

**SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

**GENERAL MEETING**

**FOURTEENTH DAY**

**November 19, 2013**

**Verbatim Transcript**

**MEETING 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**

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

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

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Good morning, everybody, and welcome to the November 19th meeting in beautiful downtown Hauppauge. Will all Legislators please come to the horseshoe? Will all Legislators please come to the horseshoe.

Madam Clerk, will you please call the roll?

*(\*Roll Called by Ms. Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature\*)*

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Here.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Here.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

*(Not Present).*

**LEG. MURATORE:**

*(Not Present).*

**LEG. HAHN:**

*(Not Present).*

**LEG. ANKER:**

Here.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Present.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Here.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Here.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Here.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Here.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Here.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Here.

**LEG. STERN:**

Here.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Here.

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

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Here.

**MS. ORTIZ:**  
Thirteen. Fourteen (Not Present: Legislators Browning, Hahn & Spencer - Vacant Seat: District #8).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
We're growing. Okay.

Again, good morning. And may we all please stand for the salute to the flag led by Legislator Stern.

***Salutation***

**LEG. STERN:**

I ask everybody to please remain standing and join me in welcoming Katie Zimmer. Katie is a 14-year old freshman at Commack High School who had been diagnosed with a rare lung disease when she was two. Two years ago, after undergoing treatment which was helpful in putting her condition into remission, it's at that time that she found out that she had a God-given talent for singing. She is truly an inspiration to us all. And many of us have seen her perform in the past at so many big and important events all across Long Island. It really is a great personal pleasure to welcome Katie Zimmer.

***Applause***

***Katie Zimmer Performed The National Anthem***

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Katie, that was terrific; and not only your story but your voice. What -- so glad that you're here this morning.

Today the clergy, the invocation will be given my by Rabbi Beth Klafter from the Temple Beth David in Commack, guest of, of course, our Legislator Steve Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. And good morning to everybody. It really is a pleasure to welcome Rabbi Beth H. Klafter to the Suffolk County Legislature this morning, the Senior Rabbi at Temple Beth David in Commack.

Rabbi Klafter joined Temple Beth David in 2006, serving for seven years as the Director of the religious school where she revised and reinvigorated the curriculum for students from kindergarten through high school. Rabbi Klafter was ordained by the Hebrew Union College Jewish Institute of Religion in 1988 where she received a Masters in Religious Education and a Masters of Hebrew Letters. She received a Bachelor of Arts Degree from Brown University and was named Reformed Jewish Educator by the National Association of Temple Educators in 1992. In May of 2013, Rabbi Klafter received her Doctor of Divinity from Hebrew Union College. And it was great to be with her and her congregation just a few days ago where Rabbi Klafter was installed as the Senior Rabbi of her shul. And it really is a great pleasure to welcome Rabbi Beth Klafter for the invocation this morning.

***Applause***

**RABBI KLAFTER:**

Thank you, Steve. As we gather this morning, we heed the words of Rabbi Hillel from 2,000 years ago; Hillel Omer: Al Tifrosh Min Hatzibur. Hillel has talked, "*Do not separate yourself from your community.*" Indeed, this body not only doesn't separate itself, but clings to its community as each of you serves it. And so we pray on this crisp autumn morning, we pray for all who hold positions of leadership and responsibility in our County and our nation. Dear God, let your blessing rest upon them, make them responsive to your will so that our nation may be to the world an example of justice and compassion; deepen our love for our community and our country and our desire to serve it; strengthen our power of self-sacrifice for our County and our nation's welfare; teach each of us to uphold the good name by our right conduct. Cause each of us, Dear God, to see clearly, that the well-being of our nation and community is in the hands of all its citizens and its leaders, and view all of us with the zeal for the cause of liberty in our neighborhood, in our community and our land. Help us always to keep our home safe from affliction, strife and war. Amen.

And as we stand together, just days before we shall celebrate Thanksgiving in our homes, we thank you, Dear God, for the blessings you have granted to us, for life itself, for the abundance of goodness and health and friendship and family. May each of us know the great blessing of shalom, the blessing of peace. Amen.

*"Amen" said in Unison*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Rabbi. And also, thank you very much, Legislator Stern.

May we remain standing for a moment of silence. This week marks the 50th Anniversary of the tragic death of our 35th President, John F. Kennedy. Let us take a moment to reflect on the affect his loss had on our nation and the world. May we forever remember the inspiring days of "*Camelot*".

Let us also remember all those men and women who put themselves in harm's way every day to protect the United States of America and our freedoms, both home and abroad.

***Moment of Silence Observed***

Let us all remember to turn off our phones as well.

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

All righty. We have several **proclamations** this morning, and the first Legislator to present a proclamation will be **Legislator Montano** who will present a proclamation to the **Long Island Ducks as the 2013 Atlantic League Champions**. Wow, that's great.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Are we on? Okay. Thank you very much. To all of the members of the Legislature and the people in the audience today, first I'd like to present a proclamation -- I'd like to call up Frank Bolton who's the founder and CEO. And is Michael here? Michael and Buddy. And Buddy Harrelson also who is -- I think everybody knows who he is.

It's my pleasure, again, to recognize the 2013 Atlantic League Champions, the Long Island Ducks. As everyone knows, I'm privileged to have had the Ducks Stadium in my district for the last ten years. On Sunday, September 29th of this year, 2013, the Ducks defeated the Somerset Patriots by

a score of 6-4 to win the 2013 Championship, third Atlantic League Title in franchise history for the Ducks and second consecutive title after winning the championship previously in 2012 and 2004.

The Ducks defeated the Southern Maryland Blue Crabs in the divisional round of the playoffs to win their third consecutive Liberty Division Championship. They swept the series from the Blue Crabs in three games, began the post season with five consecutive victories and combined for a perfect 4-0 record during the playoffs on their home field at Bethpage Ballpark in Central Islip. I congratulate them on bringing home the title during their 14th season playing on Long Island, and we're looking forward to the team becoming the first time in league history to three-peat, along with celebrating their 15th anniversary season in 2014. Congratulations again, and we're glad to have you here.

***Applause***

Come on up.

**MR. BOLTON:**

Well, thank you, Ric, and thank you, everyone. Certainly on behalf of Michael, who is President/GM of the Ducks, and Buddy Harrelson, my long-time partner. You know, it's great to win the championship, bring it home here to Long Island. We've -- it's hard to believe that we're headed into our 15th year, but we are. And we continue to have great fans here on Long Island, not only in Suffolk but in Nassau as well. So we very much appreciate you recognizing the Long Island Ducks. We're going to try to make the Long Island Ducks popular for many decades to come and we thank you for this recognition today. Thank you. And Buddy, Michael?

The only other thing that I'd like to say, you know, it's rare when you get two guys in a room that I think have given as much to Long Island that were phenomenal all-star, major league all-stars, then came back, lived here on Long Island and have given so much back in the form of Bud Harrelson and Marty Lyons, who is joining us here today. So I just wanted to point that out, that those are two guys that were, you know, NFL, Major League players that played here, represented New York Teams and have made their home here on Long Island and brought so much to all of us, including myself who grew out of the ground in Bay Shore. So thank you very, very much. Here's Buddy Harrelson.

***Applause***

**MR. HARRELSON:**

You know, a lot of fans said *What's the best thing that ever happened to you in baseball*, and I said *the Long Island Ducks*, and they said, *Well, what about the World Series that you've been in and the All-Star games*, and I said, *It didn't impact the community that I live in*. So I've been here in Suffolk County, you know, and I say this a lot; *Why did I come to Suffolk County? Well, I hit 236 lifetime, and if I were to hit 250 I would have been in Nassau County*.

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

And if I hit 300, I'd have been in Greenwich, Connecticut, with Seaver, but I didn't do that.

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

So I'm glad I came here. And, you know, this never happened in Long Island, have a professional baseball team. We've all wanted it for so many years and now we do, and it's a well-oiled machine and I'm very proud of it. It is the best thing I've ever done in baseball. I thank all of you, too, for giving it to us. I appreciate it very much. Thank you.

***Applause***

**MR. POLAK:**

Well, thank you to the Legislature, and also to Ric and Bob; you guys have been tremendous to work with over the years. And we're very proud to bring home this second consecutive championship.

And as we enter 15th Anniversary season next year, we will welcome our six millionth fan, which is a league record so we're very proud of that as well.

And we look forward to continuing to work with the County to bring affordable family entertainment and to be the cleanest, safest, most fan-friendly place for people to spend their discretionary income.

So, thank you for your partnership and we look forward to continuing working with you. Thank you.

***Applause***

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Michael, would you just hold up that ring for a second?

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

I'd also like to recognize Marty Lyons; is he in the audience? Marty, would you just stand up?

***Applause***

And congratulations to all of you. Thank you so much.

***Applause***

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Frank, Mike and Buddy, on behalf of the Legislature, go Ducks.

Nice going.

All right. Legislator Montano, I understand you have a presentation to --

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

-- both David and Daniel Ortiz. Why don't you tell us a little bit about them.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay. First, I would like to take the privilege to invite to the podium our Chief Deputy Clerk, Renee Ortiz. Renee, would you step up, please? And the reason I'm asking Renee to come forward is because I want to give her the mic. The two young men that are being honored today are actually members of the Ortiz Family and we are extremely proud of what they have done. We want to present this proclamation to Daniel Ortiz, age 17, and David Ortiz, age 14 for their act of heroism.

And by the way, I have a copy of Newsday, the front page, in case anyone hasn't looked at Newsday, and this was the Saturday edition, November 16th; you may want to take a look at it if you haven't already seen it.

On the morning of Friday, November 15th, 2013, without regard to their personal safety, the Ortiz brothers responded to a fully-engaged house fire at his neighbor's house located on Wisconsin Avenue in North Bay Shore. And Renee -- I mean, Massiel, your family still lives on Wisconsin,

right? How far from --

**MS. FUENTES:**

Just a couple of houses.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Renee's parents -- I mean, when Massiel came to work with me, she lived on Wisconsin, right near this fire, so this is obviously close to home.

Daniel and David Ortiz witnessed as the fire was destroying the house and became aware of the screams coming from inside the house. The Ortiz brothers immediately jumped into action when they realized that those boys were too afraid to jump down onto the mattresses that had been there. The brothers looked around, grabbed a ladder and placed it at the second floor window saving the lives of their young neighbors, Ryan -- Ryan, 12, Jaden 2, along with their mother, Dawn Bosque.

Is she here? Is the family here.

**MS. ORTIZ:**

No, she's not here.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I'm going to pass this over to Renee, because obviously this is something that hits close to home. Renee?

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Sorry, I get a little emotional with this. But the house that my family lives in on Wisconsin Avenue is the home that my grandfather built probably nearly 60 years ago, so this house -- this home has been in the family for many years. And the Bosque Family that lives across the street have been neighbors of my family for almost equally as long, and so our families are very close. And these two young men, my younger cousins, are nothing short of heroes. And just when you think that teenagers are aloof and only thinking about girls, they go and do something like this and it is absolutely amazing.

***Applause & Standing Ovation***

They rescued our neighbors' two sons, Ryan and Jaden, who are 2-years old and 12-years old, from the second-story floor of the burning house. When they realized the home was engulfed in flames, they quickly thought to get a ladder from my uncle's house and ran across the street and removed the children from the window. The kids were too scared to jump and it was probably too dangerous for them to jump, and I don't think the children would be here today if these two young men didn't save their life. So we want to recognize them today. I'm so proud of my family. And I want to also recognize my cousin Anna, their mother.

***Applause***

And my Aunt and Uncle who took a great part in raising these children as well, and they did a wonderful job, obviously.

***Applause***

So Danny, David, we are so beyond proud of you. And I know now that you're not only thinking like a teenager, you're growing into fine young men and we're very proud. So thank you.

***Applause***

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Would you like to say something quickly?

**MS. ORTIZ:**

They don't want to say anything (*laughter*).

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I just want to say, I want to thank you. We took a little longer than normally, but you can see that this act that these two young men performed is extraordinary. And people on -- in our community and on Long Island can't thank them enough for their courage and their ability to think so clearly under what was definitely a most difficult and sad situation. God bless them, and thank you very much. And we're going to present these proclamations to them outside, and this is the family.

***Applause***

**MS. ORTIZ:**

I would just like to add that the Bosque family couldn't be here this morning. Obviously they're displaced at this time, they have no home and they lost everything. But we're doing what we can to help them in emergency housing situation, our DSS office has been working with us, so I want to thank them for that. And they sent their best, they are eternally grateful. So thank you again.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Thank you. Let's go outside. Introduce your mother.

