

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

FIRST DAY

January 3, 2012

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT

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

Minutes Taken By:

Lucia Braaten, Court Stenographer

Minutes Transcribed By:

Kim Castiglione, Legislative Secretary

*(*The meeting was called to order at 1:01 P.M. *)*

ACTING P.O. LINDSAY:

Could I have all Legislators to the horseshoe, please. Could everyone please find a seat, please. Okay. Mr. Clerk, are you ready to read -- call the roll, please.

(Roll called by Mr. Laube - Acting Clerk)

MR. LAUBE:

Good afternoon, Mr. Presiding Officer -- Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Present.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Present.

LEG. BROWNING:

Here.

LEG. MURATORE:

Here.

LEG. HAHN:

Present.

LEG. ANKER:

Here.

LEG. CALARCO:

Here.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Here.

LEG. MONTANO:

Here.

LEG. CILMI:

Here.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Here.

LEG. KENNEDY:

(Not Present)

LEG. NOWICK:

Here.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Here.

LEG. GREGORY:

Here.

LEG. STERN:

Here.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Here.

LEG. SPENCER:

Here.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen.

ACTING P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Could everyone rise for the presentation of our colors by the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 9486, Lake Ronkonkoma, New York. The Flag Bearer is Jerry Ferrara, U.S. Navy, served aboard the aircraft carrier U.S.S. Saratoga on station off the coast of Vietnam.

(Presentation of Colors)

You could remain standing for the salute to our flag by Michael Pascal, U.S. Army Vietnam Veteran, Past Suffolk County V.F.W. Commander and current New York State V.F.W. Junior Vice Commander, will lead the assembly of the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America. Michael.

(Salutation)

Thank you, Michael. And now for our national anthem.

(National Anthem)

Thank you, gentlemen. Now I'd like to introduce the Reverend Canon Edward A. Weisbauer, Jr., the Chief of Chaplains for the Suffolk County Police Department.

REVEREND WEISBAUER:

Thank you, Bill. Before we begin our prayer, let us remember all those great employees of Suffolk County who passed away this year. They shared work with us and we are here principally because of their help. For those who are of the Jewish persuasion, (Hebrew prayer cited by Reverend Weisbauer). For Christians, Almighty God, we beseech thee to behold this County and this Legislature, which is responsible to you for the work that you have given them. We ask you to bless them with your holy spirit, grant them wisdom in all things, charity, and willingness to follow only what is true and just, regardless of party affiliation. Grant this we pray through Christ our Lord. Amen.

"Amen" said in unison

ACTING P.O. LINDSAY:

Thank you, Father. If I could ask everybody to remain standing for a moment of silence for all the men and women, as we speak today, that are in harms way to protect our freedoms which we enjoy everyday.

(Moment of Silence)

Please be seated. Please retire the colors.

(Colors Retired)

I want to publicly thank Phil Alito from V.F.W. Post 9486 for arranging for our Color Guard today, as well as our presenter, the salute to the flag.

This is I guess my 10th or 11th organizational day and organizational meeting, and something that I've never experienced before in all those years, we are going to be addressed by our new County Executive, County Executive Steve Bellone.

(Applause and Standing Ovation)

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE:

Good morning, Mr. Presiding Officer, members of the Suffolk County Legislature. Thank you for the opportunity to address you this morning in this new year. I want to wish everyone a very Happy New Year, and it is an honor for me to be here speaking before the co-equal branch of government in Suffolk County. You have done work here that I have long admired from my position as Supervisor of the Town of Babylon for the last ten years, and I very much am looking forward to the opportunity for us to work together. Now, I have heard that in the past there has been some friction between the Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch in this County.

(Laughter)

It is my intention, while I understand that we will not agree on every issue, it is my intention that I will, my staff will, and the Executive Branch of government will be working hand in hand in a cooperative fashion with this Legislature. We are --

(Applause)

As I've often said to my team in Babylon, we are in this together. And the problems we face and the challenges we face can only be overcome and solved by us working together.

I talked about two things in my inaugural address just a few days ago, two important points. The first is that we may, in fact, be facing the greatest fiscal crisis that our County has ever seen, and we will undertake in the coming weeks to understand fully the depth of the crisis that we face.

The other point I made following up on that is that we have to do more with less, and the reason for that is that the alternative is that we will do less with less. And as you all know very well, we can't afford to do that. The services that we provide, whether they be public safety or public health, or in our social safety net, are critical to our residents. But we will work together to make sure that we are delivering those services as cost effectively as possible.

That's why I am very happy and grateful that this Legislature, our Presiding Officer, and members of the Legislature, and I'm happy to announce today that we will be forming a Government Operations Task Force, a bipartisan group of Legislators that will work together with my office, the Comptroller's

Office, the Treasurer's Office, the Legislative Budget Review Office, the other areas of government that are so critical so that we can understand exactly what the current state of operations of Suffolk County government is today. If we are going to become more efficient, if we're going to, in an era of shrinking revenues, rising expenses, continue to effectively deliver these services, then we have to figure out what we're starting with, what our starting point is.

And this group, which I've appointed Eric Kopp, who will be staying on and has served many administrations in the past, will be working with this bipartisan group of Legislators, as well as Stony Brook University and the school -- the Graduate School of Public Policy. Dr. Peter Salins, along with Dr. Koppelman, will be working with this Task Force as we seek to determine the state of operations in our government today. And I want to thank, of course, our Presiding Officer, but Legislator Romaine, Legislator Nowick, Legislator Gregory and Legislator Hahn, who will be working together with my office on this committee.

Finally, I'll just say this. I alluded to this earlier. We are all in this together, every single one of us, whether in the Executive Branch or the Legislative Branch, cares about this County, cares about the people who work here, and the people that we serve. And while we will not always agree on every issue, I don't always agree with my wife on every issue, that's for certain, while we won't always agree on every issue, I give you my commitment that from me you will have somebody who will work with you, provide you with the information -- make sure that the Executive Branch is providing you with the information you need to do your role as a Legislative body, to provide oversight and to make law, that we will work together to meet our challenges.

And so once again, I thank you for the opportunity to address you on this important day. I congratulate all of you for assuming the oath of office once again and representing your constituents. And I look forward in this new year to be working together. Thank you very much.

(Applause and Standing Ovation)

ACTING P.O. LINDSAY:

Mr. County Executive, I just want to thank you for coming here today, which is a first, and the message that you delivered is much appreciated.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE:

Thank you.

ACTING P.O. LINDSAY:

This is indeed a day of firsts for this Legislature. We have another honored guest that just walked in and it's a first, I think, for this body. It's our senior U.S. Senator from the State of New York, Charles Schumer.

(Applause and Standing Ovation)

SENATOR SCHUMER:

Well, thank you. And it is great to be here. I see the Suffolk County Legislature is ahead of most Legislators -- Legislatures on everything, including this little device. You have to keep your finger down while talking. Now, if we had that in the U.S. Senate we'd be cutting the amount of time people speak by half, so we should adopt that innovation.

Anyway, it is great to be here. First I want to thank my friend and colleague, who's off to a great start as County Executive, Steve Bellone. I was at his inaugural address which was really fabulous and I pledge to him any way I can help the County I will, and I pledge the same to all of you. It's really great to be here. I love coming to these installations because they are so important for what

we stand for as a country, and I thank Bill for allowing me to say a few -- I thank our Presiding Officer William J. Lindsay for allowing me to say a few words.

The first thing I'd say is this: Suffolk County represents middle class America. There's no place probably that does it more or better. Middle class is a diverse group and you have everybody, every kind of middle class in Suffolk County. And there's no -- it's no secret that over the last decade the middle class has struggled in ways they never have before. In fact, one statistic that sticks with me is that middle class incomes have declined in this decade for the first time since World War II. So the average family living in your district is probably making less money and has less buying power than they did ten years ago. That cannot continue.

In America, we believe in the American dream. The American dream says if you work hard you're going to be doing better ten years from now than you are doing today, and if you work hard your kids will certainly do better than you. And if we can no longer have that dream shine brightly it's a different country.

