think we need this sort of clarification in this language. Thank you for bringing it forward.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. And to the sponsor, in the summary one of the -- should somebody be subject, commit this incident and then be found liable for this incident, in addition to the monetary fines, they are subject to diversity training or diversity program through Suffolk County Human Rights Commission. That is something that's being done now or would we be creating that curriculum?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

The program has been created, but there aren't funds to run the program. So hopefully -- the intent is the funds that are recouped from the penalties would help fund the program.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Fines would be dedicated specifically to the Human Rights Commission to help underwrite this program?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Right. Absolutely.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Good. Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Cosponsor, Mr. Clerk.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Please list me as a cosponsor as well.

**LEG. COOPER:**

Me as well, too.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yeah, why not.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Go back to the first page. Do I have a motion on the *Consent Calendar?*

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Motion, Mr. Chairman.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Losquadro, seconded by Legislator Eddington.

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Tim, cosponsor.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

If you go to page eight. Okay, first up *1047-10 - Increasing the petty cash fund in the Department of Social Services (County Executive)*. I will make a motion to table.

**LEG. COOPER:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Cooper.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion to approve.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

And Legislator Schneiderman makes a motion to approve.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Seconded by Legislator Romaine. The tabling goes first. All in favor of tabling? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fifteen (Opposed: Legislators Romaine, Schneiderman and Barraga).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

It stands tabled.

***1164-10 - Adopting Local Law No. -2010, A Charter Law to guarantee continuity and stability in County Law Enforcement and ensure adequate resources for public safety (Eddington).***

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

I make a motion to table.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Motion to table by Legislator Eddington. I'll second that. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***1186-10 - Amending the 2010 Adopted Operating Budget to reallocate funding for a new initiative, the Heroin Treatment Program for Young Adults (County Executive).***

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Mr. Chair, I'm going to make a motion to table this resolution based on the fact that I've actually had an opportunity to work with the Health Department to introduce a standalone in this cycle regarding the Suboxone Program, worked to establish amounts that were agreed upon by the department for the funding of the drug counselors. Also, the fee for service and put into that standalone bill a reporting requirement so that the department will come back to us in I believe it's 45 days to advise us as to what progress they've been able to make in getting the program off the ground.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

And the reporting requirement is that the difference between the Executive bill and your bill?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes, Mr. Chair. As a matter of fact, that is.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay, we have a motion to table.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Montano. Legislator Romaine, did you want to talk on this subject?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes, I just want to say one thing. Legislator Kennedy has done a good job in breaking out the separate funding. I would ask Counsel at this time, there is a provision in there in terms of Peconic Bay Medical Center to ensure the quality of their obstetric service, which is, as you know, no longer provided by Brookhaven. I would ask if you would draft a resolution that would break out that separately so that item could be voted on and we could submit that to be laid on the table at our next meeting and then consider it at the appropriate Health Committee. Thank you, Counsel.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Anybody else? We have a motion to table and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1255-10 - Appropriating funds in connection with reconstruction of spillways in County Parks (CP 7099) (County Executive).*

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'm going to make a motion to approve on this one, Mr. Chair.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Second.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Kennedy to approve, seconded by Legislator Viloría-Fisher. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

On the accompanying Bond *1255A-10 - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$350,000 bonds to finance a part of the cost of the reconstruction of spillways in County parks (CP7099.312).* Same motion, same second; roll call.

*(Roll Called by Mr. Laube - Clerk)*

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Yes.

**LEG. COOPER:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

No.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Yes.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay, page nine, *Budget & Finance:*

*1024-10 - Adopted Local No. -2010, A Charter Law to implement a cost saving measure to help mitigate budgetary shortfall by purchasing 5000 Corporate Court, Town of Brookhaven (County Executive). Do I have a motion?*

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Losquadro. Do I have a second?

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Nowick.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'm going to make a motion to table, Mr. Chair.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion to table by Legislator Kennedy. Do I have a second?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I'll second that.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Seconded by Legislator Romaine. I'm just going to just for clarification because I know we kicked this around a little bit. Is this -- this resolution just waives the offset requirement, is that correct, or is this the actual --

**MR. NOLAN:**

No, this would waive the offset requirement for this particular acquisition of the building, the IRS building. It doesn't approve --

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. But I mean, we don't have the contract final sale, anything other than just the act of waiving this, right?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yes.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Anybody else like to speak on this?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Just one comment.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Yes, Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Economically this sounds like a good thing to do and I'm going to support it. You know, the idea -- this does waive the cap, but it is -- the cap was established so that it would prevent this body from running up additional expenses. This is waiving the cap so that we can actually save the County a million dollars a year and that makes sense. The one thing that was -- nothing is really going to happen here. We're not going to go out for bond probably until November of this year, and if we could just push that bonding off until January or February we wouldn't have to waive the cap. It's a very close call there. I just wanted to point that out. I'm still going to support it, but we could possibly have done this by waiting two months and not waiving the cap.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yeah, I just want to mention I did speak with Gail, BRO, yesterday about this because what we're seeing, it's a \$250,000 -- and I don't want to say a loss to the school district in these tough economic times and our school districts are having a hard enough time. I don't necessarily see that the \$250,000 loss to the school district, but basically what's going to happen is that money is going to be distributed amongst the taxpayers and the homeowners to make up that difference. So I would like us to work on the financials.

One of the things that I have said is the Yaphank property was purchased for future development for County facilities, and I think now in light of the information about the \$250,000, we should be looking at should we be doing that or should we be building a facility at Yaphank for the Health Department? I mean, some of them are already there. So, you know, I can support the waive. I'm

not necessarily going to say I'm going to support the purchase because I want to see is that going to be a burden on the taxpayers. You know, I know that there was talk about pilots. Is that going to do us any good if we have to start paying our pilots. So I think we have got a lot of work that we need to be doing. We need to be looking at what it's doing to taxpayers, specifically in the Sachem School District.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

If I could just -- I agree with you, Legislator Browning, that the waiver of the offset isn't something that I necessarily agree with and, you know, even if I support this, I'm -- I want to take a look at the final document of purchase of the building.

As far as the Sachem School District is primarily is one of my school districts and it's a concern to my community members, the only -- it might not be as large as the \$250,000 because I believe the overall plan is to sell the Farmingville facility and put that back on the tax rolls. So there might be some offset there and I think that has to come out yet, you know?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yeah, and I think we should be looking at what the taxes would be on the Farmingville site.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Yes, I agree. I don't know what that offset number is.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Right.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

I'm sure the Farmingville facility will not pay as much taxes as this facility, but it should close that gap a little bit. You know, I don't know, maybe then we won't want to take a look at pilots, I don't know. Okay, Legislator Barraga.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Thank you. I've attended a number of meetings with reference to this particular topic and several others, and I've always had some doubts about this proposal. I'm just not a big advocate of government, especially in tough economic times, buying buildings, more real estate.

We are told, for example, that the debt service associated with this purchase will be offset by the amount of money received from the tenants. On the face, it sounds like a pretty good proposal. My concern initially, and even to this day, is you're talking about a building here that's roughly better than 265,000 square feet, and it will need capital improvements. Now, there's some indication that 7.5 million is going to be invested initially, but how much will be invested over a 10, 15, 20 or 25-year period? That could be 15 million, 20 million, 30 million; it's hard to project what those outfall years will generate in terms of maintenance associated with this particular structure.

In terms of cost mitigation, I can't believe that this was put together in order to deal with that issue. Because in 2011, as I understand it from the meetings I attended, the cost mitigation factor is between 1.5 and \$2 million, which is not a great deal of money at all.

I also am concerned, because I haven't seen anything in writing yet, about the reimbursement rate associated with what you get from the State when you lease versus when you own. I've heard mixed viewpoints on this issue. I've heard individuals say, "Yes, the rate is the same." Others say, "No, we did a study and it isn't the same, but, you know, if you add certain things in, it turns out to be a pretty good deal." Again, you know, the visibility going out five, 10, 15 years from now.

I have also deep concerns with reference to taking a building, which is on the tax rolls, off the tax rolls. You're talking about \$410,000 a year, over ten years that's 4,100,000, or for 15 years better than \$6 million that's lost to those entities that depend upon those revenues. Now, I don't know

what the Farmingville operation is going to generate. If it's sold to a private sector, I'm sure there will be some money coming in. If it's a college that comes in and wants to grab it, I'm not so sure. But those -- you know, if a frog had wings. I don't know what's going to happen with Farmingville. All I do know, based on this deal, \$410,000 comes off the tax rolls, and that has a very negative impact on school districts. You know, the Sachem School District, they're going to be down \$258,000, that's 2,580,000 over ten years. What about the Library District and the Fire District, all right?

So those entities are left with choices, well, either they cut services or they come out and try to attempt a new revenue source to offset what they're losing, or they raise taxes.

Everything costs more than you anticipated; that's just the way it is. Now, take it in our everyday lives. If I call a guy in to give me an estimate on redoing my kitchen and he says, "Okay, Tom, it's going to be \$30,000", well, not too many weeks go by before he comes back and says, "You know, we took down the sheetrock and the wiring doesn't look too good here, you know, and the plumbing doesn't look too good here," you know? These are variables, they always come into play. Nothing is ever cheap. No one ever came back to me and said, "Tom, 30,000, it's not going to cost 30, it's going to cost 25"; it just doesn't work that way.

And I think -- you know, and I say this objectively -- I am concerned about waiving the Charter and piercing the debt cap. Piercing the debt cap. Now, let's say Tom Barraga is running for Governor of the State of New York and I'm out there and I'm saying, "You know, the State of New York is in really bad shape. A tremendous amount of disfunction, fiscal turmoil. And you know what I'm going to do? I'm going to be advocating for a tax cap. I'm going to be advocating for a spending cap." Yet back home here where I operate, I'm piercing the debt cap. What's wrong with that picture?

*(\*Applause\*)*

What's wrong with that picture? Would I want to get into a debate with somebody on that issue? Because by the time the debate is over, I'm walking out with a twitch in my left eye and a limp in my left leg.

*(Laughter)*

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

But it's only hypothetical, right, Tom?

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

It's only hypothetical, right.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

So on the merits there are serious questions with reference to this and on the politics, I think it's terrible. Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Well, I was going to give a speech, but Tom did it much better than I could ever do it.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Do you have any infirmities too, you know what I mean? Do you have a limp or a twitch?

*(Laughter)*

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

No, but others may at the end of Tom's speech. We'll be looking for those.

Clearly I had a concern with this. I didn't even get into the building part of it or the real estate deal part of it. I had a concern with piercing the debt cap and waiving the Charter, and the reason for that, and I've repeated this at the Budget Committee, as the Chairman knows, many times. The reason for that is there were other ways that we could have approached this. I listened to my Presiding Officer and he had suggested other ways that this could have been approached without piercing the debt cap. That did not occur. I also read Gail Vizzini's report where she talked that we would change fundamentally what we do.

We are not landlords per se, and in this building, because many of the leases there are long-term leases, we would become a landlord. That's a positive from cash flow, but a change in policy for this County. We usually don't get into the landlord business. And as Tom had -- colleague had correctly pointed out, you have unanticipated expenses as you go deeper and deeper into the future.

So for all those reasons I'm going to vote to table this for today. I may not be in the majority, but I think that Legislator Barraga made an excellent point on several points on this issue. I feel bad because I know the people that have proposed the deal, I think they've worked very diligently. I think this is a deal that they believe from a private sector point of view makes a lot of sense, but from a public sector point of view, which we represent, it may not make all that much sense. So thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Thank you. When we talk about some of the scenarios that we could have had in place, but the fact of the matter is we have to deal with the reality of the situation, which is we didn't take that opportunity. We didn't use the environmental funds as an offset and we're faced with the situation that we have. And Legislator Schneiderman said it very well, that cap is there so we do have that circuit breaker, that we have to make the decision that if we're going to pierce that we need to look at each situation individually. We can't just do it as a blanket policy. We have to look at each individual situation and we look at this and we say, "Wow, this makes good business sense."