**MS. ORTIZ:**

My Mom's here but, you know -- Ric wants me to introduce my Mother.

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

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Oh, Mom, come on up (*laughter*). That's great. And thank you, Renee, for bringing that to us also.

All righty. The next proclamation is from Legislator Kennedy, and I believe Legislator Nowick who will present a proclamation to Marty Lyons; of course, a member of the New York Jets Hall of Fame.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Come stand here. First let me say, before I go on to the proclamation, talk about intimidation. How would you like to have to be in a foursome with Marty Lyons and also our wonderful Ducks manager; how would you like to be in that foursome? As I looked up, as they put me in a foursome, and I don't play well, and I looked up to them and I said, "*Really?*"

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

Today, John Kennedy and I, Legislator Kennedy and I would like to present a proclamation to Marty Lyons. Now, this proclamation is given to him because he's asked to be on the Jets Ring of Honor. Is that what we call it, the Jets Ring of Honor?

**MR. LYONS:**

That's what we call it.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

And from what I know, there are only 13 members. This is quite an honor. And I'm going to tell you about a lot of things that Marty Lyons has done football-wise, but I must tell you, in my dealings with him and having known him for many, many years, football is very important and the Hall of Fames are important -- and John, you're going to read that as well. But this is a man that I met many years ago. I asked him to do me a favor and do us a favor and come and be the -- what were you at the March of Dimes? You were the guest speaker at the March of Dimes Golf Outing, and he graciously accepted. But when I got that opportunity to do that, Marty and I went out to lunch and we talked for a while and he told me about what I think is the most important thing about this man, which is the Marty Lyons Foundation.

And now you can do a foundation and anybody can do a foundation, but he sat with me and he told me stories about young people, about children, by name, by what disease they had, by what they went through and how he would sit with them and how he would talk with them and the two of us cried. This is a man with a heart and a soul, and obviously quite the athlete.

So the proclamation comes to him because of such an honor for the hall -- the ring of -- what was it? I'm sorry, I have to read it again.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Ring of Honor, Ring of Honor.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**LEG. NOWICK:**

The Ring of Honor, thank you. But the important thing about him is he's a family man, he's a community man, he's such a wonderful person. And I am so delighted to know you. And as I said, we met because of the March of Dimes, and if you want to tell them how we met, you may.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

*(Laughter).*

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Go right ahead.

**MR. LYONS:**

Thank you, Lynne. First of all, I want to thank everybody here today for this honor. And on behalf of all the children and the Board of Directors and all the volunteers from the foundation, I truly thank you.

Lynne and I were very fortunate to meet years ago when she was the Smithtown Tax Collector. And I'm a resident of Smithtown and I get a phone call from Lynne, and I actually put her on hold because I didn't -- I recognized the name, but I couldn't put the face together, and living in Smithtown, when I'm told that the tax collector is looking for you, putting her on hold was a pretty good thing to do.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

It was then that she asked me if I would participate in the March of Dimes, and it was a lifelong friendship that we have developed.

I'm very fortunate to be out here as part of the New York Jet family for the last 34 years and having

an opportunity to work with Frank Bolton and Buddy Harrelson and the Ducks. Some of the Long Island Islanders that still live out here, like Clark Gillies and Bobby Nystrom, people that make a difference in the community.

I think sometimes, athletes, we get caught up in this instant gratification. You know, you have a good game on Sunday and of course you want to read about it on Monday, because everybody wants to be liked, everybody wants to be accepted. And as elected officials, I think you guys probably all feel the same way on Election Day. As you sit there on pins and needles, you're waiting together to hear the results, and once you've been elected you feel pretty good about yourself and pretty good about the campaign. But I think what makes a difference in life is the people that you touch, that really maybe you don't even have an opportunity to meet, the ones that believe in your words, the ones that trust in your leadership, and years after the fact of touching their lives they come back.

For some reason there's this big circle of life that God allows us to have; people pass in, they pass out. And every time that you touch their life, you know, it comes, it makes you feel good. But the ones that really count are the ones that come back years after the fact, years after you have forgotten who they were, and you sit down and you listen to their story, and that happened to me about 15 years ago.

The foundation is celebrating 31 years, and every now and then you run into a family or you run into a child that was one of your wish recipients back in the early 80's. And this young lady came up to me and she said, *"I was one of your wish childs in the 80's,"* she said, *"If you have time, I'd like to tell you my story."* So I sat down with her and she said when she was six she got diagnosed with Leukemia. And if anybody knows, back in the early 80's, a lot of kids passed away from Leukemia, but they were actually dying of complications from Leukemia, whether it was pneumonia, their body got too weak. She said, *"When I was six I got diagnosed with Leukemia."* She said, *"The doctor came in and told my parents that I would have had to go through chemotherapy and radiation, and that there would be a good chance that during this treatment I may not be strong enough. That I may pass away."* Then the doctor looked at my parents and said, *"Well, you know, on the good news is, if she is fortunate enough to survive, she probably will never be able to have children."*

She went on to tell me that the very next day, as I was visiting the kids at the hospital, I walked in her room and I told her, I said, *"you know, if you continue to believe in yourself and you continue to fight anything, is possible. And if and when you get well, I will send you and your family to Disney World."* She said, *"here I am, 20 years later to tell you thank you, you saved my life."*

So you stop to think that the words that we choose, the people that we meet, how we can make a difference. And I truly told her, *"Thank you. You're that reminder each and every one of us need. You're that reminder that tells us the work that we do today, certainly it is important, but the lives that you touch today for that next generation is going to be more important."* So when I got up to leave, she grabbed me by the arm and she said, *"Marty, before you go, I'd like to have you meet my son and daughter."* So certainly, we can all make a difference.

And I want to leave you with three little sentences that I try to repeat to myself every day, and they're pretty simple because you can apply them to your life. And to everybody out here, if you think about it, that's how we should live our life. It said, *"To dream anything you want, that is the beauty of the human mind."* Think about it; we all want to dream. The second line says, *"To do anything you want to do, that is the strength of the human will."* And the third and final line goes, *"To trust yourself, to test your limits, that is the courage to succeed."* Three very powerful lines. And I met -- I read those lines on a brochure one day and I flipped it over and those were three lines from the American Breast Cancer. Words of encouragement to mothers, daughters, sisters, women that were going through a very difficult time of their life. So if we take those three lines, we

teach them to ourselves, we teach them to our friends, we teach them to our kids, the next generation that comes behind us, they're going to realize that we took time to make an impact on life.

So on behalf of all the children, Lynne, John, we've been friends for a long time. I love you, Lynne, you know that for sure. John, I'm still thinking about you.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

But I truly thank you. God bless each and every one of you.

*Applause*

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

There's not much you can say after something like that, other than here in Smithtown and here in Suffolk County, we truly are blessed that we have heroes like Marty Lyons, heroes like Buddy Harrelson, heroes like Frank Bolton that come out and help us each and every day to do what we could never do that you do for us, and just please keep doing the great work that you do. Thank you so much.

**MR. LYONS:**

Thank you.

*Applause*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Lynne, John, congratulations on bringing Marty today. And just -- just quickly, one of the stories you don't tell about Marty is what a successful businessperson he is throughout Suffolk County and how many people he's employed, they must be countless. Thank you very much for being part of the fabric of Suffolk.

**MR. LYONS:**

Thank you.

*Applause*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All righty. The next proclamation is from Legislator Spencer who will present a proclamation to Ray Hubbs who recently retired Huntington Bay Police Chief with more than 32 years of service.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Good morning, Chief Hubbs? Thank you for being here. Huntington Bay Police Chief Ray Hubbs is the longest serving Chief on Long Island.

He retired from his position on November 1st after more than 32 years of dedicated service. Ray's professionalism, sensitivity earned him the respect of his fellow Police Officers and residents of Huntington Bay. Ray set the standard for stability, leadership for Village Police Departments throughout all of Long Island. His leadership over the years is demonstrated by the Huntington Bay Police Department being one of the only -- of several Village Police Departments named as a State Certified accredited agency on Long Island. It gives me great pride and pleasure to recognize Ray's years of dedication and commitment to Huntington Bay community and to congratulate him on the occasion of his retirement. Thank you.

**MR. HUBBS:**

Thank you very much.

*Applause*

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Would you like to say a couple of words?

**MR. HUBBS:**

Yes. I'd like to thank you, I feel very inadequate after the last couple of -- you know, running and saving lives and, you know, Marty Lyons, what he's done for the community. All I did is survive in a stressful job for a long time, and I did that in no small part to the guys that I worked with who were -- alleviated my stress by, you know, knowing that they had my back. I knew that they were good at what they did and they had my back. My successor is here, and I hope to come to his proclamation in 20 something years; when he gets it, I hope you invite me back for that.

*Applause*

And, you know, I'd like to thank my guys and I appreciate this and I do feel very humbled.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Absolutely. Thank you.

**MR. HUBBS:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Congratulations, Chief.

All right. Legislator, I understand you also have --

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Another. But also, just to the Chief, he is well-deserving. For 32 years he's been a hero, so he definitely fits in with the heroes that we're recognizing this morning.

I'd like to ask if Victor and Dylan Skulnick could come up.

**MS. SKY:**

Charlotte Sky.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Charlotte Sky, I apologize.

**MS. SKY:**

No, that's okay.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Skulnick is the -- okay.

The road -- I'm recognizing the Cinema Arts Center, and I had just -- I said Victor and his wife, Skulnick, they were the founders. Back in 1973, when New York City natives Victor Skulnick and his

wife Charlotte Sky were shocked to find lack of places showing good movies when they moved to Huntington. Instead of complaining about it, they decided to do something about it. With a borrowed projector and a bed sheet on the wall, the initial films were hosted at the Huntington Dance Studio on Main Street where viewers had to bring their own chairs. Besides presenting programs which dealt with controversial topics in the theatre, then known as the New Community Cinema, they gave independent filmmakers a chance to present their works.

Less than a year after the initial offering, Victor and Charlotte, recognizing that they had already outgrown the space at the dance studio, applied for and were granted a New York State Council of Arts Grant. Being the boost they needed, the grant enabled them to find a new home in the Village Green Elementary School which had been closed due to lack of enrollment and was vandalized every night, so this stabilized the community and was a win/win for everyone.

Continuing in the popularity, the Cinema Arts now boasts a membership of over 9,000 members and an annual attendance of over 150,000 people. Sadly, Victor passed away in 2010, but his contributions as a cultural giant continue to maintain their place in the heart of Huntington as the theatre continues to grow. Charlotte and Victor's son Dylan, along with his mother, continue to oversee the daily operation of the Cinema Arts Theatre.

It gives me great pride and pleasure to recognize the late Victor Skulnick and Charlotte Sky and their son Dylan as they celebrate their 40th Anniversary of the Cinema Arts Center. Thank you for your contribution to our community and to Suffolk County.

*Applause*

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Would you like to say a word?

**MR. SKULNICK:**

Sure. I just want to thank Legislator Spencer and thank the entire Legislature for this great honor, and especially for also, in addition, the support that the Legislature and the County, through the office of -- Suffolk County Office of Cultural Affairs has provided to the Cinema Arts Center for many years. It's really vital to us and we deeply appreciate that. I want to thank everyone, I want to thank the Department of -- Office of Cultural Affairs, including Michele Isabelle-Stark. And just also to say that this honor really means a lot to us because, as Legislator Spencer was saying, our original name was New Community Cinema, and everything we do is routed in the concept of being -- of the community and being part of the community. So being recognized by the Legislature is very meaningful. And on a personal note, I just add as a lifelong Mets fan, I don't think he's still here, but it was a great honor to be here honored with Bud Harrelson.

*Applause*

**MS. SKY:**

Okay. I don't have too much more to add, except I'm sorry that Vic Skulnick is not here to have -- be able to receive this great honor. Thank you very much, Legislator Spencer, and everyone on the Legislative council here.