And so I think one of the things that I'll be focusing on in Washington, and have been, and I know you will be, is jobs, the economy and the middle class. And there are things that can be done at all levels to do that. And I will pledge to work with you on some that involve both the Federal and local County partnership. One, of course, is using our great research institutions to create new companies and to create new jobs. We've been able to start doing this, and we've gotten Federal money, we've gotten State money, we've gotten very generous private donations, so that places like Brookhaven, places like Stony Brook, places like North Shore, Cold Spring, which is right on the County border so it counts, can take the research that they have done, which is beautiful research, but in a certain sense turn that research into gold, which are jobs. And Accelerate Long Island is an imaginative new program to do that that will need your help and my help, and I hope we can work on those things together.

A second thing we want to do, we want to see our young middle class people stay here. They want to stay here. They know what a great life it is, but it's hard for them to afford it, and for those who are a little younger, the life-style is not exactly what they'd want, because they're not ready to settle down and have a family and a three bedroom house with a backyard and barbecue every Sunday, so -- without helicopters flying overhead, Romaine, wherever you are. Over there. We passed our bill in the Senate, get your House members to pass it. It will prevent -- it will pass a law that limits helicopters and make them fly over the water. It's passed the Senate.

LEG. ROMAINE:

We'll work on that.

SENATOR SCHUMER:

Good, good. Anyway, so these younger people would like to be in downtown regions, and revitalizing our downtowns is really vital. The plans for Ronkonkoma, for instance, which I've worked on with some of you, are exciting, and bringing back a place like Bay Shore is exciting. So these -- this is secondary.

And third, we've always depended on transportation here, making sure the that 110 hub becomes a mass transit hub. It will really help us bring jobs and make the commute easier. One of the things I'll be working on, and this will mainly be Federal, but could use some State help, is getting that extra rail line out to Ronkonkoma to make the commute easier.

So these are things that we can all work together on in a bipartisan way, and this Legislature has a history of working in a bipartisan way, under Steve Bellone's leadership to make things happen so that the middle class dream, so important in Suffolk County, can stay alive, and I pledge that to

you.

I'd like to just congratulate the three newly -- I congratulate all of you, and there's so many of you they made a list for me of all of things that we've worked on. Kennedy on Smithtown Main Street and Montano on getting the FBI to help deal with gangs, Romaine on helicopters, Stern on BPA bans, Kate Browning on Mastic/Shirley sewers for sober homes, DuWayne Gregory on Wyandanch sewers. So I try to work with all of you on different issues, and I pledge the same to our three newly elected Legislators.

First, from the Fifth District is someone I was at her wedding. I was not the groom.

(Laughter)

I don't want anybody to think something's going on here, but I was a happy and proud guest at one of our great wineries out on the North Fork as the sun set on a beautiful Saturday evening. Her husband, Chris Hahn, had worked for me long and hard for many years, and Kara, we knew, was the real strength of the family, still is. And, Kara, you will do a great, great job. You've been so active in the community and congratulations to you.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you.

SENATOR SCHUMER:

I want to congratulate Rob Calarco, and say goodbye to Jack Eddington, my friend. But we know that Jack's dedication to his community will stay because Rob was the Chief of Staff, as many of you know, to Jack. He comes from Upstate, from Auburn, very close to the hometown of Tom Coughlin, our great Giant coach, who I was at when they dedicated the Waterloo High School field to him, I was there. And one of the things I appreciated about him, and you as Long Islanders you can appreciate it, his eight brothers and sisters are still in the Waterloo area, which is very nice. Anyway, Auburn's nearby and it's a great community. His family has had a record of public service there, and Rob has had a record of public service here. And I know that record will continue. And so thank you, Rob.

And finally, Doc Spencer. Where is Doc? Right here from that -- the place where I used to get lost, you know, Lloyd's Neck and places like that. I once did a fundraiser for your predecessor and I didn't get there because they didn't have any -- you know, I'm a city kid, I'm from Brooklyn. So they didn't have any streetlights on the signs and I was driving myself, I was a Congressman, so I had to stop at each corner, turn the lights to the sign, see if I was -- anyway, I never got there. I'm sure under your leadership, Doc, every street sign will be well lit, and permanently illuminated. Anyway, to have someone of your credentials, a medical doctor, somebody who has cared about different aspects of not only medicine and health care, but keeping our young people on Long Island, and with so many of those great institutions. I look forward to working with you.

So congratulations to everyone here, but particularly to our newly elected Legislators. As your colleagues will tell you it's a very fulfilling job despite all the broken backs and all the criticisms. I wake up Monday morning and I love going to work and I pray you have the same joy in this new job.

And one more thing, and I appreciate your indulgence, Mr. Presiding Officer. These installations are truly important. Of course, they're joys to our Legislators and their families, but it's a symbol of greatness in this country, because when you think about it, we are the only country that for this period has transferred power peacefully. You just pick up any newspaper any day and there's either power being passed at the point of a gun or riots on the streets to determine who's going to be the

ruler, but we don't do that here.

One of the great things to just witness and we all do, is on that cool November evening, as voters of all different backgrounds, philosophies, ages line-up at the polling place. Now, they may be back home from work, you know, just get off the railroad, want to get home to put dinner on the table, but they know they have their civic duty and they line-up and they quietly wait their turn and they go into the polling place and they do their duty. And that night when the results are announced we all abide by it, no matter who we worked for, who we voted for and what our own political philosophy is. It's a beautiful and wonderful thing. It has gone on in this county, in this Legislature, for a long time in a way that makes this Legislature one of the best, not just in our state, but in the country in terms of it's thinking and innovation and ability to work across party lines to get things done.

And so let me say in conclusion, congratulations and God bless all our Legislators, God bless this body, and God bless the United States of America. Thank you.

(Applause and Standing Ovation)

ACTING P.O. LINDSAY:

Thank you, Senator Schumer. You're truly amazing and your staff is pretty amazing, too. And now for the moment that we worked so hard all of last year for, and that's to take our oath of office as Suffolk County Legislators. And it's going to be in two steps. First, we'll all rise together and the oath will be administered by Suffolk County's District Administrative Judge, Judge Randy Hinrichs is with us today.

(Applause)

Immediately following that, our County Clerk, Judith Pascale, is here and she will call you up one at a time, right, Judy?

MS. PASCALE:

Yes.

ACTING P.O. LINDSAY:

To, again, administer the oath of office and to sign the official book there to make you totally legal. So with that, if we could all rise and Judge Hinrichs will swear us in.

JUDGE HINRICHS:

First of all, I would just wish all of you congratulations and thank all of you very much for your commitment to public service. It's greatly appreciated. And if you could all please raise your right hand, please.

(LEGISLATORS WERE SWORN IN BY JUDGE HINRICHS)

JUDGE HINRICHS:

Congratulations.

(Applause and Standing Ovation)

ACTING P.O. LINDSAY:

And to facilitate this, our Clerk, Judith Pascale, is going to again administrate the oath instead of doing it individually, and then you'll all individually have to go and sign the book. And as you go up to sign the book, if you have any family in the audience and you'd like a photo with your family, that

would be the appropriate time to do it.

MS. PASCALE:

Okay. We're going to do this one more time.

(Oath of Office Administered to Legislators by Suffolk County Clerk Judith Pascale and Signing of Official Record)

MS. PASCALE:

Congratulations.

(Applause)

ACTING P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Could everyone, as soon as Doc Spencer's done taking photos, please take your seats, could everybody please be seated. Could everyone in the audience please find a seat? Thank you.

Could all Legislators return to the horseshoe and everybody in the audience please find a seat.

Okay. Getting back to the order of our business today, the first order of business is the election of Presiding Officer. The floor is open for nominations. I recognize Legislator D'Amaro for the purpose of making a nomination.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you, Legislator Lindsay. I appreciate that very much. And good afternoon to everyone. Today it's my distinct honor and pleasure to renominate Bill Lindsay for the position of Presiding Officer.

(Applause)

Now, it's an especially -- it's especially an honor for me because Legislator Lindsay has been the Presiding Officer for my entire six year tenure, and like many of us here today, I've seen him in just about every situation imaginable while sitting in that Presiding Officer's Chair, and he's never fallen short. I think everyone would agree with me on that. Whether or not he was in a stressful or a difficult situation, our Presiding Officer has always handled this body with skill, and was always determined to be more than fair and accommodating to everyone who may have been involved. This in and of itself shows that Legislator Lindsay is more than up to the task of leading this Legislature. But there are many other reasons why I'm renominating Bill today. And once you focus on them, I think all of you will agree again that it's easy to stand behind this man as you come to appreciate, like I do, that he has all of the qualities needed to be an effective Presiding Officer.