The buzz word is, you know, we like to talk about running government like a business. But the fact of the matter is when it comes down to it, nobody wants to do it. This makes good business sense. This is a cash positive for us. It is something that is really a unique set of circumstances that we have a fund that is looking to divest itself of its real estate interests. We have more than half of the building occupied by government entities, which allows us to carry that building. It has vacant space that we can consolidate our other services into, that we're going to have leases expiring in years to come. This makes good business sense for us, and I think it's something that we need to do. And if we miss this opportunity, I think we're going to kick ourselves in the future.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. My motion to table is made basically because we're concerned about piercing the cap, but I personally have another issue that I have been looking at and haven't been able to get satisfactory answers on yet, and that is what use we make of our existing building stock now. As my colleagues know around this horseshoe, I moved my Legislative office out of private space in the Hauppauge area and I now occupy space on the eastern side of the Labor Department building. I have had an opportunity to take a walk sometimes to bring constituents over to avail them of unemployment services and job training services and all the other things that we have that are delivered at this site.

I am not an interior planner, I am not an architect, but as a person who worked in this building for nine years, I would say that the footprint and floor space in that Labor Department is grossly underutilized, misdeveloped and does not epitomize what would be an optimal work space for our County workforce. I don't know it specifically, I will make every effort to do so, but my sense is that we do not utilize to the best of our ability what we have now, which is why I am loathe to look at a multi-million dollar purchase for new space and a radical departure from what the basic essence of government is. We are government. We are not a business. We are not entrepreneurs. We are here to furnish space for services that citizens cannot avail themselves elsewhere out there in the world.

So I think that this proposal needs in-depth scrutiny far beyond the vague representations that were made at the committee. I read the excerpts. I saw Mr. Presiding Officer's questions, as I did the rest of my colleagues. I remain unconvinced about the reimbursement stream, and in this economic climate, purported sales of any building are as nebulous and tentative as any purchases. To my sense at this point, this deal does not seem that it's warranted or merited, and we do not have all the information before us. So that's why I made the motion to table.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Legislator Gregory.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate my colleagues' comments concerning the debt cap. Myself and the Presiding Officer and former Legislator Beedenbender, we went to the building back in December I want to say. It's a beautiful building. At that time there was a different funding stream that we were looking at. We went over that argument.

My concern really -- yes, I have concerns about the debt cap, but my concern more is about the process and how this particular property came about and the selection. I think the process was skewed. Coming from a procurement background, I don't think there was a competitive process. The consultant can be argued that it went through a competitive process, but the consultant is able to receive a commission from the sale of something he recommends are part of his duties to the County. I have a real problem with that.

I have heard but haven't been able to verify that some of the beneficiaries of this project are campaign contributors to the County Executive. I don't know if that's true or not, but that's something that we're trying to find out. But it's certainly, I think, just in itself the consultant providing -- using his, quote/unquote, expertise and receiving a benefit, monetary benefit, from that I think, you know, kind of skews the process in itself. How can you say that's objective and selective and competitive when we could have put out an RFP throughout the general public -- developers, property owners throughout the County offer their buildings at the County specifications and gone there instead of, you know, someone who is going to benefit from this process. I think that that's questionable. That's my concerns.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Can I ask a question?

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Thank you. Legislator Nowick and then Montano.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yeah, I'm hearing such differences of opinion. Radical departure doesn't bother me because sometimes if you continue -- there's a saying, if you continue to do what you have always done, you get the same results you have always gotten; so departure sometimes is good. But just in dollars and cents, I suppose there's an analysis of the income that this building would generate, and after listening to Legislator Losquadro, or was it Romaine, I'm not sure, I think it would be important for us to know, maybe Budget Review would know this. Was there an analysis of the income that this

building would generate? So let's talk dollars and cents rather than whose idea it was. I'm just curious.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Yes, both the County Executive's Budget Office, in concert with Chris Kent, did an analysis and based on discussions with them, Budget Review did an analysis as well and we incorporated that in a memo to all Legislators on March 16th.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Could you just give me an idea on the record now if you think it would be a positive generation?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Well, nothing is really going to happen in 2010. The revenue is based on what Newmark Knight Frank provided, and these numbers have not been updated since March. So it's my understanding that the IRS did pick up some additional square footage. Nothing major is going to happen in 2010 since we're really not closing on the building until -- theoretically until 2011.

The -- according to my analysis, it did not include the sale of the Farmingville Health Center, so 2011 we still have expenses that exceed revenue to the tune of about \$753,000. However, from 2012 through 2019, where we have the three leases in place, the revenue is close to a million dollars through each year 2012, 2013, 2014. However, in 2016 one of the leases comes due and we assume that we will move a County operation, either from leased or from owned space. So you lose the revenue from one of the leases, so my 2015 numbers the revenue is less. It's \$189,000 and it decreases -- it's less than a hundred thousand dollars. Again, it's only comparing revenue coming in to the expenses associated with the building.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

But now that would not include the sale of the health facility?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

2011 my numbers do not include --

**LEG. NOWICK:**

And if that health facility was sold, what would that bring in?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

The numbers that Mr. Kent placed on the record were on or about one point seven million. That's the target amount.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

That health facility, does that have a bond on it or anything that we're paying off?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

I'm not a hundred percent sure.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

All right. Because I think that all these numbers are important rather than -- I think facts and figures here are what we need to make a business decision. Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Legislator Montano.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Just two quick questions. Gail, that report that you are referring to, that was sent over to Legislators? I have to admit I haven't read it yet.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Yes, this was -- you know, the resolution was in Budget and Finance so the date is March 16th.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

March 16th, thanks. And through the Chair, I had a question for Legislator Gregory.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

I'm sorry.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

No, that's all right, Legislator. I just had a question. In reference to your remarks about the bill and the concerns, which I agree with, I'm just looking here at the vote. It was voted out of committee five in favor and one abstention. It seems that there were some concerns. I'm just wondering with those concerns expressed why was it voted out in that manner? Is there something more to it?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

No. I think that the will of the committee was to get it out of committee so that the full Legislature can discuss it. I have been apprised of some recent concerns that have at least adjusted my thinking a little bit.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

That weren't discussed at the committee; is that what you are saying?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Some yes, some no.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay. Thanks. I appreciate it.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Most of my questions have already been expressed. If I recall, Gail, in the report, when you have the numbers for 2016 and 2015, I think that in that part of the report you addressed some of what Legislator Barraga has put forward, that we would have to spend money, that by that time we will have had to spend money on maintenance of the building?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Yes, I got those numbers from Mr. Kent and Mr. Chiusano. They both, I think, deservedly discussed the building with Public Works and made some assumptions that there would be about seven and a half million dollars in necessary system enhancement and improvement because of the -- not that it's an old building, but by then it would be within the 15 to 20 years, the age of the systems.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

So the 189,000 and the 100,000 are net numbers after you are subtracting the maintenance costs, right? I'm just doing it from memory.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Yes, and it's also net of the loss of one of the leases that provides incoming revenue.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

I have a question about what Legislator Schneiderman said at the beginning of this discussion. He said if we were to bond this after the new year, in January of 2011, then we wouldn't have to vote on the waiver of the cap piercing.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

The options that are before you -- the recommended 2011-2013 Capital Program is now out. The County Executive did not include any kind of contingency in the event that you do or do not approve this waiver. So funds are not in the program for the purchase of this building.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

We can put them there.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

If the negotiations or bonding could be delayed, certainly the Capital Program could be amended to include the purchase price of the building, but only the Legislature can amend that document at this point.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Just as you were answering Legislator Nowick's question and referring back to the report, I think you said parenthetically that we probably wouldn't be completing the deal until 2011. She was asking about revenue. You said, well, there would be nothing in 2010 because we probably wouldn't close on this until 2011. So would it be, in fact, impeding the progress of this if we were to not vote for the waiver and just let it become an amendment in the Capital Budget of 2011?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

I probably would ask you to confirm the targeted close date with the County Executive's Office.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Mr. Chair, may I ask Mr. Kent to come up to answer that question?

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Go ahead.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

While he comes up can I just say it's not an amendment in the 2011 Capital Budget. We haven't passed that budget. We're the ones who are going to decide what that Capital Budget looks like.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

I think what she's talking about is amending the recommended budget, because I understand, from what you just said, Gail, that the County Executive has already prepared his recommended budget, so it would be a Legislative --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It wouldn't be an add-on. When we adopt the 2011 Capital Budget this can be in it and we'll be doing that shortly.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Yes, when you speak to Mr. Kent, could you also ask is there --

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

You can go ahead. I yield.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Okay. I just wanted the timeline in which -- Mr. Kent, may I -- are you with me? Over here. I just wanted to quickly ask where we're at with the owner of the building. Does he have a timeline? Does he have other prospective candidates out there trying to buy this? Have we got this locked up for how long and what is the timeline so we have an idea of what we're dealing with here.

**MR. KENT:**

We don't have it locked up. We have made an offer to purchase the building and I was waiting to make sure we had a waiver in place so that I could proceed with negotiating the final details of the offer.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Do you have an idea of when --

**MR. KENT:**

The goal originally was to close this in the summer of 2010. We have now put an offer in place that would allow us to close around December 1st of 2010.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

December 1st.

**MR. KENT:**

Yes.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Okay. So this actually could roll into 2011 without it ruining the deal, so to speak.

**MR. KENT:**

Well, I'm not sure if I could. I haven't tried to extend them beyond December 1st. That was kind of their outside bargaining position, they didn't want to go beyond that. But if you'd want to put it into 2011 as Gail Vizzini has stated, that would be something you'd have to do to amend the Capital Budget as presented to the Legislature by the County Executive's Office.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Okay. So if you were -- I mean, since it is the County Executive who developed the recommended budget, was it considered when you were looking at negotiations for this property of putting a contingency into the budget, and if not, why not?

**MR. KENT:**

Why not? I can't answer that other than we don't want to include anything in the Capital Budget that we could do in 2010. We didn't want to include that into 2011. We didn't place a contingency in there, but you do have the power to make that amendment yourselves. So, if this body chooses to do that, you could do that and we wouldn't need the waiver then. That's understood. But then we have to negotiate it with the seller with the understanding that we couldn't close until after we bonded the money in 2011.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Well, that's not a great difference in time because now you are talking about a projected date of December. Going into the new year isn't an extraordinary delay.

**MR. KENT:**

We would have to do a special bond sale some time other than our customary bond sale, which is currently in May and November is when we currently go out to sale with our bonds.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Thank you, Chris. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Anybody else?

**MR. KENT:**

Could I just correct one statement put on record?

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Go ahead.

**MR. KENT:**

Our analysis of this transaction included two capital improvements on the building. The building was constructed in 2000 so it's not that old; it's ten years old. We had projected a \$7.5 million capital investment at the time we moved into the building and then an additional \$12 million capital investment we guessed in 2015. So our analysis, which was presented to the Budget Review Office, included \$19.5 million worth of capital investment in the building over the first five years of ownership, and we projected out our numbers would show a cost positive based on that total of 19.5 million in capital improvements to the building in the first five years.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Anybody else? Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

The Farmingville building. What's the appraised value on the Farmingville building?

**MR. KENT:**

We projected that we could offer it for sale in the neighborhood of \$2 million with a conservative estimate that we would sell it for between 1.7 and 1.8 million dollars. Probably in the 1,750,000 range. We think that's conservative because the building is about 20,000 square feet, and buildings of that size are going in the one hundred to \$110 a square foot on a sale.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Actually this is a question for Counsel.

Thank you, Mr. Kent. Again, going from the minutes and the various presentations that I've seen from the administration about what makes this deal possibly palatable, the sale of the Farmingville building has been represented as something that would yield 1.7 million and whether or not we would have cost avoidance or not I'm uncertain. But just like it seems that we have a flurry of Real Estate activity that's being presented to us, and the last thing I ever thought I would be involved in as a Legislator is flipping properties, but wouldn't there have to be a separate declaration of surplus regarding Farmingville before we would contemplate anything with that whatsoever?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Right. Before we could sell it there would have to be a declaration by the Legislature that it is surplus to our needs.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

And that's an act that's separate and apart from anything that's been put before us, whether it's pierces the cap or a subsequent resolution to approve purchase of 5000 Corporate; is that correct?

**MR. NOLAN:**

What I think Mr. Kent testified in committee was that if you bought this building, the next move would be to sell this other building. I think Mr. Kent recognizes that there would have to be a surplus declaration before you can sell the other property.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, I wasn't at that committee. I don't know if that was testified. Did you speak to that, Mr. Kent?

**MR. KENT:**

Yes, I did. I would think it would be very premature to discuss declaration of surplus of the Farmingville building on Horseblock Place prior to our moving forward with an acquisition of 5000 Corporate Court. One relies upon the other. We can't surplus the Horseblock Place building unless we've purchase Corporate Court for consolidation of Health Department administrative functions.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Perhaps I've misread, then, the transcripts or any of the other discussion. You did represent that one of the items that makes this deal cash positive or revenue positive is the fact that along with this purchase there would be a concomitant sale of Farmingville as well; is that correct?