And I just want to say that -- I know Dylan mentioned it, but we have received over, my God, I guess since the early 80's, a lot of support from the Suffolk County Legislature. And it has made a huge difference for us, so I just want to recognize all that you've done for us. And I know that we've always gotten, you know, a lot of help from the New York State Council on the Arts, the National Endowment for the Arts, and it's enabled us to really stay here. It's hard to believe, 40 years. But when we first started, I just want to mention this briefly, because William Spencer

mentioned that we started with a sheet on the wall and people had to bring their own chairs, and of course we never realized that this would become as an important -- what has become an institution in Huntington. And I think now we have, what would you say, 9,000 members and it's -- it's just amazing that it has been able to be recognized. Because when we first started, people said, "What kind of films are you showing?" You know, because -- and we were here long before Sundance was showing their films, so a lot of independent filmmakers had their opportunities in Huntington to really allow people in the community to see their work. And we allowed during the women's revolution in film, a lot of women showed their films and it's just been a wonderful showcase and I really appreciate so much the support of the Suffolk County Legislature. Thank you.

***Applause***

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much on behalf of the Legislature.

**Legislator Anker**, I understand you'll make a presentation to **Bernadette Beckwell**.

**LEG. ANKER:**

So we have Bernadette Beckwell and her dog Tucker, and Tucker is a vet dog. He helps Bernadette throughout her life here, a Miller Place resident.

I wanted just to briefly tell you how I got to know of Bernadette and it was through the Birchwood Veterans Group, and they're over in Middle Island and they run a very successful golf outing for Wounded Warrior Project and Bernadette is very involved with that project. You know, you're just amazing. I wanted to go through some of the things that you've endured and you hopefully will continue to create inspiration, definitely for myself but for the many people that meet you and get to know you.

While courageously serving in the U.S. Navy overseas in Afghanistan, in 2007 Lieutenant Blackwell's troop was assigned to scouting remote locations via plane. During one of the missions, her plane fell victim to enemy fire and she was forced to complete the scouting via cargo truck where she was -- where she endured a traumatic head injury. Although Lieutenant Blackwell experienced great distress, she returned to the U.S. to participate in the Wounded Warrior Project, where she became a symbol of strength, resilience to our men and women of the armed forces. And I would like to give you this proclamation in honor of your service and your dedication and your resilience to what you've experienced. And I'd like you, if you don't mind, I know you have Tucker here, but explain, you know, just briefly -- no pressure -- what you're doing now and how people can participate in the organization that you're working with with Wounded Warrior.

**MS. BLACKWELL:**

He was actually balancing earlier this morning (*laughter*).

**LEG. ANKER:**

Tell them how that works, because you get dizzy.

**MS. BLACKWELL:**

I have a brain injury and I get treatment once a week for that, it's about been about six years. And what he does is he senses my instability and he'll lean on me, or if he's not close to me where he's in leaning reach, he'll actually start whining or barking to let me know that I'm going to actually lose my balance or fall over. So I really -- (*laughter*). I'm really glad I got him.

**LEG. ANKER:**

What type of dog is he?

**MS. BLACKWELL:**

He's a boxer.

**LEG. ANKER:**

He's beautiful.

**MS. BLACKWELL:**

Yes, thank you. And what I've been doing the last couple of years is I've been giving -- volunteering my time and doing speeches for the Wounded Warrior Project on behalf of the Wounded Warrior Project. And I'll go out to functions or organizations that want somebody to represent the Wounded Warrior Project to do volunteer work or donations or we have a couple of golf courses that actually let the Warriors go out there and play once a week. Basically any activity out there that is available, we want to take advantage of that for the Warriors.

There's many Warriors that are still not able to get out. So what we want to do is help them any way we can. And I figure one good thing that I can do is go out there and represent the Wounded Warrior Project. And if anybody has any questions or would like to participate, you can go on the website and we could help out with that. But it's not just about giving money, it's about opportunities to get the Warriors out. Out east in Montauk and stuff, they have like fishing trips once a year and the Warriors will get together and go on that, and it's nice to see warriors come out even if it is once a year.

So I want to thank you all for any support you've given and any help you've done for the Warriors that have come home, that have served their country. Thank you.

**LEG. ANKER:**

And I wanted to mention --

***Applause & Standing Ovation***

As we have this standing ovation for your service, and as the daughter of a disabled vet, I just want to personally thank you for everything. So, thank you. Thank you so much.

***Applause***

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Bernadette, we are truly honored by your presence today. Thank you for being here.

**MS. BLACKWELL:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All righty. **Legislator Browning** will present a proclamation, and I understand that, Legislator Calarco, you will be joining.

Legislator Browning? Proclamation to **Paul Ferguson**; Paul is the **founder of Yes, We Care**.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. I'd like to introduce to you a very special man that I have met, Paul Sequence Ferguson. He's a 13-year U.S. Army Veteran, and also joined by -- with Fran Petito who is the Executive Vice-President of *Yes, We Care*.

*Yes, We Care* is a not-for-profit charity which was founded in 2006, and Paul serves as the President. At the age of 12, he taught himself to play guitar. As a musician, he has produced music for the

Harris Corporation, HDTV, and he developed and implemented entertainment programs. While in the armed forces, he toured Germany with a 6-piece band, performed for the United Nations, League of Women, and produced music for television commercials that have aired on major networks throughout the U.S. and Canada.

He has dedicated every aspect of his life for the betterment of the lives of veterans, many of whom are long-term, in-care, disabled veterans in Eastport where he provides free concerts, holiday parties, gifts and personal events. Yes, We Care is a charity designed to greatly improve the quality of life for all veterans through first class housing, quality medical, and especially in the area of cancer. It provides nutritious meals, spiritual comfort and guidance, stress management through relaxation therapy including music therapy, and I think we all know how important music is in our lives. How many of us go home and turn on some nice music to calm down after a crazy day? Paul has designed a series of Healing Par of Music, relaxation DVDs and CD box sets for PTSD treatment and as an aid to reduce pain medications. The support services he provides tells our veterans that, yes, we care, you are not forgotten.

So I have a proclamation for Paul, but before that, I'd like to -- Paul does live in my district and Fran is a constituent of Rob's. So, Rob?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Thank you, Legislator Browning. And it's really a pleasure. As you heard from Bernadette before us, you know, often times those -- actually, most of the time, those who serve in our armed forces, they build a camaraderie with our fellow individuals in arms and they build this relationship with them where they have a commitment to each other. And as you see Paul has done, as so many others, that commitment doesn't end when they leave the service. That commitment continues on throughout the course of their life, and Paul has certainly dedicated himself through Yes, We Care to make sure that he continues to care for his brothers and sisters in arms who have served with him, served before him and served after him, to make sure that we continue to take care of them when they come home, as they most rightly deserve. So Paul, thank you very much for what you do for us.

***Applause***

**LEG. BROWNING:**

And one last thing I'd like to say; if you Google Paul, you want to hear him on the guitar, he is something else. And he has played with many greats. So, again, Paul, we have our proclamations to say thank you for your service to our veterans.

**MR. FERGUSON:**

Thank you so much.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Would you like to say something?

**MR. FERGUSON:**

Just briefly, I'd like to say thank you for what you have done here, because it's not only for me. I accept these on behalf of all my veterans that I take care of and the ones that I'm going to take care of.

And just one thing; when you pass a vet, just tell them thank you for their service, because I know it means a lot to them just to hear that word, pray those words. I spoke to one vet and he said -- I said, "*Thank you for your service,*" and he said, "*Wow,*" and he just -- he burst into tears. I said, "*Why are you crying?*" He said, "*No one has ever thanked me for what I've done,*" and that really

tore my heart.

So just say that once in a while, it will give a vet a smile internally, they will be very happy to hear that from you. Thank you.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Fran?

*Applause*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Paul. And thank you for being here today.

**MS. PETITO:**

I just want to share one thing with you. Paul is a two-time prostate cancer survivor, and every day people say to me -- because I sit on numerous charities, "*Why do you do this?*", and I say, "*Because he does this.*"

You should also know that we will be partnering with the Wounded Warriors Project, we're also working with the Gary Sinise Foundation, to make sure that all of our veterans know that we really do care about them, they're not forgotten, and Paul makes sure of that every single day. Thank you, Paul. Thank you very much.

*Applause*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

And thank you very much, Legislators, for bringing Paul here today.

All right. The next proclamation is by Legislator Hahn who will present a proclamation to Dana Mondello, a student at Suffolk County Community College.

**LEG. HAHN:**

I am here to congratulate Dana Mondello who is a resident of East Setauket, and she has been recognized and named by the New York State Cooperative and Experiential Education Association as Student of the Year. And Dana is -- and I think this is still true -- an aspiring Suffolk County Police Officer?

**MS. MONDELLO:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

So we're really excited about that. Ms. Mondello is a Criminal Justice major on the Ammerman Campus of Suffolk County Community College and expects to graduate at the end of this semester?

**MS. MONDELLO:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Excellent. And like I said, her goal is to become a Suffolk County Police Officer. While attending Suffolk, she participated in Suffolk County Community College Cooperative Education and Internship Program. The Cooperative Education and Internships at Suffolk County Community College provide an opportunity for eligible students to gain professional work experience and test the appeal of a career field of interest. And so I'm really excited to recognize this award that Ms. Mondello was honored by this New York State Association. We want to -- I think it's so important that we recognize youngsters, like the Ortiz brothers and like Ms. Mondello, for their great

achievements. And quite frankly, they said in the press release "*outstanding achievements in this area*", and so congratulations to you. I hope you are successful and can represent us on the Suffolk County Police force one day. So congratulations.

***Applause***

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator Hahn.

I believe that concludes the proclamations. Are there any more that I'm missing? We're all good? Excellent.

Okay. Will the Legislators please join us at the horseshoe? We're about ready to start the **Public Portion**. All right, the first speaker that we have today in the public portion, of course they are limited to three minutes, is Erin Thoresen, and on deck is Joe Gargola. Gargola.

**MS. THORESEN:**

Hi, good morning. My name is Erin Thoresen, I am here representing Sustainable Long Island. We're a regional not-for-profit that works to promote the three prongs of sustainability: Economic development, environmental health and social equity. And as such, we are here to express strong support for Introductory Resolution No. 1700 which seeks to amend Chapter 8 of the Suffolk County Code.

Through our community planning work over the past 15 years in Nassau and Suffolk Counties, Sustainable Long Island identified a common need throughout the region: Better access to healthy, affordable food. In addition, Sustainable Long Island participated in a food mapping project in conjunction with the Long Island Index a few years ago, and that project pinpointed locations of food {deserts} across Long Island and further emphasized the need for fresh, healthy, affordable food throughout the region.

Our Food Equity Program seeks to address these needs through collaborative, community-driven projects that make local produce more available, stimulate economic growth and create healthier communities. To that end, Sustainable Long Island recently released, in partnership with Adelphi University, a Long Island Food System Report Card which provides a comprehensive baseline profile of the regional food system. Overall recommendations include but are not limited to investing in infrastructure, diversifying the agricultural economy, protecting farmland, addressing food accessibility and insecurity and the rising cost of food for all Long Islanders.

The recommended revisions to Chapter 8 of County Code directly address and allow for improvement in many of these critical areas. Specifically, proposed revisions will make the following vitally important changes; allowing modifications to farm stand regulations, allowing on-farm processing of products and agritourism and changing the composition of the Farmland Committee to include people with expertise in areas specifically aligned with the County's diverse farming needs. These changes in particular will greatly increase the viability and longevity of the farming industry in Suffolk. It is critically important that changes be made to halt the current trends of farms going out of business within the County. And in addition, allowing farm stands to become more viable increases access to produce grown on Long Island. Many studies have shown that the faster we can get foods directly from farm to table, the more nutrients and nutritional value they will have.

Sustainable Long Island urges the passage of IR No. 1700. We believe that we must all work together to preserve our working farms, enhance opportunities that make them economically viable, and do all that we can to increase access for everyone to healthy, affordable, locally-grown food. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Erin. Joe Gergela? And on deck is Dawn Hupkins.

**MR. GERGELA:**

Good morning, Presiding Officer and members of the Legislature. I'm Joe Gergela, Executive Director of Long Island Farm Bureau. I kind of am disappointed that some of your colleagues are not here, because some of my comments are directed at them. And there's going to be -- I'm going to do a Dick Amper this morning, so I would hope they would be here for the entertainment value.

First of all, we at Long Island Farm Bureau do support Resolution 1465 and 1700. I don't have to tell you all about the benefits of Long Island agriculture: \$300 million industry, 4,000 jobs, backbone of tourism, quality of life for all the residents of Suffolk and Nassau that like to recreate on the East End. You've heard me speak many times.

I'm very disturbed by professional colleagues in the environmental world. They call themselves environmentalists; they have no skin in the game. Without a cause, their organizations don't exist. The door-knocking Citizens Campaign to scare people with hysteria and basically nonsense. They act like they're scientists, that they actually know things; they do not. They're political scientists. They say *We represent the public*; they don't, they don't. You guys do, and the Legislators at every level of government do.