No one can question Bill's outstanding leadership ability, his intelligence, his deep respect for his colleagues and his compassion. He's a person of very high integrity, and we all know that Bill's word, once given, can be relied upon without question. But beyond this, and I know this is important to him, Legislator Lindsay, our Presiding Officer, safeguards this Legislature as an institution. He's a fierce protector of our reputation, and he always insists that we maintain the highest degree of decorum here at the horseshoe. He recognizes that the sum of this body taken together as an institution of the people of Suffolk County is more important than any one of its members, and he strives to be the leader of us all, irrespective of your party enrollment, irrespective of your position on any particular issue.

And most importantly, Bill always insists that this Legislature keep and maintain its intended place as a co-equal branch of County government.

But I think the most compelling reason to re-elect Bill is because at the end of his six years of leadership so far, this Legislature still passes the one and only test that matters to it as an

institution, and that is the test of maintaining the public trust. The public believes in this Legislature and what we do here. The people have come to rely upon this body to represent their voices in government, even when they may feel that no one else will listen. In short, the people, the public, trust this body, and I suggest to you that we have maintained that trust as a Legislature and maintained our credibility in the face of some very difficult and tough decisions in recent days as a direct result of our Presiding Officer's leadership.

Let me sum it up this way. Bill Lindsay has proven himself as a successful leader of this body and he deserves to be re-elected here today; it's just that simple. He always makes us proud to call him Presiding Officer, and his concern for us as Legislators and this body transcends his own personal or political interests, as does his concern for the people of Suffolk County.

So to my colleagues, please join me here today in re-electing Bill Lindsay as our Presiding Officer, thereby giving this body the leadership it needs and to which we've grown accustomed. With your support for Bill not only will you be doing the right by this Legislature, but you will also be helping to make history. If re-elected today, and I'm confident that he will be, Bill Lindsay will become the longest serving Presiding Officer in the history of Suffolk County. That in and of itself is a ringing confirmation of his leadership and speaks volumes with respect to his abilities.

Accordingly, it is my pleasure and privilege to re-nominate Bill Lindsay for the position of Presiding Officer of the Suffolk County Legislature. Thank you.

(Applause)

ACTING P.O. LINDSAY:

Thank you very much for those kind words, Legislator D'Amaro. For the purpose of a second I'll recognize Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. First of all, I would like to incorporate by reference the comments made by Legislator D'Amaro with respect to the kind of leadership that has been provided by Mr. Lindsay, Legislator Lindsay, over the years. I've had the privilege and pleasure of working with him my eight years in the Legislature. This is going to be his seventh term as Presiding Officer, and I must say that in the time that he has served as Presiding Officer, I have found him to be dedicated, fair, straightforward, a man of integrity, someone whose word is his bond, and it's a privilege and an honor to be asked to second his nomination.

There were times during our eight years where I think it's known that sometimes we didn't agree, but there was always a tremendous amount of respect that I have for the Presiding Officer. And this budget process, this last year, was the most grueling, difficult process of my eight years, and I have to say that the Presiding Officer handled that with the utmost integrity, honesty, dedication. He went above and beyond because he has a commitment to the people of Suffolk County.

And with that, you know, I just want to wish him again, the best and his wife, Pat, and his family, because, Bill, this is -- as was said by Legislator D'Amaro, number one, it's unprecedented that you would be serving as Presiding Officer so long in a body that has a history of not being able to maintain the course, and you have maintained the course for all of us. I wish you the best and, again, I will repeat, it's been a privilege, honor to work with you. I second this nomination wholeheartedly and I look forward to serving with you as we continue to move forward on behalf of the people of Suffolk County.

ACTING P.O. LINDSAY:

Thank you, Legislator Montano.

(Applause)

Is there any other nominations? Legislator Nowick?

LEG. NOWICK:

It is my pleasure to second this nomination for Bill Lindsay to continue his role of leadership as Presiding Officer of the Suffolk County Legislature. Bill personifies his title and role as Presiding Officer. Webster's Dictionary defines preside as to preside over and protect. Bill's tireless efforts, loyalty to his constituency, unbelievable work ethics and bipartisanship speaks volumes of his problem solving skills and his ability to preside. You will see Bill at every committee meeting, and you will always see him sitting in his seat in the center of the horseshoe, never shirking his responsibilities. He is tasked with the job of helping to make sound decisions, while very carefully considering the thoughts and opinions of 17 fellow Legislators. Not an easy job, but a job he does so admirably.

Yes, we are all in different political parties. We are Republicans, Conservatives, Democrats, Independence Party members and Working Family members, but that doesn't really matter today. I so respect his leadership, his dedication and his integrity. Bill sets the bar quite high for the next generation of lawmakers. I support you, Bill, and in my heart I know this is the right thing to do.

(Applause)

ACTING P.O. LINDSAY:

Thank you, very much, Legislator Nowick. Today is kind of a historic day, and it kind of reminds me of a -- after those flowery nominating speeches and seconding speeches, our great President Truman once after a very flowery speech got to the podium and said, "I really appreciate that introduction." He said "My father would much appreciate that and my mother would believe it." So thank you very much for those kind words. Is there any other nominations? Is there any other nominations? Is there any other nominations? Nominations stand closed. Roll call, Mr. Clerk.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube - Acting Clerk)

LEG. ROMAINE:

Abstain.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Abstain.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

ACTING P.O. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Abstain.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Abstain.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

Thirteen.

(Applause)

P.O. LINDSAY:

Thank you very much. Thank you.

(Applause and Standing Ovation)

JUDGE HINRICHS:

I would just say first of all, congratulations and please raise your right hand.

*Oath of Office Administered to Presiding Officer William Lindsay by
the Honorable Judge Hinrichs and Signing of Official Record*

JUDGE HINRICHS:

Congratulations.

(Applause and Standing Ovation)

P.O. LINDSAY:

I want to publicly thank you all for the honor of bestowing on me the leadership of this Legislature again. To my colleagues of the 2012-2013 Suffolk County Legislature, my sincere congratulations. You all won a hard fought election, but now the reality of governing what is probably the worst economic climate in the history of this County sinks in. On most meeting days I usually arrive at the auditorium early to make sure everything is ready for the meeting. This morning I found myself at the photos of my 16 predecessors around the auditorium, people from both sides of the aisle who have left their imprint on this County. And their names are fixtures in this County, they're the history of this County. From our First Presiding Officer John V.N. Klein to Donald Blydenburgh, who I shared the honor of the longest tenure, and to my friend and departed colleague, Maxine Postal, whose advocacy for the poor and downtrodden still resonates in this auditorium.

What connects us all, the past and present, is a tradition that this is the people's Legislature. We come from all different walks of life. We literally have nothing in common. We're former labor leaders and police officers and bus drivers, a few lawyers, and this year we are joined by a medical doctor, Legislator William Spencer. It's comforting to me and to Legislator Barraga to have you in this chamber.

(Laughter)

LEG. BARRAGA:

Reemphasize that.

P.O. LINDSAY:

At this horseshoe is four different political parties, different races, nationalities, religious beliefs and political ideology. What binds us together is a burning desire to represent our constituents and to do the people's work. And without further ado, let us roll up our sleeves and work. Thank you.

(Applause)

We'll go to the packet now. Resolution number one we've completed. Oh, this is ***Resolution No. 1, Appointing the Deputy Presiding Officer of the County Legislature.*** Elect -- it says appointing but it's electing, it should be electing. Do I have any nominations for -- the resolution says Wayne Horsley, but would anybody like to officially nominate Legislator Horsley?

LEG. HORSLEY:

I'll leave that for you, Bill.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I'd be very happy to legislate -- to nominate Legislator Horsley for Deputy Presiding Officer.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. Is there any other nominations for Deputy Presiding Officer? Is there any other nominations for Deputy Presiding Officer? Is there any other nominations for Deputy Presiding Officer? Roll call.

LEG. MONTANO:

Mr. Speaker.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yes, Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

Can I make a couple of brief comments for the record?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Absolutely.