**MR. KENT:**

That is correct, and the reason you would do that is --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No, no. I'm not interested in the reason to do it or not. What you are telling me is, is it's premature to contemplate surplus, but nevertheless, in a financial or business analysis you are saying one is linked to the other.

**MR. KENT:**

We are trying to develop a plan here. The plan is --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Hold on a second. I'm not uninterested in the plan. What I am interested in --

**MR. KENT:**

You are asking a planning question.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No. I'm asking specifically about whether or not, through Counsel, we'd have to have a separate surplus designation. You are telling me that it would be premature to contemplate surplus, but you are also saying at the same time what makes a positive cash flow is surplus and sale.

**MR. KENT:**

You are speaking -- you are putting words into my mouth.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I don't think so.

**MR. KENT:**

I didn't say it would be premature to contemplate it, I said it would be premature to present a resolution that would declare the land surplus. Of course we would have to do that to sell the property, but I'm not saying that we haven't contemplated the sale. I am saying we haven't presented anything to the Legislature that would authorize or the declaration of the land as surplus so that we could sell.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. That's fine. Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Kent, can you just speak to us about the timing of and the scope of the lease avoidance relative to this deal?

**MR. KENT:**

Okay. The lease avoidance would be -- once we purchase the building -- we have two leases that are expiring. They're both Health Department administrative space that we lease now on Rabro Drive, two different buildings across the street from each other. The lease avoidance would be realized 2012. Both leases expire near the end of 2011. The total lease avoidance would be approximately a million dollars in '09 numbers, so there is some slight escalation between '09 and 2011, but let's say a million dollars lease avoidance on those two spaces. In 2016, when Carco would be vacating the 5000 Corporate Court building, that's the private tenant at the building we're looking to purchase, we would have a lease expiring. Again, it's a DSS administration that's currently located at 3500 Sunrise Highway. That expires in October of 2016. The private tenants lease at 5000 Corporate Court expires in August of 2016. So for planning purposes it makes sense that we would have about two months to retrofit the space after the private tenant leaves for our DSS administrative functions, it's Medicaid, to occupy this space. Lease avoidance on that would be \$325,000 a year. Plus there would be some escalation based on taxes I would imagine between now and 2016. I'm talking in 2010 dollars, putting it out into the future to 2016.

We have some other lease avoidance. When leases expire, when the IRS lease expires and the INS lease expires at 5000 Corporate Court, we will have DSS administrative leases at McArthur in Ronkonkoma and a lease at Meridian Plaza also in Ronkonkoma. Those lease avoidance costs are over seven million dollars -- excuse me, over six million dollars. The total lease avoidance cost is around 7.5 million for the million dollars at Rabro Drive, the 325,000 at Sunrise Highway and the two DSS leases in Ronkonkoma, which total approximately six million. We would be realizing over \$7 million in lease avoidance over the next 13 years. Per year. Per year, once those last leases expire. It would be a per year savings of around \$7 million.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Beginning in 2016?

**MR. KENT:**

No. The last leases that expire are DSS leases. One is in 2023 and one is in 2024. If I could discuss the whole project I will, unless you just want me to answer questions. I had some points I could make on earlier comments that you had that I could respond to if you'd wish, through the Presiding Officer.

**LEG. CILMI:**

That's fine.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Go ahead.

**MR. KENT:**

We talked about market conditions. The reason it's a good time to buy right now is that buildings are being offered for sale at less than what it costs us to construct, what it costs us to reconstruct other buildings that we already own, and less than replacement value. This building is going for around a hundred dollars a square foot. Just to give you some cost comparison, the building we're standing in right now, you are sitting in and I am standing in, we did a major reconstruction project on this building. It's about 230,000 square feet and the price tag was \$37 million. That's what it cost us to reconstruct this building. Why we thought this was a good opportunity is because of the market. The sales prices are extremely below replacement value so we could get a savings, we could buy something now. And with all the lease avoidance that we will realize from occupying this building rather than occupying a building that we rent at over \$20 a square foot, we are in at \$18 a square foot on this building without taking into consideration the lease avoidance, which is higher than \$18 a square foot.

It just makes tremendous sense in the short-term because we're going to realize a positive cash flow early on in the acquisition, and over the long-term it's even better. Near the end when we finish paying off the bonds we'll be into this building at a very cheap rate, taking into consideration even at \$19.5 million worth of capital improvements and future capital improvements. I think it just makes sense. We can get out of leases, we can stop paying property taxes under our leases. I know that you don't -- there's some dispute whether we should be paying -- whether we should be impacting school districts and other districts, but we're the County. I don't think we should be paying property taxes. We save taxpayers money that they end up paying more in other places. But our goal is to operate as efficiently as we can, and if every district operates as efficiently as they can, the taxpayers will save money over the long run.

I just think this is an opportunity for us to do something efficient, to buy a building below replacement value, below cost of construction, below cost of reconstruction. We can buy a building that's only ten years old and gives us a great opportunity to consolidate departments within one location. The redundant services that we have to provide for Health Department, having Health Department administration located in four or five different buildings you have different purchasing, you have different storage, you have different travel, you have a bunch of things, where if you can consolidate management into one location the department operates much more efficiently. So I think those things should be taken into consideration.

I know it's a policy shift. The policy shift is from occupying other space where we pay property taxes, where we lease for greater than what we can occupy property that we own. It is a policy shift and I know that's a tough decision that you have to make, but I think when you look at it and you analyze the costs, it's a tremendous opportunity that's going to save us money and we're going to operate more efficiently. If you have any other specific questions, I could speak to the taxes and anything else you would want me to respond to.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Legislator Cilmi still has the floor.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Just one more thing. I'm not sure if you can summarize this for us, Chris, but given all of the parts to this equation, the capital improvements that you are anticipating, the lease avoidance, can you estimate for us over a five year period, over a ten-year period and then maybe over a 20-year period what the cash impact to the County is going to be in each of those time frames?

**MR. KENT:**

Well, immediately in 2011, through the sale of the building at Horseblock Place, we would be realizing over a million-seven. Together with the revenues that we will receive, we will realize about close to \$2 million, a million-five to \$2 million positive, cash positive. In 2012 we'll start a lease avoidance on the Rabro Drive, so that will be a million dollars that we won't have to pay. So when you couple those in the short-term, we're going to make money on this building.

The Budget Review Office's report said we potentially could start to lose money in 2016 when the private tenant moves out. At that time we'll move in a department, that's going to mean that we can avoid lease of 325,000; that makes it cash positive. And over the long-term, when we start relocating DSS administration into the building, you are going to be avoiding over \$6 million in leases.

The total cost for us to occupy this building is never greater than about 6.3 million. That's our cost. So we start realizing lease avoidance at the back end and that's with debt service and capital improvements and maintenance. When you start projecting at the back end of it, when we stop paying bonding and we avoid the eight million, at that point future dollars, over \$8 million in lease expenses, the building is a definite good decision to make, business decision.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So aside from the generalities, maybe Budget Review is better equipped to answer that question, but if Budget Review could include in your formula the lease avoidance that Mr. Kent spoke about. If, again, you could give us a total cash impact to the County over the first five years, over the first ten years, and over the first 20 years of ownership.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

I do have the lease avoidance as far as the two Rabro Drive locations. The thing you should know also in terms of the total lease avoidance of the 7.3 that Mr. Kent had handed out at the last, I guess it was Budget and Finance Committee, that is gross in terms of the reimbursement of Social Services. Mr. Kent and I spoke the other day about the formula for reimbursement as far as Health being close to a wash, but the formula for Social Services being a little bit more involved, requiring some more calculations. So generally speaking, if we take the 25.52 a square foot that we're getting, if we were to place Medicaid operations or some of the Social Services operations -- Medicaid in particular. When the Space Committee needed to deliberate on immediate space for Medicaid operations, it was represented to us that everything about that was going to be a hundred percent reimbursed, which is a very commendable reimbursement rate. Reimbursement for Social Services generally speaking is about 75% of market value, so the 7.3 million might be a little bit less, but it will be close to what's represented.

And because these leases are coming due, it will be a policy decision as to whether these are the operations, Probation, Social Services and Health, because we currently lease them under our belief that we maximize reimbursement through lease space or whether we will be locating Consumer Affairs or other County operations in sub par County buildings. That would be another possibility. So you want your one to five years, five to ten years, based on the assumptions that these reimbursables will be put in there.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Okay. I'd have to get back to you on that.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you. Many of my questions were asked and answered by Legislator Cilmi. Let me just --

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Steve, I don't think your mic is on.

**LEG. STERN:**

I'm pushing it. Let me just go, then, back to the procedure that was brought up by Legislator Schneiderman before. My question to you, I guess, the County Executive, would be to get your thoughts again on that process as it was laid out. How you see the timing going, whether or not this is something that could be considered as a part of our Capital Budget and what you perhaps see as some of the pros or the cons to that.

**MR. KENT:**

Well, the longer we wait I think the price is only going to go up. I think the real estate market is reaching a turn and I think the longer we wait, the longer we delay the purchase. I think the seller is going to ask for more money, especially once they -- once the IRS occupies the building and starts paying rent and once the INS occupies the building and starts paying rent.

Let me tell you what's going on there so you understand the transaction. Both -- IRS had already occupied a portion of the building. What they did is they wanted more space, so they increased their occupancy by 50,000 square feet in the building. They had an existing lease. Rather than extending that lease, they renegotiated -- they terminated the prior lease and renegotiated so that the two properties are consolidated under one lease. So they're leasing about 102,000 square feet and they renegotiated the lease. That space is now being built out by the landlord and rent would be abated a few months. INS has negotiated a brand new lease. They're going to be occupying space this year, but not paying rent until around 2011.

What will happen is if we start pushing it off into the future, the landlord. This is all in the breakdown, by the way, of what we provided the Budget Review Office. As the landlord starts realizing revenue under the leases, they're going to want more money for the sale. So the longer we push it off the higher the price will be, both because I think market conditions are starting to change and because the revenue generated from the occupancy of the tenants will increase. So I thought the opportunity was probably best last year to buy this building at the lowest price possible. It's still a good opportunity today and I think the opportunity starts getting less attractive the longer we wait.

**LEG. STERN:**

And I would agree because of market conditions. But I guess the question then is, based on this particular situation, my understanding from the conversation before was that we're probably not looking at all that much time because it's been pushed off. We are already looking towards the end of the year. Maybe it's 30 days, maybe it's something less, but to get over the first of the year, are we talking about a substantial enough period of time where that would have a real impact on the cost.

**MR. KENT:**

I mean, I would leave here today if that was your wish. We would go right from here today and start asking if we could push the closing back to on or about March 1st or something at the beginning of 2011. I don't know what that impact is going to be. It may, in essence, make the transaction -- the discussion of the transaction no longer necessary because it may not go forward.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to quickly just go over the math a minute. Gail, it sounded like, and to Mr. Kent, it sounded like your forecast for 2011 was a little bit overly optimistic because you were basing it having the sale completed of the Farmingville property at 1.7, but when I subtracted what Budget Review had said the expenses would be, I think the approximation was about 750,000. So that would definitely bring us to under a million if we optimistically sold that property in -- and with the market, although it's rebounding a little bit, it's still soft, and to sell a 20,000 square foot building which we wouldn't -- you know, we still have to do the -- have the legislative process go through and then put it on the market. I think selling it within that year seems optimistic. I mean, it would be great.

Gail, haven't you said the expenses would be about 750,000? Again, I don't have your report in front of me, but I thought it was about 750,000 in the first year.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

The numbers that I gave you were expenses minus revenue. And without the sale of the mental health clinic the total expenses by my estimates -- and by the way, just to correct my misstatement earlier, Chris clarified that the targeted closing date was December of 2010, not 2011. My expenses do include the same capital investment, the seven and a half million and the 12 million under the same time frame, although with a slightly different debt service schedule perhaps than the Budget Office. The total expenses were 4.8 million offset by four million in revenue, estimated revenue, for still a net cost of about 750,000. So in 2011 alone, without the sale of the \$2 million mental health center and the associated loss of --

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

That's what I was basing my analysis on, that you had said about 750,000 is our net.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Cost.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Cost, and if we were to sell, if optimistically we could sell, you know, the property for 1.7, then our net would be less than a million, right? No?

**MR. KENT:**

Based on those --

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Chris, you know what I'm saying.