I'm about up to here with the nonsense. They talk about they want to support -- they support farmland preservation; right. They don't support farmers. The imbalance in the Quarter Percent funding, \$4 and four acres of open space and environmental land to every acre preserved farmland. It's not my fault that the remainder of the farmland, 22,000 acres of unprotected farmland, is out East. You guys, as Legislators, I know that you understand this, that you have your parochial responsibilities in your districts. You also have the greater good of the community.

One day I hope that when your children and grandchildren go back and talk to you about your careers and they say *What happened to the farms*, that you can truthfully answer that question and say *Well, you know, on our watch, we watched a lot of the farmland get converted to five and 10-acre estates out on the East End because we failed to balance the funding of the Quarter Percent and other programs*. The Quarter Percent Program and other funding mechanisms were supposed to be shared. The Environmental Community came to us 20 years ago and said it's going to be better; money will go to sewers, money will go to environmental programs, money will go to Cornell, money will go to Open Space, money will go to farmland.

*Beeper Sounded*

I know that I'm over my time, but I'll move it along. I just want to make the point that we are all environmentalists. The true environmentalists with skin in the game, they make their living out on the farms, the water, landscapers, people who enjoy the natural part of our environment. So I would ask you to fully consider both of those resolutions and thank you for giving me two seconds over. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay, Joe. Thank you.

**MR. GERGELA:**

Okay, bye.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Dawn Hupkins, and on deck is Herb Strobel.

**MS. HUPKINS:**

Good morning. My name is Dawn Hopkins, I am the Vice-President of the Lake Ronkonkoma Civic Organization and I'm here to speak on behalf of Resolution 1881 which would establish an intermunicipal organization for Lake Ronkonkoma. We do have water quality issues at the lake. We have stormwater runoff pollution, we have Canada geese infestation and we have invasive aquatic plants that are contaminating the lake.

Luckily, Lake Ronkonkoma has been designated by the State as an inland waterway. The consequence of this is that we're now eligible for State and Federal grant monies to help with the lake. What we've noticed is that in terms of grant applications, the most successful applications are those that are made combining the municipalities involved and the community. They're the ones that get the most funding and sail through the quickest.

I also would like to mention that this intermunicipal organization is patterned after very successful ones in Lake George and Cayuga Lake. So I think this is a wonderful opportunity for the County to join with the towns in this effort to protect Lake Ronkonkoma watershed.  
Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Dawn. Herb Strobel, and Lisa Ott on deck.

**MR. STROBEL:**

Good morning. I'm Herb Strobel and part of a farm family in Center Moriches where we've been farming for nearly a hundred years, and we sold development rights to the County and the town back in 2004. I'm also a member of the Brookhaven Town Open Space and Farmland Committee and here today to express my support for both IRs 1465 as well as 1700, Chapter 8 legislation.

IR 1465 would help in prioritizing land acquisitions that this body considers by setting minimum ratings for both open space as well as farmland projects. And that's really important, especially nowadays when we're in the context of extremely limited financial resources. Only the best projects should be funded, and everybody around the table certainly knows that, and this legislation, 1465, represents a common sense approach to that end.

IR 1700 dealing with Chapter 8 provides for much needed updates to that part of the code. As you've heard many times in the past, as Joe mentioned, as what other people have mentioned, the farmland program here in Suffolk County is pioneering, it's been around for 40 years. But let's face it, over that time agriculture has changed in ways that were not fully envisioned by this body, by policymakers 40, 50 years ago. Back then much of the farming on Long Island involved commodity crops including potatoes and a few other vegetables, and since that time there's been a lot of diversification into a variety of other crops including grapes, nursery and a wider assortment of vegetables.

As well, no longer do farmers simply -- most farmers simply depend on wholesaling their produce. Many now rely on direct marketing to consumers via farm stands, as well as including activities in their farm operations that deal with agritourism as well as on-farm processing of value-added products; those are also very important income generating streams for many operations. But the original preservation program, again, did not anticipate a lot of those activities, and certainly Chapter 8 should be revised in ways that promote the economic viability of the lands that are currently within, and hopefully will be added to the Farmland Preservation Program.

Make no mistake about it, the proposed changes to Chapter 8 are modest in scope and they are sensible and, over the last three or four years there has been input from both within as well as from outside the agricultural community. There have been many, many opportunities for folks to provide their comments, to provide their input and they have been thoughtfully considered. Again, these are common sense changes, they're modest in scope. They will maintain the poor integrity of the Farmland Preservation Program, while at the same time providing updates that are needed to maintain the economic viability of preserved farmland here in Suffolk County. I thank you for your attention.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Herb. Lisa Ott is the next speaker, and George Proios will be on deck.

**MS. OTT:**

Good morning. I'm Lisa Ott and this is Beth Baldwin, we represent the North Shore Land Alliance which is a land trust.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Lisa, you're going to have to talk into the mic, if you would, please.

**MS. OTT:**

The last time I was here I knocked over all the papers, so I'll try to be more careful.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

*(Laughter)* okay. We appreciate that.

**MS. OTT:**

Lisa Ott, Beth Baldwin, we represent the North Shore Land Alliance which is a land trust that operates in western Suffolk County.

We're proud to be the County's partner in a public/private partnership to acquire the 32 acres of the DeForest Williams property in Cold Spring Harbor. This property in its earlier years was a 400-acre farm, it was called Wawapeck Farm and on it cows grazed and crops were grown, but there aren't any of those farms left in this part of Long Island.

It's been two years since planning steps were authorized on this acquisition. As you may recall, a 15-lot subdivision plan had been approved to develop this heavily-wooded hilltop site. Development would have deprived western Long Island of the highly visible historic landscape, caused considerable erosion for properties below the site and increased nitrogen pollution in the relatively clean Cold Spring Harbor below. Thankfully, the County, Town and even New York State have come together to aid the community in the purchase of this community treasure. In total, this is an \$8.5 million deal. The North Shore Land Alliance will purchase -- sorry. The Town, County and Land Alliance will purchase 28 of the acres together; the bulk of the property, for \$6 million; the County's share is \$3 million. The North Shore Land Alliance will also purchase an access lot which is four acres which will provide public access to the site, including a small parking lot. Trails already exist and this property will be open to the public.

It's very special, in these days and times, when a community of residents, government and non-profits can come together and create a living legacy such as this. The environmental benefit this acquisition will create will outlive all of us and continue to do good each and every day. We thank Legislator Spencer and the Suffolk County Planning Department, Supervisor Petrone and the Town of Huntington Planning Department for all of their efforts to make this happen. We so hope you will vote yes on Resolution 1916 today to acquire the very special DeForest Williams property.

Thank you very much.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Lisa. George Proios? And on deck is Michael Gendron.

**MR. PROIOS:**

Good morning. As most of you know, I was the former Assistant County Executive for Environment Affairs from the previous administration for 12 years and have been your Chairman of the Soil & Water Conservation District for over 12, and I chair the State Soil & Water Conservation Committee, which is five voting members; it sets policy in the State on agricultural issues. And this year the Governor put in \$14 million in our budget to help us work with farmers to address agricultural non-point source programs, and our County submitted a program. We signed up 13 farmers to get them to replace their aging, old steel gasoline and oil tanks with new double-walled or fiberglass tanks and that project was approved and so they will get reimbursed 75% of the cost to replace those tanks.

I don't have to tell you because you know, you've heard this so many times, that we were the number one County in the State in terms of the agricultural production. We were -- the first cattle ranch in the U.S. was out east by Third House, and we were the first County in the nation to develop the Farmland Rights Program. Unfortunately, though, we've been sitting on our laurels for many years. The County's first agricultural plan set a goal of protecting 30,000 acres in 20 years. When we passed the 20-year mark, we hadn't even exceeded 10,000 acres, so a new plan was adopted in 1997 and set a new goal of 20,000 acres. The County has never undertaken a study to determine what is the critical mass needed to sustain an agricultural industry here in Suffolk. Other municipalities that have followed our example here have surpassed us in protecting their local farms; most notably, Lancaster, Pennsylvania and Montgomery County in Maryland. In fact, Montgomery has protected now over 40,000 acres in less than 20 years.

Suffolk County possesses some of the greatest challenges for farming; highest land values in the area, labor costs, the highest electric rates in the nation and high fuel costs. If the County were to work on just addressing one of those operating costs, the profitability of farms would increase and we would have less farmers willing to sell their farms to developers.

Buying development rights alone will not ensure that farming remains economically viable in Suffolk. We need to look at economic problems that face farmers and help them develop more profitable markets working to reduce adverse impacts to the environment. Legislation has been introduced by Senator LaValle, it was signed by Governor Pataki, to establish a regional farmers market. It wasn't a good example; unfortunately, it never came to fruition.

We need to identify these new markets by innovative technologies that will help farmers better compete in a new rapidly changing economy and better techniques to reduce environmental impacts from fertilizers. I have been proposing for years that we look into the idea of purchasing environmentally-friendly products like slow-release fertilizers, pesticide sprayers, efficient irrigation systems and put these things on State contracts so farmers can buy them at a more reduced cost than they currently are now available beyond the reach of many farmers.

I've been working with the State Department of Agricultural Markets to help us develop here in Suffolk an Agriculture Environmental Management Program which is now one of the best in the nation. We have produced our own worksheets here that the State has adopted. We have over 12 of them here in Suffolk County out of the State's 45 worksheets that we go on and do evaluations of what's happening on farms to help them improve their operations and lessen their adverse impacts on the environment.

*Beeper Sounded*

Your passage of revised Article 8, the Farmland Program and Legislator Krupski's proposed 1645 resolution will give our remaining farms here some long-needed economic support and I urge your support of that. Thank you very much.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, George. All right. Michael Gendron, and on deck is Eugene Murphy it looks like.

**MR. GENDRON:**

My name is Michael Gendron, I'm the Executive Vice-President with CWA, Local 1108. I wish to thank Presiding Officer Horsley for the opportunity to speak, along with the members of the Suffolk County Legislature.

I'm here to thank Legislator Browning for introducing Resolution 1718 which would help one of our long-time members, Steve Durkin, and his family remain in their family home. Steven and his wife Maryann were the proud grandparents of a beautiful baby girl, Cassidy {Safula}. The birth of their granddaughter brought with her great excitement and dreams of her future. Unfortunately, young Cassidy was born with many severe medical ailments and she lived most of her short life with the Durkins. Steven and Maryann provided for her and supported her, paying for a substantial portion of her medical bills with the hope that one day she would get better. Tragically, Cassidy passed away in 2009 at the age of three. Steven and Maryann were overwhelmed with the responsibility and the grief that her passing put their family through. As a result, the Durkins failed to pay their property taxes. Steven and Maryann have since paid back the taxes, but unfortunately they missed the deadline. Resolution 1718 would extend the deadline for a Section 215 redemption and allow the Durkins to stay in their family home.

The Durkins have endured a horrible ordeal and I am pleading with you not to make it worse by allowing them to lose their family home. So I hope that you can help a dedicated member of CWA and a proud long-time resident of Mastic by supporting and passing IR 1718. I want to thank you for your time and your consideration. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you, Michael. All right. On deck is Eugene Murphy, and on deck from on deck is Jane -- Janet Walerstein.

**MR. MURPHY:**

Honorable Legislators, Presiding Supervisor Horsley, good morning. My name is Gene Murphy. I have been the representative of the Town of Islip on the Suffolk County Farmland Committee since the year 2000. I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak in support of Resolution 1465, a Charter Law to strengthen farmland and open space in Suffolk County.

The preservation of over 10,000 acres of farmland, since its inception almost 40 years ago, has emerged a quality of life that Suffolk County residents, farmers, businessmen and visitors from elsewhere who were surprised and thrilled to discover a way of life they often don't expect to find on Long Island. As an Islip resident, the preservation of Loughlin Vineyards in Sayville and Brightwaters Farms made possible by this program has preserved an important facet of our town's heritage. The farms of Riverhead, North and South Forks, first and foremost, preserved the livelihoods of the oldest way of life in Suffolk County.

The proposed revisions of Chapter 8 represent a thoughtful and balanced response to opportunities and threats to the farming community. The revisions aim to provide more efficient administration of the program and greater latitude for activities which compliment farming, while exposing more people to this resource. Some of the specific revisions which achieve these objectives include the

delegation of the review and issuance of most routine activities, such as deer fencing and irrigation to the staff of the Division of Planning and Development. This reduces the cost and delay to get permits for such improvements which are essential to a farm's viability. Expanding the size and type of the sales of farmland, farm stands, while permitting year-round farm stand use recognizes the benefits to both farmer and customer from this increasingly popular activity.