LEG. MONTANO:

Just let me say very briefly, I've said this publicly and I will reiterate today, but I will be brief. I do not support nor will I support this nomination. Maybe under different times I might have been willing to do it, but I've made my position clear. This is a large County. To have the leadership of this Legislature dominated, along with other positions from one sector of the County, is not something that I think my constituents and I are willing to abide by.

I will certainly abide by the decision of the Legislature, but -- and while this decision that I have taken may be unpopular with my Democratic colleagues, the fact remains that to have the County leader, the County Executive, and other than yourself, who is term limited and will not be here in two years, the Deputy P.O. is generally a position that leads to the election of Presiding Officer, assuming that the votes are there. But in the interim I don't feel that I can in good conscience support this decision that was made, and therefore I will be voting no. And this is no disrespect, nor is it a personal attack on my colleague, Legislator Horsley. It is just something that I feel that in good conscience I cannot abide by, and I don't think should stand. So I will be voting no.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Any other comments? If not, Mr. Clerk, would you, please call the roll?

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube - Acting Clerk)

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Abstain.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Abstain.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

Abstain.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Abstain.

LEG. NOWICK:

Abstain.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

Eleven.

P.O. LINDSAY:

You called the roll?

MR. LAUBE:

Yes, I did, 11.

P.O. LINDSAY:

You called the vote?

MR. LAUBE:

Yes, I did, 11.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Congratulations, Legislator Horsley is now our Deputy Presiding Officer.

(Applause and Standing Ovation)

Oath of Office Administered to Deputy Presiding Officer Wayne Horsley by the Honorable Judge Hinrichs and Signing of Official Record

JUDGE HINRICHS:

Congratulations.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you, Randy, appreciate it.

(Applause)

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Good afternoon. I've been instructed that I have been given three minutes and the one thing I have learned that a successful Deputy is to be a team player. And this Legislature is our team. And this team will get it right. As Theodore Roosevelt noted, aggressive fighting for the right is the greatest sport in the world. Last year when nominating Bill Lindsay for Presiding Officer, I referred to him as the lion of the Legislature. Remember that? A man whose is unparalleled in his ability to make this team work together, and yet allow us to remain as independent Legislators. So when Bill asked me to consider the Deputy, I was honored and I thank him for his support. Thank you, Bill. I thank those Legislators who supported me. And I will be there for you. And for those who called but couldn't, relax, I get it. We are now in this together.

This is a new era in Suffolk County, a new era led by the vision and horse sense of my friend, County Executive Steve Bellone. Let me just give you a Japanese proverb. "Vision without action is a daydream, action without vision is a nightmare." It is now time for the Legislature to create the action. It is now time for the Legislature and the Executive to become a team. As pointed out by John Kennedy, when written in Chinese, the words crisis is composed of two characters, two characters. One represents danger, and the other represents opportunity. Game on. And thank you for this opportunity.

(Applause)

P.O. LINDSAY:

Next on our agenda is the 2012 rules. There is seven changes. They're all really minor changes. I'm going to have the Counsel explain the process and explain the changes one by one.

MR. NOLAN:

As we do every year, there are -- we have proposed rule changes which we're going to vote on individually, and when we're done we're going to vote to adopt the rules as amended, incorporating the amendments that are approved when we vote. Just to explain the rule changes, the first rule change states -- talks about the election of a majority leader and minority leader. That rule change is really linked to the fifth rule change. This was necessary because we're removing language that provides that each caucus gets an extra aide. So we just want to retain the language about a majority conference leader and a minority leader, and we're moving that into Rule No. 1. The second proposed rule change is moving up the statements of village, town, State and Federal elected officials in our meeting agenda to immediately after public portion.

P.O. LINDSAY:

No, before.

MR. NOLAN:

Before public portion, forgive me. The third rule change just removes a reference to a committee of

the whole, which kind of has been in our rules for a long time but doesn't really belong because we don't use a committee of the whole, we have a separate committee system. The fourth rule change -- hold on one sec -- the third rule change and the fourth rule change are duplicates, so we'll only be voting on one of those. The fifth rule change is the one I spoke about earlier, but basically it's removing the language that talks about each caucus being entitled to an additional Legislative Aide. The sixth proposed rule change has to do with omnibus budget amendments. Presently if you want to do an omnibus budget amendment during the Operating Budget process you need five sponsors. This rule change would extend that to the Capital Budget process. And the seventh rule change is reducing the length of testimony during public hearings from five to three minutes.

And lastly, it's numbered seven here, but it should be eight. It amends Rule 14 by adding new Section 16 -- Subsection D, which expressly states that the Presiding Officer has the authority to establish special committees of the Legislature and to appoint their membership. So we're going to take these one at a time. Unfortunately, I have to apologize, there are a couple of typos but we'll be clear when we vote on them as we proceed

P.O. LINDSAY:

Is there any questions or comments about any of the changes? Legislator Barraga?

LEG. BARRAGA:

The first change, amend Rule 1 by adding the new section to read as follows. I have some real reservations about this particular change, because when you're a minority leader, in this particular case a Republican Minority Leader, or you're a majority leader, in the case of a Democratic Majority Leader, there are certain inherent, intrinsic additional responsibilities that goes with those two positions. You're dealing with a whole host of other challenges and problems that you would normally not deal with as an individual member of the Legislature. And your staff, your current staff as a Legislator is really comprised of a number of individuals that usually have their hands full with reference to constituent challenges and legislation and that type of thing. And it isn't as if in this particular case, you know, we're adding a staff person to each grouping. These people already exist, and all we're saying is that I think you should just leave it the way it is. And we've talked about in the past making sure that the Legislature is a co-equal level of government with the Executive Branch. I think in this particular case it weakens the majority leader and it weakens the minority leader, because you're taking away something that they have had in the past that they actually really need. This isn't so much a want, it's a real need.

And the other issue, which I think is complimentary to keeping both of these positions, is that we have a new County Executive, and if you've been following his thought process and his background and experience, he's an individual who's really involved in what they would commonly call performance based budgeting and management. That isn't just some graduate level terminology. It is a very involved process that often will, in fact, if it's ever implemented right across the board, it would dramatically change the way Suffolk County operates. I mean, the communities that have gone through performance based budgeting have seen overall I think dramatic improvements, and I think he likes to talk about that concept as it appears and in terms of his own experience in the Town of Babylon. But often with this concept you have to have people in your office, especially for a minority leader or majority leader, or even P.O., who understand what this concept is all about. It's all predicated on results. It's results oriented and putting in place those systemic and analytical procedures to measure performance as you move along.

So, for example, communities that go down with performance based budgeting and management, they often have like the equivalent of a general plan, and that general plan may well necessitate looking at Suffolk County and the way we'd like to see this County 20 years from now. And it would cover areas that we have fundamental responsibilities for, like transportation and public works and the environment and general economics. And from that you develop a ten year financial plan, of

which the first two years would be your normal budget to make a determination in your best estimates as to whether or not you can either continue to cover your expenses that you incur now four, five, six, eight, and ten years from now.

Every manager under this kind of proposal is held accountable. It is not so much as we have had in the past just appropriating dollars in an area of Social Services or health or transportation. It's taking a look at results. It's saying the following to a commissioner or a manager, we agree and we expect you to perform certain things by a twelve-month period, and you will be measured accordingly through analytical means that were made available to you. You will be evaluated accordingly and your salary increase or decrease will be based on those results. It's all results oriented. And those communities that have gone to performance based management and budgeting, those managers even sign contracts with their employers that at the end of the 12 months they do a self evaluation and their superiors evaluate them to determine not so much how the money was spent, but they talk in terms of units and hours and tasks that have to be performed, something which most of us in this room are completely unfamiliar with. But that's what performance based budgeting and management is all about.

And as this County Executive moves into that area, and he will, it's extremely important for the Presiding Officer, the minority leader and the majority leader have someone on staff who studies this and has expertise in it. If we don't make people available to really learn the concepts associated with this, and these concepts have been going on for 25 or 30 years, they really started in the Clinton Administration, we're going to find ourselves in the Legislature not quite understanding what's happening in the Executive Branch. But the end result here is to make Suffolk County much more effective than it currently is.