**MR. KENT:**

Based on those numbers, yes.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

The revenue would be, yes.

**MR. KENT:**

Our numbers are just a little different. We have a little higher numbers. I'm coming up with a net of around 1.4 million in the positive.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

And Budget Review's net would be less than a million. So I just wanted to point out that they weren't the same numbers and that yours were much more optimistic. And 2011 is a tough year for us. We're looking at big numbers, negative numbers, and certainly this would add -- I mean, it wouldn't defray that much even with the sale of building. So I just wanted to put that in the right perspective. I'm done.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Legislator Montano.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Thank you. Gail, I received a copy of the report and I was just going over it. The last sentence basically says if the issue had come before the Space Committee there would most likely have been a search, comparable buildings identified and a recommendation made to policymakers. Could you just elaborate on that for me? In other words, what I'm reading from that is, and I haven't in-depth read the report, is that this is out of the normal process, out of the Space Committee process, and we haven't looked at comparable buildings or properties or we haven't done a search to see whether

or not there are other properties available; is that what you were saying here? I don't want to put words in your mouth. I am just curious as to the meaning of that sentence.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

As you well know, you know, when we're looking for space for a health clinic, a South Shore Regional Health Center or a Patchogue health center, the typical approach would be a request for proposal; that would be issued and then evaluated by the Space Committee. So this particular process is different from that. It did not start with a request for proposal for Space to consolidate the administrative offices of the Health Department. What came before Space Committee was more of an SAR to extend the current leases so that conveniently the two Rabro Drive sister buildings would come up at the same time, and they do make a good fit for the available 54,000 vacant space at the IRS building. So that was the intent of that.

As far as comparables, I don't have any information as to whether Newmark Knight Frank or the County Executive's Office had sought other comparable buildings that would fit this particular profile.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Thank you. Chris, if I may. In light of what Gail said, and I think you were addressing this, but I may not have gotten all of it. How did this proposal then surface, how did, you know, you get your hands on it in terms of, you know, having -- or what process, if any, was used for you to identify this particular location and determine that this is where -- this is the direction you wanted to go in.

**MR. KENT:**

Well, this location was first included in a report that was given to us -- to the County Legislature also. It was prepared and presented in 2008 as a real estate opportunity for us. The recommendation was that it would be much better for the County to occupy space we owned; we do it less expensively than space we lease. This opportunity presented itself because it's a building that was, at the time it was first presented, half vacant, half occupied by tenants. So the opportunity to purchase a building that would generate revenue so that the County didn't have to carry the burden on its own was very attractive to us. And there aren't other buildings available. I mean, I will let Brian Lee speak from Newmark Knight Frank, who is our real estate consultant for the County. This opportunity to own space that we could occupy and also have tenants there that generates revenue for us to offset our cost of occupying the building, those opportunities didn't exist. But I will let Brian --

**LEG. MONTANO:**

But just so I'm clear. The 2008 report that you referred to, did it talk about generally what we should do or did it specifically identify this particular parcel as one of the target parcels? In other words --

**MR. KENT:**

The report was both general and it also made specific recommendations.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay. And was --

**MR. KENT:**

So the general was that -- the general recommendation was that the County -- the cost of occupying space we own is about 40% less than the cost of occupying space we lease.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

So the general recommendation was that we should move towards ownership versus leasing.

**MR. KENT:**

There was multiple recommendations that I think this building fits.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Right. But my question --

**MR. KENT:**

One is occupying space we own and the other is consolidating rooftops. We have departments that are spread out throughout the County, and these are not places that provide services to the public. We are talking administrative functions, back office. We're not talking about places that -- where the public goes for services.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I understand.

**MR. KENT:**

We're not moving health centers here. We are moving administrative functions to this location.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

And I understand that. But my question was, and I'm not sure --

**MR. KENT:**

The specific recommendation came after the report.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

After the report.

**MR. KENT:**

I just spoke to Brian. Brian said that he wasn't sure if it was included in the report, but I remember we had a presentation of the report made by the -- by Newmark Knight Frank, and I believe you also had that presentation made before the Legislature that recommended we purchase buildings. And they did identify to us at that time that this building offered us an incredible opportunity to buy space, consolidate functions, administrative functions of a department into one location. All those redundant things that happen when we are in multiple rooftops would disappear. And this building, the added attraction to this building is that it had existing tenants that would help us with revenues to offset our expenses.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Thank you. We're at 12:30 folks. If there's any more discussion we'll just adjourn the morning session, or do you want to take a vote?

*(“Vote” said in unison)*

Okay. We have a motion to table and a motion to approve; am I correct, Mr. Clerk?

**MR. LAUBE:**

That is correct.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

The tabling motion comes first. I'm going to call for a roll call.

*(Roll Called by Mr. Laube - Clerk)*

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes.

**LEG. COOPER:**

No.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No.

**LEG. STERN:**

No.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

No.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

No.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Pass.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Yes.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

No to table.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Yes.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Twelve.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay, we are adjourned until 2:30.

*(The meeting was adjourned at 12:33 p.m. and reconvened at 2:29 p.m.)*

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Could I have all Legislators to the horseshoe, please? Mr. Clerk, would you call the roll?

*(Roll Called by Mr. Laube - Clerk)*

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

(Not present)

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

(Not present)

**LEG. BROWNING:**

(Not present)

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Here.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Present.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Here.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

(Not present)

**LEG. CILMI:**

Here.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Here.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

(Not present)

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Here.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

(Not present)

**LEG. GREGORY:**

(Not present)

**LEG. STERN:**

Here.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Here.

**LEG. COOPER:**

Here.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Here.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Here.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Here.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Here.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Here.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Tim, here.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fifteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fifteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay, we'll start the public hearings. First up is ***Public Hearing on 2011-2013 Capital Budget and Program***. And I have one card, George Gatta.

**MR. GATTA:**

Good afternoon. On behalf of Suffolk County Community College President Shawn McKay, I want to thank the Legislature for its ongoing support of the college. Your investments in both our Capital and Operating Budgets have enabled us to meet the educational needs of 25,000 students this year, the highest enrollment in our 50 year history. And I'm pleased to report that with your support, we're now the largest community college in the entire SUNY system. Looking forward to our next academic year, we're already seeing a significant increase in the number of students seeking admission to the college. Increasingly we believe County residents are seeing the great value of the college and the quality of our academic programs and workforce development offerings.

As the Legislature begins its review of the 2011-2013 Capital Program and the 2011 Capital Budget, we need to bring to your attention several serious concerns. First, with respect to Capital Project No. 2159, the Learning Resource Center at the Grant Campus, just a couple of points. Earlier this year we were very pleased that the Legislature appropriated \$1.6 million for the planning and design for that new building. Based on that appropriation, we will be ready to begin construction in 2012; unfortunately, the proposed Capital Program would not fund construction until 2013. Given that we have 50% State matching funds in place, we ask that the construction of this long awaited and much needed facility be moved to 2012.

Next I need to bring to your attention the proposed Capital Program deletes Project Number 2120, which is the Health and Sports Facility at the Eastern Campus. As you know, the college has worked hard to secure State funding for that facility and that project has been restored multiple times by the Legislature to the program. In the current Capital Program, this project is scheduled for one million dollars for planning and design next year. We request that you restore the Sports and Fitness Facility at the Eastern Campus to the Capital Program so that we don't lose the \$8.87 million, 50%

State share, which we currently have in place.

And finally, the last project I need to bring to your attention is Capital Project No. 2149, College-Wide Infrastructure. As I previously mentioned, this is the 50th year of our operation and with each passing year our facilities, the vast majority of which were built in the 1960's and 70's, are in need of major renovations including electrical systems, mechanical systems, exterior concrete work, repaving curbs, lighting, etcetera.

Recognizing the need for a detailed analysis of our aging buildings and infrastructure, last year we participated in the SUNY Community Colleges Capital Facilities Assessment and Reinvestment Study. That study was performed by a third party independent consultant working in consultation with both SUNY Central professional staff and our staff locally at the campuses and centrally. It analyzed the age, condition and life expectancy of all the major components of our 48 buildings and the 4.4 million square feet of paved surfaces at our three campuses.

Based on the size and scope of those facilities, the report recommends that in order to not to fall any farther behind we, as an institution, need to invest \$10 million per year for each of the next ten years so that we can maintain those facilities in good working order. While this is a significant challenge, I'm pleased to report that we've also been aggressively seeking other funding sources to avoid putting pressure on the County Capital and State Capital Programs. I just want to site a few examples.

Based on the success with utilizing \$5 million from the New York Power Authority in 2004 for their Energy Services Program, which helped us upgrade multiple electrical systems in terms of efficiency and replacing antiquated equipment. Two weeks ago President McKay announced a new agreement with the New York Power Authority to invest another \$5.5 million dollars provided by the Power Authority. The college repays that to the Power Authority over the life expectancy of these new systems from the energy savings.

We have also recently applied for and received two Federal stimulus fund grants; the first in the amount of \$675,000, that helps us with water conservation college-wide and also funds electrical upgrades to our sewage treatment plant. The second grant, \$430,000 --

**(\*Timer Bell Sounded\*)**

Am I for whom the bell tolls? Four-hundred and thirty thousand dollars to fund the replacement of five antiquated and energy inefficient boilers and the expansion of an energy control system college-wide. The savings alone from those five boilers is in excess of \$400,000 a year in energy savings.

So we're looking at every possible funding source. However, with the replacement value for all those buildings and parking lots and interior roads valued at about \$830 million, we need to invest a little more than 1% a year to make sure that we maintain the integrity of those buildings for students yet to come. Therefore, we're requesting that we begin adding a significant amount of funding in each of the next three years for capital infrastructure improvements.

So recapping, it's restoring the Sports Facility at the Eastern Campus to the Capital Program so we don't lose State funding; advancing the construction funding for the Learning Resource Center at the Grant Campus to 2012, not to wait an extra year; and making progress in advancing college-wide infrastructure.

I thank you for your past support of the college. We look forward to working with Budget Review and will be participating fully in the committee hearings next month. Again, thank you for the support of the Legislature on all these important projects.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Thank you, George. That's the only card I have on the Capital Budget. Is there anyone else in the audience that would like to speak on the Capital Budget? This is really the first time it's been on our agenda. It will remain on our agenda for the next several meetings so that we can -- one more, so that we can acquire more public comment.

Next up is *Public Hearing on IR 1004-10 - Adopting Local Law No. -2010, A Charter Law to strengthen the independence of the Ethics Commission (Montano)*. And I have no cards on this subject. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak to us on this subject? Seeing none, Legislator Montano.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes, I'm going to ask to recess this for one month, for one cycle.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion to recess. I'll second that. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*IR 1029-10 - Adopting Local Law No. -2010, A Charter Law to provide a fixed five year term for the Police Commissioner (Cooper)*. I have no cards on this subject. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak on this subject? Seeing none, Legislator Cooper, what would you like to do with this?

**LEG. COOPER:**

Motion to close, please.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion to close.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Seconded by Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Motion to recess.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion to recess. Do I have a second to the --

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second to the recessing by Legislator Barraga. On the subject, Legislator Muratore.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

No, I just wanted to second it.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Oh, okay. Any comments? Seeing none --

**LEG. COOPER:**

I would just like to briefly say, reiterate what I asked of my colleagues at the last meeting. It's almost unprecedented, if not totally unprecedented, for a request by the sponsor of a resolution to close a public hearing on his own bill, not to be respected. I was very disappointed at the last meeting that my request was not honored. The rationale extensively was so that Legislator Cilmi could introduce his competing resolution, which was done and the public hearing will be held on that today. So I hope that my colleagues now will accede to my request to close this public hearing so that we can proceed to a debate on both resolutions. Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. The motion to recess takes precedence. Roll call.

*(\*Roll Called by Mr. Laube - Clerk\*)*

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Yes to recess.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. COOPER:**

No.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No.

**LEG. STERN:**

No.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

No.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

No.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

(Not present).

**LEG. CILMI:**

No.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

This is to recess? No.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

No.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

No.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

No.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes to recess.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

No.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

No.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Five.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay, recessing fails. To close, roll call.

*(\*Roll Called by Mr. Laube - Clerk\*)*

**LEG. COOPER:**

Yes, please.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

(Not present).

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

No.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Yes.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

No.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

No.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fourteen.