Provisions seek to reinforce other positive trends by permitting limited on-farm processing of products grown on-site, by encouraging agritourism, by allowing activities such as you-pick, crop mazes, hay rides and educational tours. The persistent problem of preserved farmland not being used for agricultural production is addressed by a prohibition that for more than two consecutive seasons of not being grown, action would be taken. This provision is essential, perhaps more than any other, to preserve the integrity of the program. Each of these and the other proposed revisions are the fruit of an extensive analysis and discussion of both the impact and unintended consequences. Director Lansdale, Augie Ruckdeshel and Council Tom Young are to be commended for their expertise, hard work and openness to the recommendations that the Farmland Committee made to them. These provisions, by providing more opportunities for compatible use of the farmland, stronger enforcement and streamlined administration will make a good program even better. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Gene. Janet Walerstein, and on deck is Randall Parsons.

**MS. WALERSTEIN:**

Good morning. My name is Janet Walerstein and I'm the Executive Director of the Child Care Council of Suffolk. And I have to say that it's a pleasure to be here this morning because the Long Island Ducks once honored our agency and I threw out the first ball and I have it, and I also sat in that dance studio 40 years ago when the Cinema Arts Center first opened with the sheet hanging on the wall. And so it was a very pleasurable experience this morning to hear all of that.

But it is also my extreme pleasure this morning to speak with you today to strongly support the appointment of interim Department of Social Services Commissioner John O'Neal for Commissioner of Department of Social Services, and I understand you are deliberating on that today. I've worked with him and found him to be a supportive leader for those needing human services. He also heard our concerns for child care, about the eligibility for child care services, and worked to expand the percentage. If you -- if you know, we -- the percentage for eligibility had gone down to a hundred percent of poverty, which excluded most people from child care subsidy. It was raised to 125, and John O'Neal came in and supported 150% of poverty. We are still far short of our 200% and 275% that we originally had, but he is working very diligently toward that.

He's also been supportive on the State level, voicing our issues that are being squeezed by the State -- by the State allocation to Suffolk. All that being said, there are some differences that we have had and he has made his case convincingly. So I enthusiastically support John O'Neal for Commissioner of the Department of Social Services and I thank you all for the support for the Child Care Council as well. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Janet. And thank you for coming down here for the mention of support. Randall Parsons, and on deck is Nanci Dallaire.

**MR. PARSONS:**

Legislator Horsley, members of the Legislature, thank you for entertaining our comments. I'm here to speak in favor of Resolution 1916 for the DeForest Williams acquisition. In the same way that our doctors tell us we need exercise and a good diet and rest, Suffolk County needs its Open Space

Program and its Farmland Program to stay healthy, and we applaud you for bringing this resolution to a vote today. I'm feeling optimistic; it got out of the EPA Committee unanimously with Al Krupski, and we compliment Legislator Spencer.

I wanted you to know that we -- The Nature Conservancy who I'm representing does have some skin in the game. We're going to put -- we're going to provide \$225,000 to the North Shore Land Alliance toward their private fundraising campaign. So I hope we can all work together to protect this great piece of property in Huntington. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you, Randall. Nanci Dallaire, and on deck is Jennifer Juengst.

**MS. DALLAIRE:**

Thank you. The Philippines typhoon is the latest reminder of just how ill-prepared we are against the forces of nature. It raises my concerns about how prepared Suffolk County is to face our next superstorm. Sadly, many lives were lost, not because millions of people were not donating and contributing to their needs, but because those lifesaving supplies could not be delivered. It's difficult with each tragedy we learn that we cannot foresee every obstacle. When roads are gone and people are stranded, we are rendered helpless. We may be capable of upgrading communications and acquiring more Humvees, but reality teaches us we will not always be able to reach all areas and people will not always be saved when disaster strikes. Our local lessons, of course, were Hurricane Sandy, which we are still trying to recover from, and that winter blizzard that paralyzed this County. What have we learned? What is the backup plan when the rescuers need rescuing? When there are plenty of supplies but the roadways are impassable and dangerous weather has made deliveries impossible, then what?

For me, this storm was further evidenced that emergencies happen in emergencies. When hospitals are flooded and their lifesaving equipment is rendered useless, what then? I realize we will not be able to predict every problem. We may not surmount every obstacle, but we can be as prepared as possible. Yet in this age of preparedness, our County abolishes our proven emergency evacuation center by closing John J. Foley. Although the County claims that they could not rehabilitate this facility, this facility is still a state-of-the-art building, capable of operating FEMA's command center when the next disaster strikes this County. I do not want to discount the efforts made by the County since Sandy. I'm grateful for the seven Humvees that will now rescue and evacuate hard-to-reach residents next time, but I must question where exactly will those residents be evacuated? How far will they need to be transported to safety? The County believes they are better prepared for the next storm, but remember, the shelter and support of John J. Foley in Yaphank is no longer available. So where will the County evacuate Mastic Beach next time? What's their backup plan? Vulnerable residents deserve to know.

I believe the reckless decision to close John J. Foley has left this community at risk. And without these resources, too many fragile citizens will be put in danger unnecessarily. And I will continue to pursue these answers before it's too late, because we may have been lucky so far but we will be hit by another powerful storm and I fear Suffolk County is not prepared.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Nanci. Jennifer Juengst? Jennifer, I'm sorry if I mispronounced your name before.

**MS. JUENGST:**

*(Laughter)* you're not the only one.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay.

**MS. JUENGST:**

Good morning, everybody, Presiding Officer and the Legislators. I know that you've heard a lot of support here today for IR 1700, but I am actually here to ask you to table it. You have a couple of hours to think about it and my reasons are as follows, and it's based on information that came to me recently.

It's simply not ready at this point in time for a vote that's intended to be taken later today. And some symptomology of the problem is that this long-standing protective device for farmland has undergone extraordinary changes three times in the last three years, and that signals a problem, for me that raises a red flag that the program -- that people are uncertain about where the program is going, that the public probably doesn't understand where the program is going, that the public hasn't been asked and that the major stakeholders haven't been properly asked. I was recently contacted by a couple of farmers who do not agree with 1700, they feel these changes are going to undermine five, six, seven generations of how they've been farming their land. They have PDR land, they've been complying with the law, it's been a difficult business for them, but they feel to now introduce retail provisions into this law is a mistake, because it's going to divert their attention from what they're doing to comply to keep this land in the condition that we need it to be in which is nutritious soil, clean water to grow food, that's the intent of Chapter 8. It's not an economic driver. It's not that economic driver, it shouldn't be called into play at this time. Farming has changed, the environmentalists acknowledge that, but Chapter 8 is not the place to do it. We need to put the breaks on a little while longer. The Department of Economic Development has a Division of Planning that's been holding meetings, five meetings were scheduled, only two have been held. I was at the first one and there were some very unhappy farmers and vineyard owners in that audience, and those voices haven't been heard yet. You've only been hearing from the special interests who have been telling you that this is where farming is going. We don't know that. I understand that a \$50,000 grant was awarded to the County to figure out how to do a new farmland plan to preserve, we need to finish that. Hold these next three meetings, find out from all the farmers where they stand, because their voices are more critically important. They're not thinking five or ten years down the road about retail, they're thinking about the next three or four generations they intended to keep in farming. We need a hundred-year plan, not a five-year plan. This is a big component of Suffolk County's economy and it needs to be taken more seriously than it's being taken now. So all I'm asking you today, put the breaks on. There's no rush, there's no need to rule on this today or to have a vote on these small components today about retail. We need to look at it in a more wholistic fashion and get all the players involved, including the public which knows next to nothing about what's intended to happen today. So thank you very much. Have a good day.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you, Jennifer. The next speaker is Jane Jackson, and on deck is Kimberly Quarty.

**MS. JACKSON:**

Good morning. I'm a member of the Huntington Oyster Bay Audubon Society, HOBAS, which works with Long Islanders to conserve wildlife and its habitat and I am here to speak in support of the DeForest Williams Property acquisition.

One of the last remaining intact estates on the North Shore of Long Island, the DeForest Williams property, includes mature, hardwood forest and is home to a wide variety of native plants and animals.

***(THE FOLLOWING WAS TAKEN AND TRANSCRIBED BY  
LUCIA BRAATEN - COURT REPORTER)***

**MS. JACKSON:**

There is potential for discovery for vernal or ephemeral pools, a natural community that is increasingly being lost to development, and supports many amphibian and insect species, many of which are in decline. Eastern box turtles, a New York State watch list species, have been observed on the property, and at least three State-protected plants have been documented there under a lush and healthy tree canopy.

Williams has several trails which may eventually provide connectivity to the northern trailhead of the Nassau/Suffolk County Greenbelt Trail. This corridor of undeveloped land benefits Long Island's human residents and wildlife alike.

While biological surveys of the property have been somewhat limited due to restricted access thus far, some evaluations have revealed a variety of birds, including the Scarlet Tanager, one of a number of neotropical migrant species that HOBAS can't wait to document next spring when our surveys will confirm the properties importance as breeding and stopover habitat for migratory song birds and other species.

We also look forward to working with the preserve owners and community residents on possible habitat enhancement activities, such as installation of a hummingbird garden or a butterfly garden, whose milkweed would nourish the iconic monarch butterfly and other pollinators.

Finally, the property lies at the edge of the Oyster Bay area, important bird area, which is one of the state's 136 such sites designated by Bird Life International, National Audubon and their partners, because they support bird species at risk, or assemblages of bird species for which New York State is responsible for their long-term conservation, and/or are sites where large numbers of birds congregate, such as are many, many, many thousands of winter water fowl.

Just above Cold Spring Harbor, which is also designated significant coastal fish and wildlife habitat, an intact Deforest Williams preserve will help to ensure the continued quality of this habitat.

Many thanks to the Suffolk County Legislators who have worked so hard on this project.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Jane. I'd like to make a motion to extend the Public Hearing. It is now 11:00.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Portion, Public Portion. Seconded by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? Public Portion has been extended.

Okay. The next speaker is Kimberly Quarty and --

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Ten.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

We got 10, right?

**MS. ORTIZ:**

No. Actually, we only have nine.

(Legislator Nowick Entered the Auditorium)

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Ten.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

You got me, Renee?

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Yeah.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. They're streaming in. We're good, though. Kimberly, welcome. And on deck is Melanie Cirillo.

**MS. QUARTY:**

Good morning. My name is Kimberly Quarty. I'm with Peconic Land Trust, and I'm here today to support two of the resolutions before you, 1465, to strengthen farmland and open space preservation in Suffolk County.

The existing Open Space and Farmland Acquisition Programs are currently among the most successful land preservation programs in the nation, with the Farmland Preservation Program successfully protecting over 10,000 acres of farmland, which has helped to farm land as a viable industry in our County. We recognize this resolution as a way to bring parity to the program, as it will ensure that only the most highly rated parcels are targeted for acquisition.

We're also here to support Resolution 1700, the amendment of Chapter 8 revisions governing the County's Farmland PDR Program, and I'm here today to support this and ask, too, that you don't table this today. These proposed revisions are, as Herb Strobel had mentioned, very modest revisions to support the economic viability of farming. It's a voluntary program, and we have had over 40 meetings over the past two years with farmers. We invited all the farmers in the program, as well as the County met with all the townships in the County to discuss this, so there's been several meetings where all parties were invited, all parties were heard, and there's been input from everyone.

As I said, this is a voluntary program. It will affect PDR easements that only state as amended, and they are typically from 1992 and on, but these proposed revisions will allow for some aspects that are important; that with today's farming trends, such as agri-tourism, limited processing, and modification of farm stand regulations, and possibly, most importantly, is the prohibition, which was previously mentioned for abandonment of agricultural use, which is a huge problem, especially on the South Fork, where we're seeing realtors and developers bundling these preserved lands with spec homes, taking this land out of production, making it inaccessible and unaffordable to farmers.

So we really need this legislation to go forward today. I ask that you support this, as we need it to conserve and protect viable farmlands and active agricultural operations that will serve current and future generations of the County residents. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Kimberly. Melanie Cirillo, and on deck is Robert Hughes.