So I would again respectfully request that, you know, this change be deleted, be taken out. There is a real definitive need for each one of these two people, both the minority leader and the majority leader. I just think we're definitely moving in the wrong direction. I mean, I understand the economics, we can save a couple of salaries, but with what's coming down we need all the resources that we can possibly generate. These two leaders already have additional responsibilities and that's not going to change. I mean, you speak to the Presiding Officer. He knows what he has to do with the people he has, and he has fewer people today. But I don't think based on what this County Executive has in mind, and most of us I think don't really have a clear understanding about performance budgeting and management -- performance based budgeting and management. I think that it would really be a mistake to eliminate these two positions. Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Gregory.

LEG. GREGORY:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As the Majority Leader of the Majority Caucus, I would normally agree with my colleague's thoughts, but I think, as everyone understands and fully -- has full knowledge of, we are in difficult financial straits, and during such financial and fiscal -- fiscally difficult times it's important that we have leadership, strong leadership, and I think Bill Lindsay has stepped up. He had to reduce his staff. He set the example, he set the tone, and I think as the majority leader and the minority conference leader I think it's important that we step in line and follow that example. You know, my staff is going to be -- have an additional burden, but I am fully confident that we can take on that additional burden and move forward and be able to accomplish the task of our respective responsibilities. So I support this rule change.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Having done the function for the last year, I will say that there is absolutely no doubt that the comments that Legislator Barraga puts forward are very cogent and very relevant. And I'll also go one step further, because I did participate in the Budget Working Group, and the elimination of these positions was something that was part of a broader effort to try to go ahead and address the budget issues. But the notion that this is balanced or that there is an equal reduction in my opinion is a fallacy. Co-equal branches of government, yes, are something that's critical and we've all strived for that, actually from the day that I took office in November of 2004 it seems that that's been a quest over the last eight years. But there's always been a calumny amongst us, too. There's a majority, there's a minority, but every one of us has the opportunity to speak forward and to debate and hash out any issue. And any group, in this case the minority, needs the resources to be able to do that, and to do that vigorously.

So I will likewise oppose this reduction, as I will some of the other items in the rule, and I think in an effort to point towards savings in essence what we may be sacrificing is effective governance. So I think at the very least I'd make a motion to table the rules, at least until we could look at what the actual savings are going to be.

P.O. LINDSAY:

In all due respect, Legislator Kennedy, I think this is our organizational meeting and we have to adopt some rules. You certainly can vote against that rule, but I don't really think a tabling motion would be appropriate in this particular case.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, let me then ask, Mr. Chair, what does Counsel say?

MR. NOLAN:

We have to adopt our rules. We should vote on the amendments up or down and then we should vote on the rules as amended up or down. That's all we've done every year. We go through them individually, the proposed changes --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, but this is not a question of what we've done every year, George. This goes more to a question of order. I'm asking you now from an actual procedural perspective is it valid for this body to entertain a motion to table.

MR. NOLAN:

I would say no.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Based on what?

MR. NOLAN:

Based on the fact we have to adopt our rules today. The rules today. We need to do -- if you want -- afterwards, you know, if you want to propose amendments during the year that's fine, but we need to work through these amendments and when we're done, we need to adopt our rules.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, what if we were then -- how about if I was to move that we strike this first motion from the modifications to the rules?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Just vote against it. If you don't get enough -- you know, if you don't get enough votes for this rule

change, it's struck.

LEG. MONTANO:

May I jump in here?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Go ahead, Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

Let me just jump in from a procedural perspective. Legislator Kennedy brings up a good point in my mind. We currently don't even have rules, because we haven't voted on any rules. So we're sort of in legal limbo. What I would maybe suggest then is to vote on the rules as they were last year, so that we have a set of rules to guide us by, and then vote on the amendments individually to change those rules. I think that might be a cleaner process than to simply go through changes of rules that haven't even been adopted.

So, you know, lawyer to lawyer, I think you bring up a good point there, because this is, as I said, we're in legal limbo. Maybe we can get out of it by adopting last year's rules and then begin to change them as we see fit with these proposed changes. Counsel, do you have any opinion on that?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Just my opinion as the Chair, Legislator Montano, is the 2011 rules stand until we adopt the 2012.

LEG. MONTANO:

If -- that's fine, then we're dealing under the 2012 rules -- I mean, 2011 rules. Is that where we're at?

P.O. LINDSAY:

We're talking about changes and then we're going to vote on 2012 in its entirety. We're going to go through amendment by amendment.

LEG. MONTANO:

So at this point we are working under the prior rules, is that what we're saying?

P.O. LINDSAY:

We have to have some rule of order until we adopt the 2012 rules.

LEG. MONTANO:

I could live with that. Counsel?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Do you disagree?

MR. NOLAN:

This is -- right now we have no rules. We're adopting our rules. So we -- what we've done for the last six organizational meetings is we used the prior rules from the year before as the template which we work off of. There are proposed amendments to that document. We have done this repeatedly. We vote on the proposed amendments, and when we're done we vote to adopt the rules as amended. If the Legislature wants to change the procedure and vote and say that the 2011 rules are the ones we're going to adopt, that's up to the body, and then we can vote amendments, it doesn't matter. But I think we're going to get to the same place in either case. I'm just telling you that the way we've done it for five or six years is the way I've just described and

I don't remember any complaint about it.

LEG. MONTANO:

Whatever your pleasure.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Anybody else? I just want to comment, and it's not that I disagree with the content of both Legislator Barraga's or Kennedy's comments. You know, before I was the Presiding Officer, I was the minority leader, so I've always been in the leadership role, and you certainly can use all the help you can get. The fact of the matter is, and I'll say it again, we're broke, we have no money. You know, when we put together the budget we tried to do it in a fair and sensible way. I think we cut something like 12 positions from the Executive staff, and we cut five positions from the Presiding Officer's staff, which includes, I consider it my staff but it's actually the majority and minority caucus leaders. And, you know, I wish we had the luxury of it. I'm just very reticent on going back and modifying the budget we approved. It was a tough, tough process that we struggled over long and hard. And this was just one of God knows how many decisions that none of us wanted to make, but we made them. I think it behooves us not to go back on those decisions. Nobody else? Call the roll. Roll call.

MR. LAUBE:

I don't have a motion and a second for this.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah, I'll make a motion on the first rule change.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Second by Legislator Horsley.

(Roll called by Mr. Laube - Acting Clerk)

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yes.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

No.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. NOWICK:

No.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

Thirteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. On proposed rule change number two, it's amending Rule 2A, to add a new Subsection 6 to read as follows. "Statements and presentations of village, town, State and Federal elected officials, delete the language regarding these presentations from the current Subsection 7 and renumber following the subsections accordingly." And what this is all about, the rules currently read that elected officials will have an opportunity to make presentations before us after the public portion. It isn't how we've operated. We've always given a visiting public official the courtesy of going on first because of their busy schedule, and this would just reflect the practice to the rule.

LEG. MONTANO:

I'll make a motion.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Motion by Legislator Montano.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Second by Legislator D'Amaro. Do we do all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And three, amend Rule 3A by deletion of subsection relating to the committee of the whole, renumber following subsections accordingly. It's just a term that's been in our rules forever that as long as I've been here I've never known exercised, the committee of the whole.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Mr. Chair.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yes, Legislator Kennedy

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yeah. Can I get Counsel to explain that one? My understanding with committee of the whole was that we can actually at a General Meeting act as whatever the particular committee was that had jurisdiction over a particular resolution, pass it so that it is in front of us, and enact as the general body. Is that the --

MR. NOLAN:

That's the general idea of a committee of the whole, is that the entire body works as a committee. But, as you know, we have a very strong and elaborate committee system. We have other rules that talk about that, you know, bills cannot -- before the full body unless it's discharged by the committee or by a petition or a majority vote of the committee. In my experience we've never used a committee of the whole. So at this point it's a vestige that, at least in the opinion of the Presiding Officer and myself, can go. But, again, that's up to the group. I don't know how we would work a committee of the whole exactly considering our committee system.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, you bring up an important point about discharge, and I guess we will get to that further on. But if the committee of the whole piece is eliminated, does that in any way impact our current discharge procedure or a consideration to return back to the authority we once had, which was discharge from the floor.