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

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. ***Public Hearing on IR No. 1055-10 - Calling for a public hearing for the consent to the acquisition of additional land at Marinold Way, Town of Southampton, County of Suffolk, State of New York, by the Quoque Cemetery Association, Inc. For cemetery expansion purposes (Schneiderman).*** I have one card, Marietta Seaman.

**MS. SEAMAN:**

Good afternoon. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm Marietta Seaman, I reside at 32 Midland Street in Quoque, New York. I'm here representing my husband, Charles Seaman, who owns the roadbed of this subject hearing, one of the parcels of this subject hearing.

What has started as a simple expansion of the Quoque Cemetery has really turned into a quagmire of land acquisition. The cemetery was in contract to purchase a half-acre parcel along with the private road known as Marinold Way back in 2009. Our attorneys at that time had indicated to the attorneys of the Quoque Cemetery that the individual that they were in contract with did not own the roadbed, they only owned the half-acre parcel. The cemetery did close and acquire the half-acre parcel and purchased it. We have been in negotiations with the cemetery since the summer of 2009 for them to acquire a portion of the roadbed from my husband by sale, and then we found out that this hearing was taking place today. We were not notified by the Legislature nor by the cemetery association. That may not be a requirement, I don't know, but you received a petition from the cemetery seeking your consent for them to acquire these two parcels of land.

Since that time that I guess you received the petition, we have signed a contract of sale with the cemetery for them to purchase this roadbed which, in the petition that you received, they were looking to acquire it by condemnation. So now they have a contract of sale with us to purchase the property. That contract of sale will close once the Quoque Cemetery gets the lot line modification that's required for the cemetery to have its expansion so that it is a contiguous parcel.

On the maps that we gave to you -- that I gave to you, the pink is the current Quoque Cemetery, B is the half-acre that they acquired by sale, and C is the roadbed which splits the cemetery and the new piece that they acquired and it does not make the cemetery a contiguous parcel. But as I stated, we are in contract to sell this to the cemetery, we negotiated in good faith. There's no need for a condemnation authorization by this body to the cemetery when there's a contract of sale, in my

estimation.

So that's the question, really, that I'm asking you, you know, should you give them and consent to them that they can acquire, they should acquire our property by condemnation when there's a signed contract for sale? So I would ask you to eliminate that as part of it. We have no objection to them acquiring the property, but it should be by sale, not by condemnation.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Ms. Seaman, first of all, let me apologize for the lack of notification. We deal with this situation so rarely that I'm going to ask our Counsel to explain to the Legislature our role in this, because we're not a party to either purchasing or selling this land.

**MS. SEAMAN:**

Right.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

So, George, if you would, please?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yeah, this is a very rare occurrence. But when a cemetery wants to expand and acquire property to expand, it has to be approved by the County Legislature. As part of that process, we hold a public hearing, which is what we're doing today, on the petition that was presented, and I think what the people were asking for is the right to acquire and/or condemn property. This doesn't -- obviously we're not authorizing anything, there would have to be a separate resolution later authorizing them to acquire the property, but this is just the public hearing on this. We did have to advertise it for six weeks in the County newspapers, and that's the notice that we're required to give and we did that, but that's why this particular hearing is before us today.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Does -- yes, Legislator Gregory, you have any questions?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes. I know Ms. Seaman and I know her to be a fine, upstanding resident of Suffolk County, a former elected official of Suffolk County of the Town of Southampton, actually; right?

**MS. SEAMAN:**

Thank you, DuWayne, yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

So my reading of what you're saying is that you entered into a private arrangement with the cemetery and the cemetery tried to burn both ends of the candle, see if they could go private or public; is that what's happening?

**MS. SEAMAN:**

I think that's what's happening.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right, thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

But again, this is a public hearing that doesn't specifically -- I assume that Legislator Schneiderman is going to follow-up with an acquisition resolution or an approval of that acquisition. Okay?

**MS. SEAMAN:**

The petitioner does, in the petition that was given to the Legislature, ask to take this particular parcel, the 20,000 square feet, by condemnation for cemetery purposes; they're asking for your consent and authorization. While this is not the hearing for the condemnation itself, it's giving them the consent and authorization to go forward and acquire it by condemnation when there's a contract for sale. That's all I'm trying to bring across.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

What I would like to --

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Wait, wait, wait. Could Counsel just answer that? I thought it gave it leeway either way.

**MR. NOLAN:**

This is just a public hearing, we're not approving anything. We're required to hold a public hearing on the petition basically so people like yourself can come forward if there is a problem. We would have to pass a resolution authorizing the acquisition and that's not even before us.

**MS. SEAMAN:**

Right.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

But, George, the question is if this is a voluntary acquisition, not condemnation, does this hearing suffice to fulfil the hearing requirement under that subsequent resolution?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yes, it would.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay, that's all I wanted to know. Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

That's basically the question I was going to ask; does this need to be recessed so that Counsel could review this or do I need to change it and have a new resolution that specifically -- that doesn't mention condemnation? You're saying that this is sufficient to allow for the non-condemnation acquisition of the property by the cemetery.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Honestly, I'd like to go back and look at the petition again, but I don't know if there's really any procedure to recess this type of public hearing. We're required to hold a hearing on the petition that's presented, that's it, and I think we really don't recess these type of hearings, has been my experience. But I think -- I would be surprised if what we are doing here affects their ability to make a direct sale, a negotiated sale with your husband.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Well, the other thing is, Legislator Schneiderman, your resolution says to consent to the acquisition, it doesn't define whether that acquisition is voluntary or by condemnation. So I --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It refers to a petition and within that petition is where it talks about the condemnation. It's in the first line of the resolution. Maybe we could just pass over it for now? You know, I'd like to recess it, if that can be done, if it can't be done procedurally.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Why don't you pass over it, we'll see if we can recess it. I'll try to give you an answer in the next couple of minutes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay?

**MS. SEAMAN:**

Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Thank you, Ms. Seaman. All right, I'm going to skip over that.

Next on the agenda is ***Public Hearing on IR No. 1129-10 - A Local Law to ensure the integrity of prescription labels in Suffolk County (Cooper)***. I have no cards on this subject. Legislator Cooper?

**LEG. COOPER:**

Motion to recess, please.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion to recess. I'll second that. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***Public Hearing on IR 1174-10 - Adopting Local Law No. -2010, A Local Law amending Chapter 8 of the Suffolk County Code (County Executive)***. I don't have any cards on this subject. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak on this subject? Seeing none --

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

I'll make a motion to recess.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

I was -- thank you. I'll second that motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay, motion by Legislator Viloría-Fisher, second by Legislator Losquadro to recess. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***Public Hearing on IR 1176-10 - A Charter Law to repeal the Suffolk County Energy Tax via public referendum (Romaine)***. I have no cards on this subject. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak on this subject?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Motion to recess.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion to recess, I'll second that. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***Public Hearing on IR No. 1229-10 - A Local Law prohibiting the sale of aerosol dusting products to minors (Horsley).*** I don't have any cards on this subject. Anyone in the audience who would like to speak on this subject? Seeing none, Legislator Horsley?

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Motion to recess.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion to recess. I'll second that. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***Public Hearing on IR No. 1231-10 - A Local Law requiring owners of private residential communities to ensure emergency access to roads after snowfall (Romaine).*** I have no cards on this subject. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak on this subject? Seeing none, Legislator Romaine?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I'm going to make a motion to recess because I want to deal with the issue of fire hydrants within these communities so that when they clear the roads they don't block the fire hydrants --

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

-- which was an issue that was brought to me by the Water Authority.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Okay, I'll second the motion to recess. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***Public Hearing on IR No. 1334-10 - A Local Law to strengthen the County's Crack House Statute (Browning).*** I have no cards on this subject. Anyone in the audience that would like to speak on this subject? Seeing none, Legislator Browning?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Motion to close.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion to close. I'll second it. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***Public Hearing on IR No. 1352-10 - A Local Law banning the sale of certain synthetic --***

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Cannabinoids.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

-- ***cannabinoids to minors in Suffolk County (Schneiderman)***. I have no cards on this subject. Is there anybody who wants to speak about cannabinoids?

**(\*Laughter\*)**

I don't see anybody. What is your pleasure, Legislator Schneiderman?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'll close; motion to close.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion to close by Legislator Schneiderman. I will second that motion. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***Public Hearing on IR No. 1354-10 - A Local Law to impose civil penalties for the use of a vehicle in connection with the sale, purchase, use or transport of unlawfully possessed controlled substances (County Executive)***. I have no cards on this subject. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak on this subject? Seeing none, close, is that what the County Executive would like? Okay, I will make a motion to close.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***Public Hearing on IR No. 1355-10 - A Charter Law to implement Two-Year Rolling Debt Policy Under 5-25-5 Law to Mitigate Budgetary Shortfall. (County Executive)***. I have nobody -- no cards on this subject. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak on this subject? Seeing none, the County Executive would like this closed.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Motion to close.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion to close by Legislator Gregory. I'll second it. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***Public Hearing on IR No. 1366-10 - A Local Law to maximize promotion of tourism in Suffolk County (Schneiderman).*** I have no cards on this subject. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to talk on this subject? Seeing none --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion to close.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion to close by Legislator Schneiderman. I'll second that. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***Public Hearing on IR No. 1370-10 - A Charter Law to increase the accountability of Department Heads (Cilmi).*** I have no cards on the subject. Legislator -- yeah, let me just -- you want to make a motion?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No, I want to note my recusal on the record, as previously filed with your office.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

I have no cards on this subject. Legislator Cilmi, what would you like to do on this?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Motion to close.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion to close. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

You need a second on that.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Oh, I'll second it.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Does Counsel have an opinion on --

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Yeah, that's where we're going.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy - Recused: Legislator D'Amaro).

**MR. NOLAN:**

I looked at the State Law, I believe we can recess the public hearing to look at everything.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'd like to make a motion to recess.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Motion to recess by Legislator Schneiderman, second by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

That concludes our public hearings.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Moving right along.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

I'd like to set the date for the following Public Hearings of May 11th, 2010 at 2:30 PM at the Rose Caracappa Auditorium in Hauppauge; 2011-2013 Capital Budget & Program; IR 1164, a Charter Law to guarantee continuity and stability in County Law enforcement to ensure adequate resources for public safety; IR 1390, a Local Law to prohibit cyber bullying in Suffolk County; IR 1408, a Charter Law to increase Legislative oversight of RFP process; IR 1410, a Local Law requiring broader dissemination of auction information; IR 1412, a Local Law establishing fair and objective procedures for contracting title insurance work; IR 1415, a Local Law to establish a prompt contracting policy for not-for-profit organizations; IR 1431, a Local Law to encourage the sale of substandard properties in the County's inventory of adjacent property owners; IR 1451, a Local Law to enact Campaign Finance Reform Act to limit campaign contribution for County contractors; IR 1452, a Local Law prohibiting demonstrations at funeral services in the County of Suffolk; IR 1474, a Local Law authorizing the County Executive to execute agreements for the sale of the John J. Foley Skilled Nursing Facility; IR 1489, a Local Law to establish a notification requirement for consultant contracts; IR 1490, a Local Law to extend prompt payment policy for not-for-profit contract agencies.

**MR. NOLAN:**

You need a motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

I need a motion.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Motion.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Eddington.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay, back to page nine. We're doing good, it's only three o'clock, you know?

*("Shhhhh" said in unison)*

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**Budget & Finance (Continued):**

***IR 1025-10 - Requiring disclosure of specific information regarding closed capital projects (Romaine).*** I need a motion.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Motion to approve.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Romaine. I'll second the motion. Do we have any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**Economic Development, Higher Education & Energy:**

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***IR 1341-10 - Appointing the Town of Huntington Representative to the Suffolk County Empire Zone Administrative Board (Mark Cuthbertson) (County Executive).*** Do I have a motion?

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Stern.

**LEG. COOPER:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***1347-10 - To reappoint Ronan Mulvey as a member of the Suffolk County Citizens Advisory Board for the Arts (Muratore).*** Motion by Legislator Muratore, seconded by Legislator Vilorio-Fisher. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1361-10 - Authorizing 2010 funding for the Suffolk County Cultural Arts Community Re-grant Program (County Executive).*

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Motion.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Motion.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Nowick, seconded by Legislator Viloría-Fisher. Just a question; Ms. Vizzini, this is all budgeted items, this is not -- this is already included in the budget, right, it's just approving the actual grants.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Correct.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1365-10 - Amending Resolution No. 965-2009, establishing a Local Home Energy Efficiency Task Force (Viloría-Fisher).*

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Nowick. On the question, Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Thank you. If I can just get an explanation of what exactly we're hoping to accomplish with this? I mean, LIPA is spending millions of dollars. I know Legislator Stern just had a forum where he was offering information to his constituents about energy efficiency and grant programs that are available. So what exactly is this task force hoping to accomplish?