**MS. CIRILLO:**

Hello. I'm Melanie Cirillo, Director of Conservation Planning at Peconic Land Trust. The Trust is here

to support Resolution 1465, sponsored by Legislator Krupski, to strengthen farmland protection in Suffolk County. The County should bridge the gap with the disparity between what public money is spent on open space versus farmland.

It is so important that we work diligently to protect farmland, some of the best agricultural soil in the country, so it's available and affordable to farmers now and in the future. It goes hand in hand with the trust farms for the future initiative.

Our population needs to be fed. It's a very real thing for us to see more and more farmland go out of food production each year. Every week we get a phone call from a farmer asking how they can afford to expand their operation, or continue farming when real estate value pressures are working against them, or rules and regulations that are not current with the farming developments of our time make it harder to make a living. We get as creative as we can to meet their needs and use many tools.

Resolution 1465 is important so that farmland protection is valued equitably in Suffolk County, and the revisions to Chapter 8 will make the County's Farmland Protection Plan better for the agricultural community.

The timing of these revisions is important, because Legislator Krupski knows firsthand the time is now to work with farmers to foster farming, so that farmland is available to feed Suffolk County's growing population.

Jennifer mentioned that we need a hundred-year plan, but that's really not practical. The Chapter 8 revisions address current concerns, because farming is changing and adapting. The County Farmland Protection Plan is responsive to that, and will have to change and adapt to agriculture, because it really is so integral to Suffolk County's economy. Thank you for your support.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Melanie. Robert Hughes, and on deck is Dick Amper.

**MR. HUGHS:**

Good morning. My name is Robert Hughes. I am the President of Eagle Dock Foundation in Cold Spring Harbor. Eagle Dock is a community beach open to all the residents of Cold Spring Harbor.

The beach was founded in 1948 when local residents, led by Priscilla Williams, purchased two acres of waterfront property to protect it from development, and made it available to the children and other residents of Cold Spring Harbor as a playground and bathing beach. Mrs. Williams then donated additional property in 1986 on the condition that it be forever wild. It is appropriate that we are now here to talk about acquiring the rest of Mrs. Williams' property uphill from the beach property.

We have recently expanded our mission to concentrate on the health of the our marine environment and educate our residents about the importance of that marine environment. Protecting this land, as you have heard, will not only be good for the hardwood forest and the birds that live there, but it will also protect the marine environment in Cold Spring Harbor and Long Island Sound, which, of course, is very important and very much under threat.

So I encourage you to support the acquisition of the Priscilla Williams DeForest property. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Robert. Dick Amper, and on deck is Syma Gerard.

**MR. AMPER:**

I'm sorry we didn't hear the impersonation of Dick Amper on the part of Joe Gergela. I'm among the people here who think that more than one of us is enough, probably, but it could have been entertaining, and I'm sorry. Bring him back for that performance.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Having the both of you up here might be interesting, too. I mean, we can do a little mud wrestling.

*(Laughter)*

**MR. AMPER:**

Well, you know, and we have worked so closely with the farm community from the time the quarter penny was approved by 84% of the voters, that I'm just a little bit troubled about how this is sort of splitting off a little bit, just about the time we get to the serious problems of water quality and contamination from pesticides and fertilizers, and I think we can do both. So let's decide where we are on both of these things.

On 1465, you've gotten a memo from Citizens Campaign. That's the group of people that are working on the water that everybody on Long Island drinks. They're joined by the Pine Barrens Society and the Group for the East End opposing this measure. The implication here is that farming isn't getting the same concern or consideration from this body. You can count on the fingers of one hand the number of applications for farming development rights that have been turned down by this Legislature in the last 30 years. It's just not a problem. We're just saying if it ain't broke, don't fix it.

The other thing that is being implied, I take some offense to, is that at least 16 of you are from districts that are not farm districts, and the implication is that your acquisitions are somehow less important, that the overwhelming majority of the members of Suffolk County, of the voters of Suffolk County put up this money exclusively for something out on the East End. This would reduce the competitiveness of your parcels unnecessarily. Are they suggesting that we're buying the wrong parcels in your district or in yours? I just don't see that there is a problem here. We've worked with the farm community for years and there's no reason now to change the rules to favor one over the other when there is not a farm that seeking purchase that we're not purchasing. And to simply then lower the -- or increase the requirement for other acquisitions is not what the legislation intended, and it doesn't benefit the people in your districts or the people of Long Island as a whole.

With respect to 1700, we are not opposing. Same group, Group for the East End, Long Island -- Long Island Pine Barrens Society, and also Citizens Campaign are asking you to do this. We need to consider, at the same time we're trying to advance farmland and make it more useful to farmers, what the implication is on water quality. You have your own County studies showing that the greatest contamination from fertilizers and pesticides is coming in part necessarily from the agriculture community. Why shouldn't we be looking at how to solve that problem in addition to how to advance farming at the same time? That's gotten short shrift. So we're not opposing 1700, we're asking you to table it. We're asking you to allow the other considerations that are associated with the Drinking Water Protection Program and the Farmland Preservation Program to be considered collectively so that we can come back to the days when the farmers and the environmentalists were all on the same page, supporting one another's acquisitions and trying to advance the protection of drinking water at the same time.

Usually we don't call for inaction. We're not calling for inaction, we're calling for more collective action so that we can reconcile these competing Long Island needs. We're asking to table 1700 and to defeat 1465.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Dick. Syma Gerard, and on deck is Michael Finland.

**MS. GERARD:**

Good morning. My name is Syma Gerard. I'm a businesswoman. I'm a real estate broker for over 45 years, and for the last 18 years I've been working exclusively on the East End on land projects, and I'm here really to give you a slightly different perspective on how these laws -- I'm here in support of both 1465 and 1700, how these laws affect people from a slightly different perspective. But I would like to respond to a comment made just a few minutes earlier from one of those people who would like the bills tabled.

And I believe to assume that agriculture must remain as it has always been in a society in the midst of enormous change in all other ways is to further cripple an already distressed industry.

But let me tell you a little bit about the area. As someone who's hired by local farmers to sell their farms, and someone who works with people who hope to buy these properties, I'd like to tell you a bit about who the folks who will be most affected by the decisions you make on the proposed changes to Chapter 8. These are people who either already have chosen to protect their land, who are considering it, or who are looking to purchase such land. Because of the immensely important previous work of this body, this region remains an area of rural beauty and economic vitality, and one way that is shown is the number of farm-focused owners and buyers has substantially increased over recent years. There's a growing interest in living as a farmer.

In my work on the North Fork, I don't see many of the wealthy buyers who want to scarf up these farms and convert them into private estates, a type seen much more often on the South Fork in the Hamptons. With some of these recommended changes, particularly the requirement that land must be kept in farming or the owner is subject to penalties, perhaps even the South Fork will see a lot less of those.

Many current farmers have been here for years, even for generations. They're people whose families want to remain in farming. Now some of their children are getting agricultural degrees instead of going off to the city to become stockbrokers, and, by the way, there are a lot of those. These changes to the code will help these farm families survive economically. For others, those whose kids have gone off elsewhere, they hope that whoever buys their property will be able to continue it in farming. And there's a very strong emotional attachment that these people have to the land, it's very important to them.

Among potential buyers, I see many young people, sometimes from current farming families, where there are too many kids who want to continue and too little land in the family. Others, however, either from the Island or elsewhere, are people who grew up on farms, who created other careers in business, but now often many of them are newly married. They want to return to the lifestyle that they loved. They want to give up that opportunity to their own kids.

Your support of these well-thought-out changes to Chapter 8 of the code will dramatically increase the ability of these farmers and prospective farmers to live on Long Island and thrive. When they thrive, so will our regional economy. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you, Ms. Gerard. Before Michael -- come on up, Mike -- I just want to remind the Legislators there'll be a photo taken of all 17 Legislators promptly at 12:30 p.m. today. So that's my little notice.

Michael, welcome.

**MR. FINLAND:**

Thank you. Good morning, everyone. As you know, I am Michael Finland, Executive Vice President, Suffolk County AME. I'm here today because I wish to garner your support for I.R. 1966.

I just want to take a few moments and stress the valuable points to this agreement. It will pose a modest wage increase for our collective workforce. The most important component of this contractual agreement is that it contains a no-layoff clause. And I just want to state that with regard to the clause, our legal team at AME researched this extensively just to ensure the solid at this of the no layoff clause. In the midst of our current economic climate this agreement will provide job security for our workforce. The overall package is fiscally prudent, and will not negatively impact the County budget in moving forward.

I just want to state that I'm very, very proud of our workforce, and I believe that the workforce is absolutely deserving of this agreement. And in the midst of things, I'm working on different projects. We have recently launched a new public relations campaign for AME to promote the workforce. And I want to commend the diverse workforce. We have over 800 civil service titles that we represent as a union. And, again, I want to commend the workforce, the services that they provide on a daily basis. And in using the motto of our new public relations campaign, that is, "I Am AME," the workforce, the backbone of Suffolk County government.

I wish to again garner your support for I.R. 1966, and I thank you for your time.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Michael, thank you very much for coming down here today, and congratulations on an agreement.

**MR. FINLAND:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

E. James Freeman.

**MR. FREEMAN:**

Good morning, Legislators.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Welcome.

**MR. FREEMAN:**

My name is E. James Freeman. I'm President of the Greater Gordon Heights Civic Association. I'm also one of the Chairs of the Gordon Heights Clerical Council, a Council made up of pastors in the Gordon Heights community. And we are here, basically, to affirm and to support DSS Director John O'Neill to be confirmed today. I'm also able to speak on behalf of the Rosa Parks Democratic Club, the Gordon Heights Fire District, and also the Gordon Heights Chamber of Commerce as well, all of which their Boards support having Director O'Neill come in as Director, a permanent Director of the Department of Social Service.

Real briefly, we started a council, the Clerical Council, roughly seven months ago in the Gordon Heights community, and we started meeting up at Town Hall. One of the first persons we reached out to was Legislator Rob Calarco, who has been a member and has been a part of our Council meetings regarding illegal dwellings in the Gordon Heights community for the past seven months. Over the course of those seven months, we also reached out to the former DSS Director. After repeated requests of having to try and have him come out and sit and discuss things that were going on in the community, that Director never showed up, not one single time. With Director

O'Neill, we put out one request when he came out as the Interim Director of the Department of Social Service. On that first request, he showed up to a meeting. To that meeting, there was a roomful of people who -- let's just say it may have been a little hostile in the beginning, environment that he was walking into, a lion's den, in a sense, but he came in very calm, very astutely, and he spoke very openly about what was going on within the community and also within the Department of Social Service.

Over the course of that seven months, we've been able to build a very productive relationship with many members throughout the Council and the Director of the Social Service Department. Just to give you a couple of examples of just the people that we've been working with, like I said Legislator Rob Calarco, Connie Keppert, Council District 4, Supervisor Ed Romaine, the Assistant Director, Commissioner Risco Mention-Lewis. We've also reached out to Pax Christie, the Department of Labor, John Sarno, and many, many other individuals from other departments we've been able to reach out to.

And just some of the accomplishments that we've been able to do by having Director O'Neill sit in on those council meetings, we've actually over seven months been able to reduce the violent crimes in our community by 50%, petit larcenies by 36%. We've actually built a relationship with the Department of the DEA, ATF and the FBI to where we reach out into the community and address the drug issues that have been going on in the community as well, and we built a strong relationship with them, and the Director has been a great part of that.

Just one real quick example, also, is we had one home that had 36 individuals living in the home. We were able to decrease that living condition down to four, and we were able to place those individuals in drug programs, and also provide them with jobs, and also put them in better living conditions. And now, over a two-block radius from where that home is, children weren't able to come out and play, parents, when they came in, they locked their doors and there was no community activity. Now you have children playing outside. You have people who are active in the community who are doing things, and a lot of that is in part because the Director has been there. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much. We appreciate you coming down. And congratulations on your progress, it sounds great.

**MR. FREEMAN:**

Thank you. You want a second one?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

We've got -- unless you want to fill out another card.

**MR. FREEMAN:**

No, this is good.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

We're good?

**MR. FREEMAN:**

Thank you. Okay. That concludes the cards that I have in front of me. Would anyone else like to speak? Would anyone else like to speak? Would anyone else like to speak? Okay. With that, I'll make a motion to close the Public Hearing, second by Legislator Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. Okay. A couple of quick notice --

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Reminders again. The photo taken of all 17 Legislators promptly at 12:30. And secondly, from the esteemed Mr. Bodkin, he wants to, and rightfully so, let us all know that today is the 150th Anniversary of the Gettysburg Address, and we appreciate him bringing that to our attention.