MR. NOLAN:

No, not at all.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay, fine. Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

The other thing that I'd like to point out, Legislator Kennedy, is the current committee system, the way we have it, really assures that the minority in this body has ample say and ability to get bills to the floor, and if you go to a committee of the whole you are really giving an awful lot more power to the majority, in my opinion. Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you. I just did a little quick research here. This was a device used by the United States Senate. It was a parliamentary device for 197 years from the first Congress and the Senate stopped using it in 1986. And the standard code of parliamentary procedure rejects both the committee of the whole and quasi committee of the whole procedures as being outdated. So I think you're right on, it's just something that's antiquated.

MR. LITTELL:

Antiquated.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Antiquated, thank you. It's just -- it's old, exactly. I say let's just vote, get rid of it.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Do we have motions yet on this?

MR. LAUBE:

No.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I'll make a motion.

LEG. MONTANO:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Four is a duplicate, so you could ignore it. Five, amend Rule 4E to include the following language. "The political party with the largest number of elected members of the County Legislature choose a majority conference leader, and the political party with the second largest number of elected members of the County Legislature should choose a minority conference leader, and each conference leader shall be entitled to one additional Legislative Aide position to be appointed by the conference leader." This is a duplicate of 1? It's not?

MR. NOLAN:

No, it's not.

P.O. LINDSAY:

It addresses the same issue.

MR. NOLAN:

We wanted to retain a majority and minority leader, that language in our rules, so I moved that into the organization part, Rule 1, but we're also deleting this language having to do with the additional aide positions. So it's not a duplicate.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Any comments?

LEG. NOWICK:

I just have a question.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yes, Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:

George, the majority leader and the minority leader, do the rules specify anywhere that they're selected once in the beginning of the year, or how does that work? Or is that just up to the parties?

MR. NOLAN:

The language has always been, as it is now, which it doesn't set a timetable for picking those positions, but it does make an allowance for a majority conference leader and minority conference leader that each conference will choose their leader, but doesn't say when, which is probably a good thing.

LEG. NOWICK:

Once a leader is chosen, unless the political party itself decides to change the leader, is that how it works, you do this at the discretion of the party itself?

MR. NOLAN:

It's up to the caucuses. I think if a caucus picked a leader they probably could get rid of that same leader within the same year. But the rules have only just stated what I've read, that each party --

LEG. NOWICK:

So it's not a term.

MR. NOLAN:

It's not a term position, no.

LEG. NOWICK:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. I'll make a motion to approve number five.

LEG. GREGORY:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

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

LEG. ROMAINE:

Opposed.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Opposed.

MR. LAUBE:

Sixteen.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Opposed.

MR. LAUBE:

Can I see a show of hands for opposed?

MR. LAUBE:

Fifteen.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No. Yes. I'm not voting no.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Are you confused, Mr. Clerk?

MR. LAUBE:

I have 15 as of right now.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Call the roll.

(Roll called by Mr. Laube, Acting Clerk)

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

No.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. NOWICK:

No.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

Thirteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Six, amend Rule 7 to read as follows. "Omnibus budget amendments resolution which seeks to amend the proposed operation budget or proposed Capital Budget in an omnibus fashion must be sponsored by at least five Legislators before being considered by the full Legislature." Counsel?

MR. NOLAN:

Before we vote just should it should be proposed Operating Budget. Would the Clerk please note that. It should be operating as opposed to operation budget.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yes, Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I'd like to ask the Counsel, what is the rationale behind this? It seems to me that the current process is sufficient enough. You are making it, on the face of it, a lot more cumbersome and time consuming for the member to introduce this resolution.

MR. NOLAN:

The rationale is really -- it comes more from the Budget Review aspect, which is preparing omnibus budget amendments can be quite a lot of work and quite involved. And so the idea was before they would have to do that and set down that road, there would be at least a demonstration of some meaningful support for that budget amendment, that five Legislators were supportive. So we've always had that as an informal rule. A couple of years we amend our rules to set that forth as part

of our Operating Budget process, that if you wanted to do an omnibus resolution you had to go get four other sponsors. So by the same rationale we're extending it to the Capital Budget process because, again, an omnibus budget amendment can involve a lot of work, so we want to see --

LEG. BARRAGA:

It may involve a lot of work, but now it involves extra work on the part of the member to go out and get another five signatures.

MR. NOLAN:

You don't need to get signatures, but you need to get four people signed on to it who will say they will support it.

LEG. BARRAGA:

They're signing something. The point is the member has to take the time to go out and get four or five other signatures. I just don't -- you know, we set a precedent with this sort of thing a couple of years ago where, you know, you have resolutions in committee and they are basically tabled and then all of a sudden somebody came up with the idea that if you get ten signatures we can get this out of committee and on to the floor. And normally I don't think I've ever said no to a member who requires my signature just to bring it on the floor. I always indicate that if it does hit the floor I may vote the other way. But it's just a lot of extra work, and I don't think this is really needed. It puts an extra onus on members. At what point does it stop, you know? You need ten signatures to get something out of committee, you need five signatures on the Capital. Do we get to a point where I need five signatures to come in and take a seat in the chamber? I mean, it just doesn't make much sense.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I just would like to point out to Legislator Barraga, this does not take away the ability of the individual Legislator to sponsor a stand alone resolution to the Capital Budget.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Well, if you want to amend it, it does, doesn't it?

P.O. LINDSAY:

No, no, no. You can -- you can sponsor an individual Capital Budget.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I'm reading this, it says "A resolution which seeks to amend the proposed Operating Budget or proposed Capital Budget in an omnibus fashion must be sponsored by at least five Legislators."

P.O. LINDSAY:

In an omnibus fashion. This -- it doesn't restrict your ability to do stand alones on individual projects.

LEG. BARRAGA:

That doesn't satisfy my request. I just don't think we need the signatures.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

No, actually you just answered my question.

P.O. LINDSAY:
Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yeah. I'd just like to go and see if I can get a little bit more clarity to what in the Capital Budget would constitute omnibus. I mean, it's very clear in the Operating Budget. As a matter of fact, we elected doing a minority budget in this 2012 process. But Capital is -- how would we categorize it? How would we aggregate it? If we were looking at impacting equipment purchase across all departments or a resolution that limited vehicles, or what -- how do you take the one concept from one side and implement it on the other? They seem to be two non-analogous types of functions.

P.O. LINDSAY:
Okay. Ms. Vizzini.

MS. VIZZINI:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. If I may. Typically a -- well, we all know the extent of what an omnibus resolution is to adopt the Operating Budget.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Sure, absolutely.

MS. VIZZINI:

We've experienced that and, you know, very similar to Legislator Barraga's arguments in terms of the effort required for the sponsor to obtain supporters, there is considerable effort on the part of the Budget Review Office to complete an omnibus type of resolution to amend Operating and Capital.

The specific answer to your question is how does it apply to Capital. Let's imagine for a moment that the proposed Capital Program is simply a \$10 million, three year program that the new County Executive, although this is highly unlikely, proposes to do no more than \$10 million in capital projects. And advocates for economic development and infrastructure maintenance and preservation and all the correct things to do from a fiscally responsible point of view, decide that this should really be a \$300 million Capital Program, \$100 million in each of the three years. That's an omnibus amendment. That's taking a program that has maybe five or six projects in it and making it a more robust program that we're accustomed to. So, you know, we're not talking about adding one capital project for health center equipment or something like that. We're talking about a philosophical major overhaul similar to what we do when we do the Operating Budget

LEG. KENNEDY:

So then I'll say, Mr. Chair, the request, I think is -- makes sense. We all have finite resources, but the issue is then going to be who's going to decide whether it's an omnibus or just a series of resolution changes?

P.O. LINDSAY:

I think as an individual Legislator or collectively a number of Legislators can sponsor multiple stand alone resolutions, as opposed to a resolution that combines a whole bunch of different things. I mean, I could go one step further. We might have an omnibus that says I don't want to buy any more equipment for everybody, I just want to go for bricks and mortars.

LEG. KENNEDY:

That's the analogy that I tried to get at in the first instance, to see what would be some kind of a common theme. Let me just turn to Counsel then and ask Counsel. George, what's going to determine whether a particular resolution is an omnibus or not under Capital?

MR. NOLAN:

I think it would be a consultation between the Budget Review Office and myself. That's the way it normally happens.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Madam Clerk, do we have a -- I'm sorry, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. My question is really sort of -- comes off the heels of Legislator Kennedy's question, although it deals with the Operating Budget in addition to the Capital Budget, and that question is that we really don't have, and we have anecdotally sort of a feeling of what an omnibus resolution is. But we don't really have a definition of what an omnibus resolution is in an empirical sort of a specific way that says well, if you're -- if you're taking three or four different items and combining them together, then it's an omnibus, or if you're taking seven or eight, or if you're taking just two, for example.