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Okay, this is an expansion of what a consortium that was just developed had worked on, which was trying to look at green homes, green jobs, that's one of the issues that's being covered there, but we want to include all ten towns. We also have several Commissioners on it or their appointees to look at what we have -- what we're offering in the County, vis-a-vis job training for green-collar jobs in our Labor Department and Consumer Affairs, also in our energy departments. The Commissioners have offered that they have a great deal to put as far as input into this Energy Task Force. The

towns are very much on board, and we also have such people as The Energy Institute over at Stony Brook, they want to have input. The college will have input in this. So we're looking at green energy and green job training in the County and how we're marrying those efforts.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

So I guess the possibility of creating jobs --

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

We're also going to have two people representing labor unions on the task force. So it's job creation married with energy issues.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Okay. Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**Environment, Planning & Agriculture:**

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***IR 1037-10 - Adopting Local Law No. -2010, A Charter Law to expand the functions of the Council on Environmental Quality to include advising Suffolk County on bicycle routes (Schneiderman).***

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion to approve by Legislator Schneiderman. Seconded by Legislator Losquadro. Do you want to debate that one? Okay.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

No.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Oh, all right. Does anybody want to comment? Is this going to put a bicycle path through the Pine Barrens?

**(\*Laughter\*)**

No? Okay. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***1306-10 - Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 --***

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

This isn't a campus, is it?

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

-- *(Hughes property – Town of Southampton)(Schneiderman).*

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Viloría-Fisher. Does anybody -- well, this is just planning steps, so we don't have any rating on it yet.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

We do, it's rated 33; it scored very high.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1333-10 - Extending the term of the executed intermunicipal agreement between the County and the Town of Smithtown in connection with the Nissequoque River North Tributary Storm water Remediation Project (CP 8710.114)(County Executive).*

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by the great Legislator from the Town of Smithtown, Legislator Nowick.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

And I'll second it.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Seconded by Legislator Viloría-Fisher. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*IR 1348-10 - Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 - Peconic Land Trust property – Town of Southold (SCTM No. 1000-117.00-08.00-018.000)(Romaine).*

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Schneiderman. Same question, what's the rating?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

This rated 50.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Oh, good.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

One of the highest ratings around.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

That was that small piece on the water that that group was going to manage.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*IR 1358-10 - Amending Resolution No. 618-2007, authorizing planning steps for acquisition under the Suffolk County Multifaceted Land Preservation Program (Forge River Watershed property), Town of Brookhaven (Browning).*

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Browning.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Losquadro. Same question; what's the rating?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

PG?

(\*Laughter\*)

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

PG. Okay.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I do not remember.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Mr. Chair, I don't think it was very high, but it's part of the management system in the Forge River Watershed and the County has been trying to acquire it.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

And I will just add that this would be a 50/50 partnership with the Town of Brookhaven, that the Town is on board with this.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yeah. Also, what it is is there were some properties that were not included in the resolution to -- for the acquisition, but when the appraisal was done those properties were included in the appraisal, so it's not changing the amount of money. So there was an approval already done, it's just including these properties.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

And, you know, the reason why I ask these is, you know, it's been reported to us that the amount of money we have for land acquisition is shrinking rapidly and I don't want to approve planning steps for something that we might not have the money for. Legislator Cilmi, did you want to comment?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Just very quickly, maybe Budget Review could tell us how much money -- my understanding is that this is a finite piece of -- chunk of money that we have in this particular program; is that true? And if it is, how much is left?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

I don't have those numbers at my fingertips. We are in agreement with the Budget Office in terms of what we can bond, so, really, what we're talking about is bonding and paying for the land acquisition component from the proceeds of the bonds, but I don't have that in front of me.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

You want us to get Carrie in here? Do you want to get an answer to that?

**LEG. CILMI:**

I would be curious.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

All right. Well, we'll skip over that and we'll come back to it and see if we can get the question answered.

**Health & Human Services:**

***1230-10 - Adopting Local Law No. -2010, A Local Law banning the sale of drinking games to minors (Cilmi).***

**LEG. CILMI:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Cilmi. Do I have second?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Second.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Muratore. On the question, anybody, no? Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Cosponsor.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

No more beer-pong.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

That's your first bill getting passed, right?

**LEG. CILMI:**

My first Local Law.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Hey, congratulations. Throw the baseball out and give it to him.

*Applause*

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Tim?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fourteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***1317-10 - Authorizing a request for proposals to relocate the South Brookhaven Family Health Center (Eddington).***

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Eddington.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***IR 1364-10 - Authorizing the County Executive to apply for Federally Qualified Health Center status as a public entity with Look-A-Like status (County Executive).***

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I'll make that motion to approve.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Browning.

**LEG. COOPER:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Seconded by Legislator Cooper. On the question anyone? Seeing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

We are moving right along.

*("Shhhhh" said in unison)*

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**Labor, Workforce & Affordable Housing:**

***1276-10 - Adopting Local Law No. -2010, A Local Law to expand opportunities to create housing under the 72-h transfer program. (Schneiderman)***

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

I'll second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Eddington.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Explanation, please.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Explanation is asked for of the sponsor.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Sure. Okay, well, most of our housing programs are -- we expanded years ago to go not just from 80% of median income but up to 120% of median income. The 72-h Program isn't one of those programs, it's only been available -- but this is really the only program we have for homeownership, which is really the American dream. And so many people have priced out of home ownership. And the idea was to expand the eligibility pool, so people making median income who still could no way ever afford a house in a lot of these areas could have that opportunity. But it doesn't automatically go up to 100% or 120, it does -- a decision has to be made by the Director of Housing. There's a test that's being developed, a number of criteria that have to be met, and then if the Director feels that it does meet that criteria, then it comes back to the Legislature and we can then waive that 80% up to 120.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

The reason I ask -- and maybe Counsel can respond. I thought that those criteria were set by HUD standards for 72 -- you know, using the 72-h money.

**MR. NOLAN:**

I think both standards were developed by HUD, the 80% and the 120%. But we -- it's our 72-h Program, we can put the conditions on the transfer that we want.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Okay.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Can I say that not all, you know, the town's efforts to do, through 72-h, to build housing go through HUD. Some of them don't require any Federal grants to do this, so they're not -- if HUD is involved, I think you're right, 80% is the max if there's HUD grant money involved.

Sometimes in trying to keep in character with the community, the cost of developing is getting so high that it's impossible to have somebody who makes 80% of income support a mortgage on what that house is costing just to build even when the land is free. So this gives a little bit more flexibility.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Tim, am I cosponsor on that?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Tim?

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Me, too.

**Parks & Recreation:**

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***IR 1298-10 - Adopting Local Law No. -2010, A Local Law to change the composition of the Vanderbilt Museum Board of Trustees (Presiding Officer Lindsay).*** I'm going to make a motion to table.

**LEG. COOPER:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1329-10 - Authorizing use of Cathedral Pines County Park by the Lupus Alliance of America for its Walk-Along-for-Lupus Fundraiser (County Executive).*

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator -- who was that, Nowick?

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Nowick.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor?

**LEG. MONTANO:**

No, Montano.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Montano, I'm sorry. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1330-10 - Authorizing use of Blydenburgh County Park by the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation for its Great Strides Walkathon (County Executive).*

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Kennedy. Anybody? I'll second it. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1344-10 - Authorizing a license agreement with the Town of Huntington to use certain space at Coindre Hall at West Neck Farm County Park, Huntington (County Executive).*

**LEG. COOPER:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Cooper. Do I have a second?

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

What the heck, I'll second it.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Viloría-Fisher. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1349-10 - Authorizing use of Smith Point County Park property in 2010 by the Mastics-Moriches-Shirley Community Library's Family Literacy Project (Browning).*

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Motion.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Eddington. All in favor? Opposed?  
Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1350-10 - Authorizing use of Smith Point County Park property by Mastic Beach Ambulance Company for "Help Us Save You Program" (Browning).*

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Browning, seconded by Legislator Eddington. All in favor? Opposed?  
Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**Public Safety:**

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

1228 we already have approved.

*1323-10 - Approving the appointment of John Carney as a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services Commission (County Executive).*

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Motion.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Motion.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I'll second it.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Motion by Legislator Barraga, seconded by Legislator Montano.  
All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1324-10 - Approving the appointment of John Bancroft as a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services Commission (County Executive).*

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Eddington.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1325-10 - Approving the reappointment of Anthony LaFerrera as a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services Commission (County Executive).*

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Motion.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator D'Amaro, seconded by Legislator Horsley.

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1326-10 - Approving the reappointment of Norman Reilly, Jr., as a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services Commission. (County Executive).*

**LEG. STERN:**

Cosponsor.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Kennedy, second by Legislator Eddington. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1327-10 - Approving the reappointment of Edward Tully, Jr., as a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services Commission. (County Executive).*

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Eddington, seconded by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***1328-10 - Approving the reappointment of Craig Zitek as a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services Commission (County Executive).***

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Seconded by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***1332-10 - Appropriating funds in connection with improvements to the Fire Training Center (CP 3405)(County Executive).***

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Kennedy, seconded by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

In the negative.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (Opposed: Legislator Barraga).

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

On the accompanying Bonding Resolution, ***1332A-10 - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$220,000 bonds to finance the cost of improvements to the Fire Training Center in Yaphank (CP3405.120 and .321), same motion,***

same second; roll call.

*(\*Roll Called by Mr. Laube - Clerk\*)*

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Yes.

**LEG. COOPER:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

No.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Yes.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***1343-10 - Appropriating funds in connection with updating microwave radios (CP 3233) (County Executive).*** Motion by Legislator Eddington.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Losquadro. Legislator Nowick, did you know that the microwave had a radio in it?

**LEG. NOWICK:**

I was just going to say, did you know they don't seem to have one over there?

***(\*Laughter\*)***

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Question.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

We have a motion and a second. Oh, question by Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes, what department does this serve, the microwave radios?  
Can someone explain that to me, please?

**LEG. NOWICK:**

It's got to be FRES.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Public Safety, do you remember the answer to this?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Could someone tell me a little bit about the updating of these microwave radios; where the work was done, when it was done, by whom it was done? And I'm catching people off guard and I realize that, but I had some concern, and I'll explain why as we unfold this tale.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

If I might, Mr. Presiding Officer? It's for the Police Department.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Right.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

And it was a request by the Police Department to update the microwave system so they can transfer fingerprints, voice data and other information throughout the County, in the precincts and the Riverhead County Center.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And where is this work being done and by whom is it being done; is there a contractor, is it being done in-house? How is this being approached?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I don't know if the contract has been awarded. I know this is --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I don't want to hold this up, so I'm going to ask for that information and then I'll share with you why I'm asking these questions.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Okay.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay, privately, and then maybe you can follow-up with that.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Sure.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. We have a motion and a second, Mr. Clerk, on this?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Yes, you do.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Opposed.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Same motion, same second on the accompanying Bond Resolution, ***1343A-10 - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$630,000 bonds to finance the cost of updating microwave radios (CP 3233.510)***; roll call.

***(\*Roll Called by Mr. Laube - Clerk\*)***

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Yes.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Yes:

**LEG. COOPER:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

No.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Yes.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***1305-10 - Authorizing transfer of surplus County computer systems and keyboards to RSVP (Kennedy).*** Legislator Kennedy, would you like to make this motion?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

As a matter of fact, yes, I very much would, Mr. Presiding Officer. And I would just like to say that RSVP has now moved approximately 200 computers to senior citizens and does an outstanding job with it. That's why I feel comfortable with sponsoring the resolutions each time they come up.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Thank you. I'll second it. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***1307-10 - To amend the required concentration of bio-diesel fuel to be used in the Suffolk County fleet (Losquadro).***

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Losquadro. I'll second that. All in favor?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Nobody wants me to explain?

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***1339-10 - Transferring Assessment Stabilization Reserve Funds to the Capital Fund, and appropriating funds for the improvements to the Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest Wastewater Treatment Plant (CP 8170) (County Executive).*** I'll make a motion. Do we have a second?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Seconded by Legislator Browning. What's the amount of money on this, does anybody --

**MS. VIZZINI:**

A hundred thousand.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

A hundred thousand, okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***1340-10 - Authorizing the execution of an agreement between the County and the New York State Department of Transportation for Federal and State Aid funding for the continuation of the HOV Bus Service on the Long Island Expressway for 2010 (County Executive).*** Do I have a motion? I'll make a motion. Do I have second?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Which number was this?