All right. The first piece of business, we'll move to the Consent Calendar. I'll make a motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Are we going to take Mr. O'Neill out of order?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yeah. I'm going to take Mr. Giordano first, though. Okay. Legislator -- we're going to move to the resolutions on Page 11. Okay. Why don't we -- I've got a couple of folks that have been hanging around the morning, and we would like to work with their schedules. And the first of them, Legislator Gregory, you want to make a -- take a motion to take something out of order?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes. Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. I would like to -- if you go to Page 11 in the agenda under Economic Development, we have Mr. Tony Giordano, who is here for the appointment to the IDA Board, as well as the Economic -- Suffolk County Economic Development Council -- excuse me, Corporation. So I would ask that we take out of order -- do I have to, Counsel, just one a time?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Okay. Take out of the order ***I.R. 1887(Appointing Anthony Giordano as a member of the Suffolk County Industrial Development Agency (IDA) (Horsley).***

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Stern. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. 1887 is now taken out of

order.

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy/Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Mr. Gregory, would you like Mr. Giordano to come up or --

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Sure.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

I know he's been in front of the committee.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Sure.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Why don't we get a motion on the floor?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

I'd like to make a motion to approve.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Make a motion to approve, second by Legislator Stern. There's a motion to approve. Any other motions? Okay.

Mr. Giordano? Is there any questions of Mr. Giordano. Okay. Let's just vote it.

All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been approved.

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy/Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. ***1950(Appointing Anthony Giordano as a Director of the Suffolk County Economic Development Corporation (Horsley).*** We'll make a motion, Mr. Gregory?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes. I'd like to make a motion on 1950, to take it out of order as well.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Seconded by Legislator Stern. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. We have taken it out of order.

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy/Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

On the motion, you want to make a motion, Legislator Gregory?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

I make a motion to approve I.R. 1950.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. There's a motion on the floor, second by Legislator Stern. Any other motions? We're all good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been approved.

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy/Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Mr. Giordano, congratulations, and welcome aboard, and thank you for your service on behalf of all the Legislators in Suffolk County.

**MR. GIORDANO:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. The second appointment that we had requested to take out of order is for 1962, which is Page 14 in Human Services, 1962.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I'll second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Everybody -- okay. Well, Legislator Browning, you want to make a motion to take it out of order?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Sure. I'll make the motion to take 1962 out of order.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Second by Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. We're taking it out of order. Let's have a motion on the -- Legislator Browning, do you want to do that?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I'd like to make that motion to approve 1962.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Seconded by Legislator Schneiderman; Browning/Schneiderman. Okay.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

On the motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

On the motion, Legislator Gregory first, and then Kennedy.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes. Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. I want to state for the record that Mr. O'Neill has been the Deputy Commissioner under the former Commissioner. He has stepped up to the plate as the Acting Commissioner, and he is -- I mean, there aren't enough words to really describe his abilities. He's a terrific -- I think he'll be a terrific appointment. He certainly understands the inner workings of the Department and the -- and all the complexities that it entails, and he's always looking out for creative ways to generate revenues, as well as efficiencies within the various Departments. And I think he is the perfect man for the job, particularly during the times that we are facing now. He is -- he's a money -- he's a walking money-saving machine, an efficiency expert, and we need more like him, and I fully support his nomination.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

A walking money-saving machine. I like it.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Remorseless.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

As Counsel notes, he's remorseless. I like that, that's great. Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to commend the Commissioner for having made his office accessible to my Legislative District, and I do intend to vote him today. I do just want to say for the record, I remain vehemently opposed to the homeless housing shelter solution put forward by the Administration with the adoption of the mega-shelters, but I don't necessarily believe that that's the particular decision on the part of the Commissioner.

As far as operations of the Department, I applaud you, and I want to be able to continue to speak with you directly about remedying that item that I have put forward as a violation of our Administrative Code. But that notwithstanding, you, as a Director, are doing a good job and I believe that you deserve a full term. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator Kennedy. Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Thank you. I just wanted to echo the comments. And, honestly, we don't usually get people from the community here to support an appointment for Commissioner, let alone one for Social Services. Usually, they get vilified one way or the other, and that's a real testament to what John's been able to do. He has been nothing but an asset to my community. He's been at every one of our meetings, not just for the Gordon Heights community, but also for the North Bellport community, to make sure that Social Services really meeting its charge, which is taking care of those who are most in need and giving them an ability to get a step up and get back on their own two feet, and that's really what he makes as his main mission in the Department. He saves us quite a bit of money, and he does it -- Counsel said remorseless, but I don't think that's quite accurate. I think he cares quite

a bit and he shows that in his actions, so I'll be supporting him.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. "Remorseless and," that's nice. Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I'd like to, you know, throw my support behind Mr. O'Neill. Coming from where I came from, I really didn't have much experience in DSS at all, so it was kind of a blank page for me. I met with Mr. O'Neill a couple of times and on specific and generic issues on how the Department runs. And every time he's come before this body and every time I've met him privately, I've been really impressed by his knowledge and his willingness to work for everybody in the County. He's really shown a -- I'm going to go with relentless here -- pursuit of doing a better job of running an enormous department with so many different responsibilities with so many moving parts. I've been very impressed with them, and I'm really -- I'll be really proud to support him.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator Krupski. Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

John, I've had the pleasure of working with you from the time you came in as the Deputy Commissioner. And I'm very happy to support you because you're coming in at a tough time; the economy, a major increase in homelessness, and you do it with a lot of compassion, but you're also, I will say, a very strong fiscal watchdog for Suffolk County taxpayers and their dollars. And, again, we talk about Safety Net and the fact that you've realized that with the State cuts what it's doing to the taxpayers here in Suffolk. And I appreciate all your hard work and what you've done.

What Rob just said is, you know, the Gordon Heights residents, you showed up when they formed their committee. Bellport did the same thing and you're there. So you're -- I don't know how you do it, because it's a tough job, and it's not a popular Department, but, like I said, you do it with a lot of compassion, and, like I said, the fiscal watchdog that you are, our Department will become a better Social Services Department under your watch. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator Browning. Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Again, I also want to thank you for helping in my District. You know, this is one of the most challenging departments we have here in Suffolk County, and, you know, John, you have a very big job ahead of you, but with your knowledge and understanding the fiscal dollars, but also understanding that we have to support those in need. You know, and the military phrase is "We are only as strong as our weakest link," and if you don't help those in need, Suffolk County will not be strong. But we have to be a watchdog and you're a very good watchdog.

I just wanted to mention, you know, I read the book, a former employee here, by Regina Calcaterra, *Etched in Sand*, and it was a very heart-wrenching novel. And I don't know if you've read it; I suggest you read it. It's about the fault of our Social Service Department. We can do -- you know, we can do better than that, than what she, what Regina experienced, and I know we are experiencing improvement.

Please, you know, feel free to reach out to our -- to the Legislators here today, to the community that's there, we had Gordon Heights here this morning, and to -- you know, the people here to help support those in need.

So, again, thank you, John, and I look forward to working with you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator Anker. Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. Let me start by applauding the County Executive for bringing this appointment forward. It's always nice to see a promotion from within. And there's no doubt in my mind that Mr. O'Neill -- I want to say Commissioner O'Neill, that will be clearly the case soon, is a superbly qualified individual. And I've had numerous occasions where I've gone to visit Mr. O'Neill. He's been extremely responsive, extremely accessible, not only a real nuts-and-bolts manager, but also a very compassionate Director, as has been -- as I echo what the other Legislators have said, we are seeing a surge in homelessness, approaching 600 families in Suffolk County. Social Services and the many responsibilities they have is clearly one of the most important functions of County government. It is extremely complex, a difficult large department to manage, and Mr. O'Neill has demonstrated that he has the capability of doing that. So I'm going to just join the chorus of support. I think this is a great appointment and I'm looking forward to working with you as Commissioner.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator Schneiderman. Legislator Montano.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Thank you. I just want to echo the comments that were made by Legislator Kennedy. I've met with the nominee numerous times and I will support the appointment.

In my dealings with the prospective Commissioner, or soon to be Commissioner, he's been very professional, he's been very courteous, he's given me all the information that I've requested, and I consider him a true professional. However, I am, and he knows this, we have had numerous discussions, I am adamantly opposed to the decision that was made by the Department to place the homeless -- 400 homeless families in a motel where eight people are sharing two rooms without kitchen facilities, with simply a microwave, in an area where there is no ability for people to walk down the street, there are no sidewalks there.

And, as Legislator Kennedy said, while you -- you know, you've been referred to, what, as a money-saving machine? I understand that we have fiscal problems, but saving money at what expense, to have people live in conditions that I find deplorable. I've been to that facility. And I don't blame you for that decision. I know that that decision was not made from you, it came from -- I blame the Administration for placing that there. I've said that publicly before and I will say it again today, and I will say it for as long as I am able to. And my hope is that that situation will be rectified.

But, as a term, I believe that the Social Services Commissioner serves a term; am I correct, Counsel?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay. As a term employee, I would hope that you would revisit that. You are a fine individual. You've got excellent background, excellent credentials, you know what you're doing. It's been a pleasure working with you. I do support you, but I am really adamantly, as I said, abhorred by what conditions the people are living in that particular facility. And, you know, I visited that facility one

day, went in there, and the bathroom facilities weren't even working, you had kids walking in the lobby, and I think that's something that really needs to be looked at. So I hope that during your term you look at that very carefully and that you rectify that. Thank you very much, and congratulations.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator Montano. Legislator Spencer?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I wanted to, again, add my support also behind the new Commissioner, and I didn't have a chance during that particular committee I don't serve on, and I was wondering, through the Chair, if I could ask a couple of questions?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Sure, absolutely.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Could you come forward, please?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Deputy Commissioner. Is it Deputy? Director?

**LEG. HAHN:**

Acting.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Acting? Prospective.

**ACTING COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

Good morning.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Welcome, Mr. O'Neill.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Good morning. Mr. O'Neill, you've done the position as Deputy and our Interim. I know that it's a very large Department, and just for the future, I'm curious to hear your thoughts about the Deputy position. Do you -- would you need a Deputy, or is it something -- have you had any discussion or thoughts about that?

**ACTING COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

Yes, I will need a Deputy. I will look to hire from within, I'm a big believer in that, and I do have some candidates in mind from my current staff.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Okay. Thank you. And the other question that I had, I know of your work, and I appreciate what you've done. Now that you are, I guess, imminently going to sit in the Commissioner's position, I'd just like to know, in your words, what is the biggest challenge that you see for that Department and for this Legislature; what do you need from us to support you?

**ACTING COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

The biggest challenges going forward for the Department is the rapidly changing landscape. There is a Medicaid transition undergoing from New York State. Concurrently with that, as Legislator

Browning had mentioned earlier, there's -- there was a change made a couple of years ago regarding reimbursement for Safety Net clients, those that have been on public assistance for greater than 60 months, where it's 71% local cost now. It used to be 50% shared, 50-50. So, from that perspective, it makes it very difficult to move forward with programs that you would like. So, as a result of that, it's even more important that operationally we can deliver services more efficiently, and we can get -- transition people from Social Services programs to permanency. That is the key. And the way to do that, quite frankly, is we are locked into State systems. That's just the way DSS works. So we need to make operational improvements around those systems to deliver the services. We need to think differently. For instance, with the homeless families, we are looking to segment them out for Safety Net singles and Safety Net families. We are looking to segment them out and find out what the root cause of their problem, it's a substance abuse problem or mental illness problem. We are going to bring more intensive case management services to those folks and that takes money. However, a small investment up front can save you big dollars on the back end, and there's been -- I won't go into great details, but there have been numerous cost-saving initiatives. And, quite frankly, I couldn't do this without my staff. I have an excellent staff.

But, again, as going forward, efficiency is very important, and rooting out waste, fraud and abuse. Those folks that are entitled to services should get them, they deserve them and they will receive them. However, those folks that are not entitled to them and should not be receiving them, I will actively root out that kind of waste, fraud and abuse of government dollars.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

My last question, and I do appreciate your indulgence and my colleagues' indulgence, with regards to the exchanges and the Affordable Care Plan, I'm familiar with that as the Chair of the Health Committee and also in medical terms, but I know that Medicaid's responsible for a lot of payments for Social Service programs. Have you studied those changes? Are we prepared for -- you know, I guess, as the Affordable Care interacts with Medicaid, do you foresee an expansion of opportunities, or do you see that resources will be taken away from Social Service programs? And what are your plans to kind of be able to deal with these changes?