I can recall during this past year's Operating Budget discussions me asking about a variety of things and, you know, getting the response that this may be considered an omnibus, you know, resolution, you'll need five cosponsors, and this may not be considered. In instances where I may not have agreed that it was an omnibus resolution, and to my knowledge, we have no hard and fast rules as to when it is an omnibus and when it isn't an omnibus. So if we don't have that hard and fast rule this will limit members ability, to some extent at least, to sponsor a resolution and it will limit it based on, as our Counsel said, I suppose, a discussion between our Budget Review Office and Counsel as to whether or not something is or is not an omnibus resolution. Did I make sense?

P.O. LINDSAY:

I think just by definition an omnibus resolution is multiple resolutions lumped into one. I mean, there is nothing, again, that would prevent the individual Legislator of whether it be one, two, three, five, ten, 20 different projects being sponsored as a stand alone.

LEG. CILMI:

Well, my question, again, is not exclusively towards Capital but it's towards Operating, and if it's one, two, three, four, five different -- if we're looking at an Operating Budget amendment, for example, and we're looking to increase staff in one department and eliminate staff in another department well, that's affecting two departments and I suppose that somebody could call that an omnibus resolution. That's my point, is that there doesn't seem to be a definition of what an omnibus resolution is. That's all I have to say.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Do you want to say anything else, Ms. Vizzini?

MS. VIZZINI:

Only if you want me to address that. Well, two things. One is if you want, I would be happy to work towards a mutually agreeable definition, but we've had many conversations in terms of amending the Operating Budget. This rule change is in regards to Capital, and the practice has been, as George stated, we've pretty much gone along the lines that to have substantive, comprehensive overhaul of the Operating Budget or the Capital Budget, we have required five sponsors just so that the Budget Review Office can finish in a timely manner or at least finish before you have to vote.

Secondly, in our many discussions, and I think you're referring to our discussion about omnibus versus stand alone, part of our discussion was Legislators would always have the opportunity to take each one of those changes and make it a separate stand alone. But an omnibus, it will depend on what the recommended budget is, if it satisfies the policy and philosophy of the Legislature. But if you're talking about government overhaul, downsizing and reduction in staff, generating new revenue, some of the things that we did in this cycle or had to do in this cycle, that's an omnibus. It's very different than reducing department A and increasing department B.

LEG. CILMI:

And that may well be my only point is, and I appreciate your offer to work with us in terms of developing an actual definition. My only point is that definition is now in somebody's head, whether it be yourself or subsequent Budget Review Director or what have you. It's not a hard and fast rule.

With that said, I completely understand why you wouldn't want -- I mean, you could potentially have, you know, a dozen omnibus resolutions to prepare, and we all know that you don't have the time, nor does your staff have the time to effectively do that. But on the other hand, in order for me as a Legislator to go and try and gain support from my colleagues for a resolution that I may have in my head, I need support in terms of putting that to paper to some degree and developing the idea with its fiscal implications. And so, you know, we would look to your office to do that. If you can't do that for an individual Legislator, and if rather you say, "Well, look, kind of talk about your ideas in general with your colleagues, and if you get five people to say sounds good, let's take a look at it, then, you know, we'll do the work." To me that, you know, doesn't really work either. It gives us a disadvantage.

MS. VIZZINI:

I don't think this rule change means that I would not work with you as I did in pricing --

LEG. CILMI:

I didn't say you didn't.

MS. VIZZINI:

I don't think that's what this says.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Mr. Clerk, do we have a motion?

MR. LAUBE:

No, I do not.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I make a motion.

LEG. MONTANO:

Second.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Twelve. (Opposed: Legs. Romaine, Muratore, Cilmi, Barraga, Kennedy and Nowick)

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Seven, "Any individual other than a member of the Legislature who wishes to speak at a public hearing done before the full Legislature for the purpose of ultimately acting upon legislation which is the subject matter of said public hearing, may speak at such public hearing for a period of time not to exceed three minutes in total. This three minute limit shall not include any time expended in answering questions posed by members of the Legislature. Persons speaking at the public hearing may submit a copy of their testimony to the Clerk of the Legislature for inclusion in the public record." It's to change the amount of time at a public hearing from five minutes to three minutes. I make a motion.

LEG. MONTANO:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Second by Legislator Montano. Does anybody want to talk about it?

LEG. BARRAGA:

No, very good.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Very good? Okay. Do you want to talk about it, Ed?

LEG. ROMAINE:

No, I understand the basis of this. Beam me up, baby.

LEG. HORSLEY:

You have the rationale behind it.

P.O. LINDSAY:

We have a motion and a second that the sky is blue. No, I'm just kidding.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Chemtrail.

P.O. LINDSAY:

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. CILMI:

Mark me opposed, please.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. The next one has been misnumbered, it should be eight. Amend Rule 14 by adding a new Subsection D to read as follows: "The Presiding Officer may establish special committees to perform certain tasks or study particular issues as he or she deems necessary. The Presiding Officer shall appoint the members and Chairperson's of such committees." This is to really put the paper or practice that as far as I know has went on here for as long as I've been here, is the Presiding Officer has always had the ability to set up special committees. I'll make a motion to

approve.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:
Second by Legislator Horsley. Anybody on the issue? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:
Now I'll make a motion to adopt the rules as amended.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:
Second by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Fourteen. (Opposed: Legislators Romaine, Muratore, Cilmi and Kennedy).

P.O. LINDSAY:
Thank God we got rules. Okay. The next order of business is appointing the Clerk of the Legislature, and administering the oath of office, and it's number three. ***Resolution No. 3, Appointing the Clerk of the County Legislature***, Tim Laube. I'll make a motion.

LEG. GREGORY:
Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:
Second by Legislator Gregory. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Congratulations.

(Applause)

P.O. LINDSAY:
Resolution No. 4, Appointing the Chief Deputy Clerk of the County Legislature, Renee Ortiz.

LEG. MONTANO:
Motion.

LEG. HAHN:
Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:
Motion by Legislator Montano, seconded by Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

(Applause)

P.O. LINDSAY:
Resolution No. 5, Appointing Deputy Clerk of the County Legislature, Barbara LoMoriello.

LEG. SPENCER:
Motion.

LEG. GREGORY:
Motion.

P.O. LINDSAY:
Motion by Legislator Spencer.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:
Seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

(Applause)

P.O. LINDSAY:
Okay. Three Clerks go get sworn in. Want to do him, too? Okay.
Resolution No. 6, Appointing a Counsel to the Legislature, George Nolan.

LEG. STERN:
Motion.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:
Motion by Legislator Stern, second by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

(Applause)

P.O. LINDSAY:
Do Gail, too, Judy?

MS. PASCALE:
Sure.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Resolution 7, Reappointing Director of Legislative Office of Budget Review, Gail Vizzini.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Speaker.

P.O. LINDSAY:

You want to speak? Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Certainly as I have in the past I will support this appointment, but I would like -- I think I would be remiss in not expressing a word of caution to Budget Review to make sure in the future that they really distinguish themselves in terms of their fundamental goal is to represent the Legislature, not the involved political campaigns. There was a major article in Newsday during the campaign concerning the County Executive's race and I was amazed to see the information given by Budget Review to that newspaper, and further amazed by one of the deputies actually being quoted in the paper. I just felt that in this particular instance, that particular instance, they went way overboard. They should have never gotten involved in political campaigns and I would hope that they would stay away from doing such things in the future.

LEG. GREGORY:

Mr. Chair.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

I just wanted, as the former, I don't know what I'm going to be next year, but I worked with BRO as the Chair of Budget and Finance and I have always found them to uphold the highest levels of professionalism, and I respect their work that they do for the committee as well as for all of us in Suffolk County. So thank you for your efforts.

MS. VIZZINI:

Thank you.

LEG. NOWICK:

Bill.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yes, Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:

I also want to say that Gail Vizzini works as hard as anybody could work in the budget. And I want to tell you something, we sat with her day after day after day in that Budget Working Group, and I don't know anybody that had a better knowledge of what went on, who pulled out any trick she could, although it was hard this particular year. Gail, you do quite a job. Thank you.