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Chair of our Public Works Committee, Mr. Schneiderman, Legislator Schneiderman, do you know what this means exactly?

**MR. NOLAN:**

You get \$775,000 from the Feds and State.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay.

**MR. NOLAN:**

No local match.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

I'm just told it's a grant of \$775,000 from the Feds and the State and no local match; no, right?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

That's correct.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Six twenty from the Feds and 155,000 from the State.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay, thank you. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1342-10 - Amending the 2010 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with energy conservation at various County facilities (CP 1664) (County Executive).*

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

I'll make a motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Losquadro, and I'll second it.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

This is first-instance funding. We'll be getting this back, right?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Correct.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Anybody else? No? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen -- eighteen, eighteen, sorry.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

On the accompanying Bond Resolution, *1342A-10 - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$732,900 bonds to finance the cost of energy conservation improvements at various County facilities (CP 1664.115 and .316)*, same motion, same second; roll call.

*(\*Roll Called by Mr. Laube - Clerk\*)*

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Yes.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. COOPER:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1353-10 - Amending the 2010 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with preparing a sewerage feasibility study for the business district of Center Moriches (CP 8191)(Romaine).*

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Motion.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Romaine, seconded by Legislator Browning. All in favor? Opposed?  
Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

On the accompanying Bond, *1353A-10 - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$150,000 bonds to finance a part of the cost of preparation of a sewerage feasibility study for the business district of Center Moriches (CP8191.110), same motion, same second; roll call.*

*(\*Roll Called by Mr. Laube - Clerk\*)*

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. COOPER:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Yes.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Yes.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1359-10 - Amending the 2010 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with CR 31, Old Riverhead Road and CR 104, Quogue-Riverhead Road, Intersection Improvements (CP 5572) (County Executive).*

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. Do we have a second?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

On the motion?

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

On the motion, Legislator Montano.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Thank you. The memo, the backup memo on the resolution says the money is being taken from the CP 5539, Wicks Road Corridor Study and Improvements. Could you -- anyone from Public Works or Gail, you want to tell me why we're using money for that?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I think this did come up in -- I think this came up in committee and I think that that project isn't ready to go, it's going to happen next year.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Well, that's what I'm asking. Do you know what the status is?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yeah, so the money's not needed this year. I think that's my recollection.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

That's correct. The money is not needed this year because the project is just not ready to go. That's the explanation.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It was a timing issue on that project.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

That's the explanation?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

That's the explanation, it's going to be included in the coming Capital Budget.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay. And then the next resolution also takes money from the same project, so I assume it's the same reason. And what I'm hearing is that we're going to use -- we're going to go with this project next year, not this year?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

That's correct.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. We have a motion and a second on 1359. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Opposed.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Abstention.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Same motion, same second on ***1359A-10 - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New***

*York, authorizing the issuance of \$1,600,000 bonds to finance the cost of intersection improvements on CR 31, Old Riverhead Road and CR 104, Quogue-Riverhead Road (CP 5572.310); roll call.*

*(\*Roll Called by Mr. Laube - Clerk\*)*

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes.

**LEG. COOPER:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

No.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Abstain.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Yes.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Yes.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen.

*(The following testimony was taken by Lucia Braaten - Court Reporter  
& transcribed by Kim Castiglione - Legislative Secretary)*

*1360, 1360A, Amending the 2010 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds for  
the Yaphank County Center Wastewater Treatment Plant (CP 8158).*

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Do I have a motion? Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Horsley.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

On the motion, Mr. Chair.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

On the motion, Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Do we have any explanation with this and does this have any connection to the proposed development project that's been put forward by the administration?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I spoke with Ben Wright and he said it has nothing to do -- I guess it's a State requirement. I guess Ben is going to respond. But there's no connection between that and Legacy Village is what I've been told.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

That's correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

This is just a routine upgrade, Ben, as we have for any our 23 waste treatment plants throughout the County?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

That's correct. Remove nitrogens and upgrade the facility.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, but will in the process of doing this equipment upgrade and an increase in the removal of nitrogen, is the capacity of the plant being expanded or will it remain at the same capacity?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I don't believe that this is a resolution to expand the plant for Legacy Village in any way.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I didn't say necessarily for Legacy Village, but -- so in other words, it is your understanding, you are representing at this point this is not an expansion of capacity. This is merely just an increase in order to go ahead and purify the effluent.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**  
Okay. Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**  
Okay. Questions answered? We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. MONTANO:**  
Abstain.

**MR. LAUBE:**  
Sixteen. (Abstention: Leg. Montano; Opposed: Legislator Barraga)

**P.O. LINDSAY:**  
On the accompanying bond resolution 1360A, same motion, same second.  
Roll call.

*(Roll called by Mr. Laube, Clerk)*

**LEG. BROWNING:**  
Yes.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**  
Yes.

**LEG. COOPER:**  
Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**  
Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**  
Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**  
Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**  
Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**  
No.

**LEG. CILMI:**  
Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**  
Abstain.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**  
Yes.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**  
Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Yes.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Turn the page to page 12, the last page. *1362-10 - Requesting legislative approval of a contract award for transit bus in-plant production line inspection (County Executive).*

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

I'll make a motion because I'd like an explanation.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Losquadro, I'll second it.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'll give it'll a try.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Go ahead, Chairman.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

The County is getting some 35 buses through the Federal stimulus package. So in August we're going to have basically a whole new fleet of County buses. Those buses - this is a required procedure that this inspection happens during this construction phase before we get it, so we have to do this. I guess they identified -- they had some kind of RFP and they identified a contractor to do this, checked the credentials. This is what the Commissioner represented was the best company and most qualified company to do it. This has to happen before we can get the buses, so this is procedural.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Did they give any indication as to why this was required? I mean, I seem to recall that there were a number of fire departments that were under some scrutiny for having people travel across the Country to take a look at a fire truck being built and, you know, it really wasn't necessary. So why are we required to go look at something while it's under construction? Do we have -- this is a Federal mandate?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Yes.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

That's brilliant.

**BEN ZWIRN:**

This is a Federal mandate. And there were 11 -- they distributed 11 proposals to 11 different companies, and only one responded, and that's why we're back. It's a sole source --

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Ben, can you give us an idea of how much the buses we're getting is worth under the grants and what it costs us to do this inspection?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

It's up to 85 transit buses.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Eighty-five buses?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Yeah, up to 85.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Eighty-five. It's gone up.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Ten thousand seven hundred dollars. Sounds like a good deal.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

We're getting 85 buses inspected for ten grand?

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Yeah.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It's pretty good.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Can I ask that for the record? Mr. Zwirn, we're going to have 85 buses inspected by an independent qualified inspector for the sum of \$10,000?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I don't have the number.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

That's what it says in the resolution. But in all due respect, Legislator Kennedy, they're brand new buses. I don't know why they have to be inspected in the first place.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I don't believe that 85.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yeah, but, you know, Mr. Chair, you'll recall when I think the MTA took delivery of about 311 electric subway cars that had cracked carriages and a variety of different things. I'm not opposed to independent inspection.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

But I don't know how somebody keeps the light on if they're inspecting 85 buses at a sum total of ten grand. I'm just curious as to what the commitment to the full extent of the exposure is. Does BRO know?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I still think it's 35 buses even though the resolution says 85.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Would it make you feel better if we paid more?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, you know, there's an old saying in life, Mr. Chair. You know, you get what you pay for.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Legislator Cooper, you want to jump in?

**LEG. COOPER:**

No, I just -- my understanding is that the inspection solely pertains to confirming that 60% of the buses are made in America and that the final production is made -- is done in the United States. I think that's the only purpose of this, to comply with FTA requirements. So that may be why it's done at minimal cost, because they're only confirming that they're doing the final production in the U.S.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

And spending ten grand? Anybody else? Legislator Montano.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Just curious, Ben. You said that the resolution says 11 RFP's were sent out; only one responded.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

That's correct.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Any indication why only one?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I don't have that information here, but that's why we're here.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

No, I understand that's why you're here. It's just that --

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I don't have any backup from Public Works as to why -- I'm sure they believed there would be more than one responder, but all we got was one.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

All right.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Is everybody halfway satisfied? We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1369-10 - Amending Resolution No. 1246-2009, a resolution making certain findings and determinations in relation to the increase and improvements of facilities for Sewer District No. 7 - Medford (CP 8129)(County Executive).* Motion by Legislator Eddington.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Losquadro. On the motion? Legislator Eddington.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Yeah. I just -- I was wondering if I could find out, is this to increase capacity for a project? Because my understanding was that that was maxed out.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Jay, do you know?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

1369.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

You're asking whether that Sewer District No. 7 is maxed out?

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

I think I had been told early on that it was. And it's increase -- I'm just wondering, is it increasing the capacity for a project that I'm not aware of, or is it just increasing the capacity for existing facilities?

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

It looks like Mr. Zwirn might have the answer.

**LEG. ZWIRN:**

Well, in the resolution it says increase and improvement of facilities.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Can we pass over it and I'll get back to you?

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Sure. *Veterans & Seniors:*

*IR 1219, A Local Law to increase the property tax exemption for Cold War Veterans.*

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Romaine, seconded by Legislator Cilmi. We're being asked is there a fiscal impact here from Budget Review?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Yes, there is.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Basically what the resolution does is it enhances the exemption for Cold War Veterans similar to what is available for other veterans. Based on our analysis, we were able to extrapolate that there's probably about 38,760 Cold War Veterans. This would bring their exemption closer to 12.2% of their assessed value. It raises the assessed value. The short of it is it's about a \$95 benefit to the Cold War Veteran, which would be spread across the rest of the tax base.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Niney-five dollars a year.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Correct.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

For all taxing jurisdictions?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

County. The County tax.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Let me just ask something that's -- we have exemptions for every other war veteran, am I correct? Legislator Romaine, do you know that?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I believe that's the case. The State -- the reason that we're capable of doing this is that the State legislation passed enabling legislation to allow Cold War Veterans to enjoy this increased property tax exemption, and obviously it was a local option. I'm presenting -- the Veterans Committee under our Chairman, Legislator Stern, considered this. We went through the financial impact with Gail at that time and I believe the committee voted unanimously of those who were present to approve this.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

And I'm not necessarily saying I'm opposed to it, I'm just trying to figure how it works. So it raises everybody else's tax rate, including the other veterans that we've already given an exemption to.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

No, it only deals with the Cold War Veterans.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

No, no, no. You missed my point. The World War II Vets, the Korean War Vets, Vietnam Vets are in the tax base, so in order to pay for this we're raising everybody else's tax rate, including them.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

That may be the case.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Is that the case, Ms. Vizzini?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Well, those veterans have the exemption that's coming to them, but all other taxpayers would --

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay, but would it affect their tax rate as well to do this?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I just would clarify for the Presiding Officer that this exemption already exists. All it's doing is raising the threshold level of the exemption.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

All right. And I realize this. I'm just trying to figure out who's going to pay for it.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I guess the same that pay for any other exemptions.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

No, I realize that. But the point that I'm trying to make is, and again, I'm not opposed to it, but it does raise the cost on the other veterans that already do have an exemption. Don't know that.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

If -- it's likely, but if those veterans are at the maximum exemption, they're not going to be paying any more. They have their exemption, so it could be on those who do not have an exemption of some sort.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

**Ways and Means:**

***1200, A Charter Law to establish Common Sense Policy for special meetings of the Legislature.*** And I'll make a motion.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Viloría-Fisher. Any other comments? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Can you please list me as a cosponsor.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen. Yes, sir.

**LEG. COOPER:**

Tim, me as well, please.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Cosponsor.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

***1222, A Local Law requiring advisory boards to conduct open meetings.***

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Motion.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Romaine, second by Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

On the motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

On the motion, Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

I just have a question regarding cost. Every time we adopt a resolution creating one of these boards we always have a line in there that it won't exceed a certain dollar amount that we, you know, we appropriate to that resolution. If this is going to change that cost does that impact any of those prior resolutions that we passed?