(Applause)

P.O. LINDSAY:

Do we have a motion? Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

This is not about Gail Vizzini or her abilities. They're well documented; she does an excellent job. It's about moving in an area that they shouldn't be involved in to begin with. Stay out of political campaigns, simple as that.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Do we have a motion, Mr. Clerk?

MR. LAUBE:

No, you didn't recognize anyone.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I'll make a motion.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

(Applause)

Oath of Office Administered to Tim Laube, Clerk of the Legislature; Renee Ortiz, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature; Barbara LoMoriello, Deputy Clerk of the Legislature; George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature; and Gail Vizzini, Director of the Budget Review Office by Suffolk County Clerk Judith Pascale and Signing of Official Record.

MS. PASCALE:

Congratulations.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I'm going to move along. *Resolution No. 8, Fixing time of meetings of the County Legislature.* I believe everybody had these early. Does anybody have any objections to any of the dates? If not, I'll make a motion to approve. Second by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen -- 18.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Resolution No. 9, Designating depositories pursuant to Section 212 of the County Law. Anybody have any questions? Yes, Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes. I see that State Bank of Long Island is listed here and my understanding is that that bank no longer exists, and that bank was taken over by Valley National Bank in New Jersey. And, in fact, there's an article in today's Newsday stating that so -- you know, I don't know if that should be listed amongst our things. If anybody has the internet they can take a look at the Newsday article today. This bank apparently has been taken over by Valley National Bank in New Jersey.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Thank you, Legislator Romaine, for pointing that out.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Not that I read business news.

P.O. LINDSAY:

No, but this list was developed by the Treasurer, we had no input into it.

LEG. ROMAINE:

This occurred in the last couple of days, the takeover.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. What we could probably do is approve this and then do a technical correction, or else we could just table it to our first meeting in February.

MS. CARPENTER:

No, don't table it.

LEG. ROMAINE:

The Treasurer wants to see this passed.

P.O. LINDSAY:

You want to come up, Ang?

MS. CARPENTER:

Not necessarily. If you would just --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Good.

MS. CARPENTER:

Since this just happened, and I don't know if it has been totally formalized, because sometimes that takeover may take 30 days, 60 days, so if you could approve it as is. When the name is officially changed and all of the, you know, paperwork is processed, then we'll file a resolution. We have very, very little money in with State Bank anyway, it really isn't problematic, but we will correct the records when it is official.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Would that be all right with you, Legislator Romaine?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Sure. I just point that out.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Ok. Then I'll make a motion to approve.

MS. CARPENTER:

Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Do I have a second?

LEG. NOWICK:

I'll second.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Second by Legislator Horsley. Did you want to comment? I'm sorry.

LEG. NOWICK:

I just wanted to say if we table this, you know what, in an hour or two maybe three or four other banks are going to change names because the way they are going they just keep changing. I'd keep an eye on it.

P.O. LINDSAY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Resolution No. 10, Designating two (2) alternating newspapers as official newspapers of the County of Suffolk. Any questions? I make a motion. Do I have a second?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Second by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Resolution No. 11, Designating two (2) alternating newspapers as official newspapers of the County of Suffolk. How does that differ?

MR. NOLAN:

Republican and Democrat.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Oh, okay. Okay. The first two -- oh, I see, this is the Republican papers. Do I have a motion?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Motion.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Motion by Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised his hand)

P.O. LINDSAY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

LEG. MONTANO:

Abstention.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Resolution No. 12, To designate local newspapers in which County notices may be published. These are the town papers.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I make a motion to table, Mr. Chair, for one cycle.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Motion to table. As normal, we'll go along with the tabling. I don't know what it is with you guys with the newspapers.

LEG. MONTANO:

Are there any questions?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Huh?

LEG. MONTANO:

Question. Any consequences to tabling?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No.

LEG. MONTANO:

Fine with me.

P.O. LINDSAY:

We tabled it for like a half a year last year time.

LEG. MONTANO:

That's what I thought.

P.O. LINDSAY:

The old newspapers just continue. There really isn't many ads in the beginning of the year anyway. Okay. We have a motion and a second to table. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yes, we got to go through. Okay. We have one CN, which is *1056, Amending the 2012 Operating Budget in connection with positions in the Labor Department*. After we did our Operating Budget, Labor came forward with an offset position, a person that already left that was high priced and a bunch of Federal aid that we didn't count on. So, as a result of that, we could restore seven positions that were on the layoff list. And it's funding neutral. So I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised his hand)

P.O. LINDSAY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And the last business we have of the day is late starters. I'll make a motion to waive the rules and lay the following pieces of legislation on the table.

LEG. MONTANO:

I didn't get one.

LEG. HAHN:

I didn't get one.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I didn't get one.

P.O. LINDSAY:

You didn't have yellow -- okay.

MR. NOLAN:

Nobody got the packet except the Presiding Officer. As part of the waiver of the packet, we're just going to read them. They're available on your computer according to the Clerk's Office. Tim, if you --

MR. LAUBE:

Yes, they will be available electronically and if you do need copies we can provide them.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Why didn't we have these? This is a change.

MR. LAUBE:

This is something I've been wanting to pass -- have you guys approve for a while now. It's just to reduce paper. Later on in the year this gets to be quite a stack of documents, and they're available to each Legislator right from your laptop where you can click and print, they print right here.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Where?

MR. LAUBE:

Or you can print in your office or from actually any printer in the building.

MR. NOLAN:

Tim, why don't you explain where on the -- you know, how people can look at them on their computer.

MR. LAUBE:

If you go to our Legislative website. Just a second. Under documents, if you go to the -- actually the faster way is right from our home page. If you're at our home page we usually have the agenda posted, and under the agenda for each meeting at the top, if you've gone to the agenda in past meetings, at the top we have four links. One is for the resolution packet, one for veto messages, one for laid on the table and another one for Certificate of Necessity. And all the documents that you get before you are provided, we scan in and have available there at any time. If you click on the link right now you bring up the notice of special meeting from today. Because this is a special meeting we do it a little different. The rest of the meetings will be yellow boxes across the top. That's how we've done it in the past. You'll see two links, one for late starters, one for Certificate of Necessity.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I guess this is --

MR. LAUBE:

This accomplishes two things for the Legislature. It speeds things up and it saves a lot of paper and it saves money.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I know, but it's something that I don't think I -- we were aware of and it's different. How about for today that I'll just read the full title of the bill, we'll lay it on the table, otherwise we're not going to have any bills in committee. Is that okay with everybody?

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah.

P.O. LINDSAY:

All right.

Procedural Motion No. 1 of 2012, Improving Legislative meeting transparency and openness by requiring meeting audiotapes to be posted immediately online, to Ways and Means.

1046 to EPA, Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007, Town of Brookhaven.

1047, Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007, Town of Brookhaven, assigned to EPA.

1048, assigned to Labor, Housing and Consumer Affairs and set a public hearing for February 7th, 2:30, in Hauppauge. Adopting a Local Law to require all retail stores to display fees associated with layaway programs.

1049, assigned to EPA, Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition under the Suffolk County Multifaceted Land Preservation Program, Town of Brookhaven.

1050 to EPA, Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition under the Suffolk County Multifaceted Land Preservation Program, Town of Southampton.

1051 to Public Works, Establishing a Blue Ribbon Panel to examine restructuring of all County-owned sewer districts into one consolidated district.

1052 to Ways and Means, Confirming appointment of County Attorney of Suffolk County.

1053 to Housing and Consumer Affairs, Confirming appointment of County Commissioner of Labor.

1054, to Health, and set a public hearing for February 7th, 2:30, Hauppauge. Adopting a Local Law to extend the date filing disposal plan for unused medications.

1055, Labor, Housing and Consumer Affairs. Set a public hearing for February 7th, 2:30, in Hauppauge. Adopting a Local Law to increase licensing fees for motor fuel facilities operating in Suffolk County. I need a second to the motion.

LEG. GREGORY:

Second.

P.O. LINDSAY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And a motion to adjourn would be in order.

LEG. MONTANO:

Motion.

P.O. LINDSAY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Eighteen.

P.O. LINDSAY:

We stand adjourned.

(*THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 3:18 P.M. *)