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Maybe to the sponsor, do you envision this raising the cost at all?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

No, I don't. And I want to state very clearly for the record the Legislative intent of this is simply that these meetings be open to the public and be publicly advertised so people can attend. I do not wish nor expect as part of the Legislative intent that any transcript or records be maintained, simply that these meetings be open to the public, because there were a number of meetings about different policy decisions that have occurred over the last few years where these committees have meet in camera, in secret. And I think it would be better that they be open to the public so that if there is an interest, you don't have to wait, ask questions at committees, because not every member of the public is a Legislator and doesn't have that opportunity. So this way they can attend these meetings open and transparent, so to speak.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Open is good, open is good.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Reforming Suffolk.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Legislator Montano.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

To Counsel. George, are these advisory boards -- were they already not -- I mean, weren't they already subject to Open Meetings Law? That was my understanding, or is there an ambiguity in their status?

**MR. NOLAN:**

There's really not an ambiguity. The Committee on Open Government has opined many times that advisory are not subject to Open Meetings Law requirements.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Not subject?

**MR. NOLAN:**

No.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

This would change it and make them open and transparent.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Reformed.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

George, but generally in practice aren't our Task Force's open? I know mine are.

**MR. NOLAN:**

I think in general they do -- I'm pretty sure that most of them do their work in open.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Right, okay.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Put me a cosponsor.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Will do.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1308, Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Alcides Amaya (SCTM No. 0400-148.00-02.00-060.000).* Do I have a motion?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator D'Amaro. Do I have a second? I'll second -- oh, Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Mr. Chairman, I apologize, but I just got some information confirmed on 1362. The cost of that contract is not \$10,000 on the travel for those buses as was previously stated. It's \$108,498 on the expense. And even though the wording of the language -- oh, okay. It's 78 buses, it's an 80-10-10 split, it's 10% County. But I just wanted to put that on the record even though it said up to 85 buses it's actually 78.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

So the \$10,000 that was previously stated is the County share?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

That's what it sounds like. I just wanted to put that on the record. I don't think there's any need to reconsider it, but I just wanted to put on the record the total cost for the contract was 108,498. It makes more sense now.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Thank you very much, Legislator Losquadro.

***IR 1321, Amending Chapter 865 (Wireless Communications) of the Suffolk County Code to make the County's Wireless Communications Policy and its administration consistent with the duties of the Department of Information and Technology.*** Do I have a motion? Motion by Legislator Gregory.

**LEG. COOPER:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Cooper. Explanation? Legislator D'Amaro, do you remember this?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

(Shook head no)

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

No?

**MR. NOLAN:**

It's really technical in nature in that wherever it says Division of Telecommunications in Chapter 865 now it says Department of IT, because apparently IT has picked up those responsibilities with wireless communications.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

It doesn't add any jobs?

**MR. NOLAN:**

No.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Can we go back to **1369**, resolution -- same page, 12, making -- ***A resolution making certain findings and determinations in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 7 - Medford.***

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I have the information now.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Do you have the information? Please, Legislator Schneiderman, enlighten us.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I do. It's not an expansion. It's to install equipment at Sewer District No. 7, Medford, that will reduce liquid sludge hauling by a minimum of 75%. Thickening of liquid sludge will reduce hauling,

and as a result, it will reduce tractor trailer traffic through district communities. Also includes odor reduction system and related systems.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Less sludge is a good thing. We have a motion -- do we have a motion and a second on 13 --

**MR. LAUBE:**

You do.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

And that finishes the 12 page agenda.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Can I just go back with a question? I'm sorry, Mr. Chair.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Didn't we skip something, Tim?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Yeah, 1358.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

I have a question about one we just passed.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. First of all, I'm being told that we didn't do 1358, but Legislator Viloría-Fisher would like the floor. Go ahead, Legislator.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Just very quickly on the one about IT, the wireless communication. It does say -- I thought I had seen something about hiring somebody, that they can hire a consultant to provide -- I'm just wondering how much money -- promulgation of rules -- no, no, no. Here it is. The Director of Communications in 856-6, assessment of property suitable. Director of Telecommunications is hereby authorized and directed to hire a consultant in accordance with applicable procurement laws. I'm just wondering how much money they're putting into hiring this consultant and -- okay, it looks like Ms. Bizzarro might have the answer to that.

**MS. BIZZARRO:**

Yes. Actually they're removing that provision in the bill because that was already done, so that's an obsolete provision. That's what Mr. Nolan meant, it's just really a clean up bill. That's done.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

It's been removed.

**MS. BIZZARRO:**

It's been removed correct. Yes, bracketed, and D was bracketed as well. The only remaining section is C under that 865-6.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Okay. I'm seeing the bracket now on my online. Okay. Thank you.

**MS. BIZZARRO:**

You're welcome.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. **1358**, I'm being reminded we didn't -- we skipped over it, *Amending Resolution No. 618-2007 Authorize the planning steps for acquisition of Suffolk County Multifaceted Land Preservation Program, Town of Brookhaven, Forge River watershed property*. Help me. Why did we skip over this?

**LEG. CILMI:**

I had a question.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay, but that has nothing to do with this resolution. This resolution that we -- the acquisition I believe was approved and there was 12 parcels that were not included -- okay. The 12 parcels were in the appraisal and approved in the appraisal. However, when the resolution was done, the 12 parcels were not included in the resolution.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

So we already included the funding, but didn't do a specific resolution.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Right, right. So there is no money changed.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

This isn't adding any money to anything. It is just amending the picture. We really shouldn't have skipped this and somebody went to answer your question. I sent one of my Aides.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. So do we have a motion on 1358?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Yes, you do.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

And a second?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Yes.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. In the manilla folder, we have two Procedural Motions, right? Three procedural -- four Procedural Motions. First is *Procedural Motion No. 6, To set a Public Hearing regarding the authorization for approval of a license for the Fire Island Water Taxi*. I'll make a motion. Second by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

It stands approved. *Procedural Motion No. 7, To set a Public Hearing regarding the authorization approval to alter the rates for the Island Water Taxi, LLC.* Motion by Legislator Barraga, I'll second that. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

And *Procedural Motion No. 9, Authorizing funding for communal support initiatives (Phase II).* And they're all listed there. I'll make a motion. Do I have a second?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

I'll second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

And *Procedural Motion No. 10, Approving partial settlement of MTBE Litigation with defendant Getty properties.*

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion by Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

I'll second it. It's for a nominal amount of money \$7,150, but we'll take it. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. And this is just being laid on the -- okay. All right. Let's go to the red folder, CNs. *1439, Accepting and appropriating \$74,959 in 100% grant funding from the New York State Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance, for the continuation of the intensive case services component of the Sanction Intervention Program in the Department of Social Services.*

I'll make a motion.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

*1506, Authorizing public hearings and a Legislative Office of Budget Review Analysis on a proposal to provide services at John J. Skilled Nursing Facility through an entity other than Suffolk County Government.*

I'm going to make a motion to table.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Eddington. And just -- yeah. We'll commit it to committee, but here's my rationale for the whole thing is, number one, I don't think that we need a resolution for our Budget Review Office to do an analysis of anything. And the second thing is I fully intend to support public hearings when we're ready. I don't think we're ready. I would like Budget Review's analysis of the deal before we have the public hearings. I would also like the appraisal of the facility that was done by the Executive branch analyzed in the same component.

And I also am introducing a resolution today to authorize a second appraisal for this facility. My rationale for that is simple, is we have two appraisals when we purchase a piece of property over \$5 million. We're looking to sell something that's worth in excess of 30 million, somewhere in that range, and I think it would behoove us to have a second appraisal.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Mr. Chair, on the motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I have just a question for Counsel that I think is relevant to this latest offer that's before us. And again, I guess it's a procedural question. I believe that during the RFP process there was an evaluation committee that was formed that was actually requested to work in confidentiality. Now that there is an offer presented to us, I believe the origins of this deal, the RFP process itself, who the actual bidders were and how that process originated is very relevant to where we're at now.

My understanding is is that there were two different offerings and in both cases there was surplus property that was contained in the offering when the solicitation went out. So my question really is to Counsel as to whether or not those documents are now available and is that process something that can be made public?

**MR. NOLAN:**

I don't think I can answer that question right now, Legislator Kennedy, I really don't. I don't know what type of agreements were signed, what were in the confidentiality agreements, so I'd have to learn a lot more before I could give you an answer on that.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

And I respect that, Counsel. As a matter of fact, we are in an area that's probably, you know, a not so common area of law. But nevertheless the outcome, I think, is important as each and every one of us does our due diligence on this and we look at what, in fact, is the actual nature of the offer that's purportedly before us, how that offer was solicited in the first instance, and what the representations were that were put out there, whether or not there was even capacity to offer what was intended to be offered based on surplus declarations. So I'll be eager to hear.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Okay. I'm just clarifying you are just talking about the person that has been selected or all the entities?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, I think, George, that, you know, when you contemplate the transaction or privatization of a major municipal asset, the process is certainly as important as the outcome. And I can understand, I think, the need to have some confidentiality for the committee to do its work, although it's ironic that we just adopted a resolution that has even our committees now be open to public participation. But nevertheless, you know, the sale of an asset is an important thing. And I think committee members have to be able to do some degree of scrutiny, some degree of evaluation. But now that the decisions have been made there really is no more reason to have any of that process not all be made available for any of us that need to look at it. So that's my question.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Well, could I just weigh in because I was on the RFP Committee and I agree with you, that I really don't think the need for secrecy exists anymore. But I'd like to hear what Counsel finds. You know, we were all -- the RFP Selection Committee was asked to keep everything confidential about the number of bidders and who was bidding and the prices and everything until a contract was secured. My understanding is a contract is secured now and I really don't see any reason why to keep that part of the process confidential. But I would welcome any scrutiny by our Counsel so that we don't make a mistake.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Absolutely, Mr. Chair, and I just think it goes to another point as to why we need to table this matter now, because all of us have a lot of due diligence to do. Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Mr. Zwirn, I see you floating around the mike. Would you like to say something?

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I don't think there's anything I could say that would be persuasive to this Legislative body except to --

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Don't underrate yourself, Mr. Zwirn. You are a very persuasive person.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I like to think so, but I have a feeling that --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motivational speaker perhaps.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

-- all the powers of persuasion that I have today are not going to pass this CN.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

It's a different Legislature.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Well, the faces look the same. At any rate, my only point is that we would like to at some point be able to get this as an up and down vote and move it forward. But I respect everything that I've heard today and the process can only go as fast as the Legislature wants to move and we respect that. We're available to answer any questions that we can, to individual Legislators, in groups, at committee, wherever. We think the process was fair and I think it will stand up to the test of any

questions that the Legislature has. And I say, look it's a controversial, it's an emotional issue, it has to be done right, everything has to be crossed and dotted, and we think it will be as time moves on, but it's something that I think we owe the taxpayers that we should look at it.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Very well said. So I have a motion to table. Do I have a second?

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Yes.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Oh, commit to committee. Commit to committee.

**MR. LAUBE:**

You need a second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Muratore.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Thank you.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

It would go to Health.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Health.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Health. Okay. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions to the tabling?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Would the Clerk please note my recusal on this?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Yes, sir. Seventeen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Late starters. Yellow packet. I'll make a motion to waive the rules and lay on the table the following late starters. 1491, to Economic Development, Education and Energy. Does anybody want me to read the titles?

*("No" said unanimously)*

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

1492 to Public Safety; 1493 to Public Works; 1494 to Public Works; 1495 to Public Works; 1496 to Public Works; 1497 to Public Works; 1498 to EPA; 1499 to Ways and Means; 1500 to Economic Development, Education and Energy and also set to Public Hearing for 5/11 at 2:30 P.M. at the Rose Caracappa Auditorium in Hauppauge. 1501 to Ways and Means; 1501 to Health and Human Services -- 1502 to Health and Human Services; 1503 to Ways and Means; 1504 to Ways and Means; 1505 to Ways and Means. Do we have 15 -- okay. 1507 to Ways and Means and set the Public Hearing for 5/11, 2:30, in the Hauppauge auditorium. 1508 to Public Safety; 1509, Public Safety and set a Public Hearing 5/11, 2:30 in Hauppauge. 1510, Public Safety and set a Public Hearing 5/11, 2:30 in Hauppauge. 1511, Public Works; and Procedural Motion No. 8 to Health and Human Services. Okay. I made the motion. Do I have a second?

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Second.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

And I'll be very happy to accept a motion --

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

To adjourn.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Motion to adjourn.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion to adjourn by Legislator Eddington, second by Legislator Romaine. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? We stand adjourned.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eighteen.

***(THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 4:04 P.M.)***

***{ } - Denotes Spelled Phonetically***