**ACTING COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

Sure. So the quick little education lesson here regarding Affordable Care Act. New York State has their own exchange, so they're not tied into Federal Exchange that everybody's hearing so much problems about. New York State received funding to create their own Exchange. So a lot of the issues that plague the Federal level and those states that opted to utilize the Federal Affordable Care Act or the Exchange, we're not seeing that in New York State. Having said that, I've been having meetings with my Department for about 11 months now. We meet every other week and we go through what the issues are or what we see coming down the road, the changes, and we're working with the navigators. Those are folks hired by New York State, subcontractors, to implement the Affordable Care Act. I trained roughly 24 people in Social Services to be CACs or Coordinators of Care. So, when folks do come in, we are trained.

We have -- we'll be setting up kiosks in some of our location service centers in advance, and we also have backup plans in different County locations, so that if we did see an influx, we'd be able to handle that influx. Right now, we're not seeing that.

New York State has had a, we refer to many times, as a Cadillac type of Medicaid program, so the expansion will be less impact here in New York State versus other states. So, since October 1st, when the Exchange first opened, we have seen only a slight uptick in applications to get down to the real details.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Thank you, sir. And, again, I'm very supportive of your appointment, and I look forward to working with you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator Spencer. Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Hello. I am thrilled to support your nomination. I just also want to say, as someone who -- and Jack Eddington used to say this all the time, I don't think I say it quite as often, but as a social worker.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

Just a reminder to everyone here of what this Department -- the areas of activity that this Department works in; Child Protective Services, Adult Protective Services, Child Support Enforcement, child care, foster care, so many other areas of grave, grave concern to people's lives. Efficiency is very important, especially now. But I think, given the areas I just described of your work, efficacy is more important. Making choices for efficiency's sake today will not only cost us more dollars later, they could destroy lives in the process, and I think you understand that.

And you're right, your success is built on the incredible strength of your staff. And you do have an incredible group of individuals who are committed to protecting children, protecting vulnerable adults. I saw it as I walked through the offices, and I hope, as you take this position, having risen to it and earned it, that you continue to recognize and see in your staff the passion they have for making a difference in people's lives, and you're able to reward them and continue to educate them on how to do what they do more effectively, and efficiently, but effectively, too, because that's what really matters in the end, is that when we're helping a child, when we're helping a family, when we're helping an elder adult, that we actually do help them, and that we don't harm them in the process of seeking aid.

So I'm very supportive of your appointment, and I look forward to working with you.

**ACTING COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator Hahn. Legislator Barraga.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

I certainly support your appointment, John, and -- but I want to point out one or two things, if I may.

You know, Commissioner of Social Services, that's one of the few positions where it's a designated appointment, I believe, for a period of five years. Just by that very fact that you're appointed and you're in for five years gives you a sense of flexibility and independence that other department heads, for the most part, do not have. Once you're in, you're in. I only thing that up because there'll be a great stress in terms of flexibility as far as the financial versus the need. Certainly, all of us want you to run that Department very efficiently from a fiscal perspective, but there's never ever a good time when it pertains to human services, never a good time. The need is always much greater than the fiscal reality associated with it. And I'm hoping that you're the type of person, and every indication you are, that will bring about a degree of balance between the fiscal and the need, to really sit down with your staff and say, "Look, you know, this is a want versus a need. Go with the needs." At times you may have to spend a little more money in the short term, maybe to save

money in the long-term. And maybe you spend money in the short term and you don't save any money in the long-term, but you still have a more fundamental responsibility to meet the needs of the varied numbers of people who will utilize the services of your agency.

So I think you're the right person for the job. Hopefully, you will do a great job, and if you do, the County Executive will take credit for it, and if you don't, I wish you the very best in your future endeavors.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator Barraga. Would anyone else like to be heard?

All right. We have a motion on the floor to approve and seconded. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Congratulations, Commissioner.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**ACTING COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

Thank you very much, everybody. Thank you, Presiding Officer. It's very appreciated, all the support. Thank you very much.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Mr. Presiding Officer.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes, Dr. Spencer.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I'd like to make a request to take a resolution out of order, if I could.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Sure.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I have some people here that we're doing a partnership with from the Land Alliance and from the Town, and that's Resolution 1916 on Page 12.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Twelve?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes. We have a lot of people that took some time out and wanted to be here, and I think it's gone through committee and should be pretty straightforward.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. We have a motion to take out of order.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

You're welcome. **1916(Authorizing the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (effective December 1, 2007) - open space component - for the Estate of Priscilla De Forest Williams property - Cold Spring Harbor watershed - Town of Huntington (SCTM No. 0400-016.00-02.00-013.004 p/o)(County Executive).** I'll second the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it is 1916, on Page 12 --

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Hahn/Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

-- has been taken out of order. Everybody with us? Okay. For purposes of a motion, Doc Spencer, so you want to do it or --

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I'd like to make a motion to approve.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Very good. There's a --

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

And Legislator Krupski seconds the motion, so Spencer/Krupski. And on the motion?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

On the motion.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

On the motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Everybody --

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

On the motion. Yeah, sure, Doc.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

On the motion. I wanted to again -- you know, in a situation where we're looking at open space acquisitions across the County and with regards to just the critical issue of water protection, that this particular property, I think, could be the template moving forward; that it takes a very valuable piece of property that's a nature preserve that will have an impact on surface waters and also on groundwater. It brings in funds from the Land Alliance, from the Town, and we've got partners that have bought into this that allows us to increase a fund that is very precious in terms of being able to leverage.

This property is the crown jewel. It's backed -- it's one of our Master List properties, and I really think that this is kind of -- when we put this program in place, this is the type of properties it was designed for. So I would urge my colleagues to please approve, if they would.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator. Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you, Presiding Officer. This is a -- this is a parcel that I'm not familiar with, and I might never ever go there, and my children might never ever go there and walk there, but I think it's a very important acquisition.

And I'm going to echo what Doc Spencer said, that this is important, because not only is -- first of all, it's important to the community, but the -- it's important because here's, you know, the North Shore Land Alliance, who has been working on this for 10 years, and who has cobbled together a partnership of government at different levels, and the community, and themselves, and now even the Nature Conservancy is involved there. And I know they've been a good partner in preservation throughout the County, so this isn't anything new to them.

So this is an easy one to support and it is a great example of land preservation being important to a community, and it's going to have a great impact for the people who live in that area.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator. Legislator Montano.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I just had a question, Mr. Spencer. What was the cost factor on this bill, if you know, or maybe Counsel, just to put it on the record?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Go ahead.

**MR. NOLAN:**

It's a six million dollar total --

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Six million?

**MR. NOLAN:**

-- for the acquisition. Our share is half of that, and the rest is being shared by the Town and the North Shore Land Alliance.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

But what's not mentioned there is that the Land Alliance has gone further to make sure that they've purchased more acreage for access point to the property, that they've gone out and they've raised funds on their own to -- I don't have the exact numbers. They're here, they could probably share with us, but they're -- it's over another million dollars that they're raising in addition for -- to purchase even more land than we're getting here. So it's really -- they're all in on this, they have a lot of -- in the game.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. Thank you very much. Is that -- Legislator Montano, are you --

**LEG. MONTANO:**

No, that was it.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

You're good? Okay.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I just wanted to know the cost.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Very good. Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. And not being on the committee, but somewhat familiar with this area, I think it's a good parcel, a valid purchase, and I think something that, you know, is reflective of what we find as west end parcels that we bring forward and have some validity. But just for the sake of knowledge, give me a little bit of the back of the napkin. So we have a total six million dollar purchase price? I'm sorry. Was it six million or three million?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Six.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay, six million total. How many acres? How many developable acres? Do we have a subdivision plan that was on it. Did it have a prospective yield, and how many parcels would have been waterfront?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Certainly. What was going to happen, I think it's like 27.4 acre. I have Sarah here who can give me just the details. But the issue here is that they were looking at a cluster development on this parcel, and it sits kind of at the inlet as you go into Cold Spring Harbor. It sits atop a hill, so it's important, not only for storm water runoff --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Where is it in relation to the fish hatchery. Is it -- which side of it is on 25?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

It's north.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Is it north or south of 25A?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

North of 25A.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

North of 25A?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

North of 25A.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

On the east side of where the harbor is, so the waterfront parcels would be on the -- okay.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes. So --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Twenty-seven acres. What would have been the yield out of it, Sarah?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

The yield would have been -- there was a preliminary subdivision map prepared by Nelson and Pope that yields 12 residential lots on the portion of the property that's proposed.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Twelve lots with conventional septic, or were they going to throw the Chromaglass in?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

I don't have the details on it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

The young lady back there has a map. Does that have any reference to the septic on it or no? Either way, it's just -- in any event, we're avoiding a regular, you know, additional source of nitrogen that would be migrating down to an impacted inland bay.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

It's proposed septic, to answer your question.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

It is individual septic, okay.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Any buffers around it, or would it have been just, you know, clear-cut, leveled for 27 parcels, clustered for 12 half-acre lots?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

So we have the proposed subdivision. It would have been clustered; there would have been a buffer around it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yeah, but you still would have about eight or ten acres that would have been leveled, right?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Precisely, yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. All right. Thank you. Yeah. No, I'm familiar with the parcel. As a matter of fact, it makes a lot of sense, and it's nice when you see a decade-long effort come together, so I'll vote -- I'll support it.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator Kennedy. Are there any further questions? Are there any further

questions?

Okay. We have a motion on the floor to approve and seconded. Are we ready with this? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Congratulations to all.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

We have a deal.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Thank you very much. I really appreciate my colleagues. Thank you.

*(\*Applause\*)*

**LEG. STERN:**

Renee, cosponsor.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. I have a -- we have about a half hour before we take our picture. That's the event. And with that, Legislator Calarco would like to make a motion to take an I.R. out of order.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yeah. I'd like to take a -- make a motion to take *I.R. 1966 - Authorizing (the County Executive to execute an agreement with the Suffolk County Association of Municipal Employees Bargaining Units No. 2 and No. 6 covering the terms and conditions of employment for the period January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2016 (County Executive))*. This is the contract with AME, out of order. We have a couple of Board Members here. I thought we'd get this out -- off the agenda and out of the way.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

What page is that, Rob.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Page 13, 1966, about halfway down in Government Operations.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. We have -- yeah, it might be a good idea. We'll need a motion to take it out of order. Legislator Calarco makes the motion. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. MURATORE:**

(Raised hand).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Legislator Muratore makes the second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

1966 has been taken out of order. We have a request for BRO to be here, I'm hearing that from the side. Anybody want to -- someone want to run out and get them? In the meantime, let's get a motion on this.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I'll make a motion to approve.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. There's a motion to approve by Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

(Raised hand).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Schneiderman. Okay. We have a motion to approve. Any other motions? We're good, okay.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

On the motion, Mr. Chair. While we're waiting for BRO, can somebody talk to us? George, can you talk to us about this no-layoff clause? I know I asked in committee. I think we had a brief discussion. Can you give us some sentiment of --

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

What it's about, yeah, we got it. Okay.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Great.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Well, I listened to Dennis Cohen speak about it and he described it as a very broad no-layoff provision, probably as broad a language as you can get in a no-layoff provision. Privatization initiative, you can't lay somebody off because you're privatizing a service. So that's the way he described it; I guess it's accurate.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. And this was something that the Administration indicated that they were fully prepared to embrace, right?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Would you like Mr. Vaughn to confirm that.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

That was my recollection. Tom, was that -- that was a part of our discussion at Government Ops, I believe, that Chief Deputy Cohen said that this was the Administration's position, they were, I guess, prepared to not lay off?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yes, sir. The no-layoff clause was a negotiated provision of this contract that we fully embrace, or

else we wouldn't have gone forward with the contract.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

All right. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Kennedy. Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yeah, I know that there was another issue. There was a request for some clarification on the lag payroll, that he was not able to tell us for sure whether that was to come back to the Legislature. I think I've made it very clear that I feel that one of our County bargaining units -- I certainly am not supportive of forcing a lag payroll on the AME workers when no one else is. However, it's a decision of the membership to approve this and I'll respect that. But I know we did ask for a clarification on lag payroll, if it would have to come to the Legislature.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Legislator Browning, you're looking for Mr. Vaughn to answer that or our Counsel?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Whoever's got the answer.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Mr. Vaughn, you want to take a stab?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Absolutely. So I spoke with Mr. Cohen last night, and it is the position of the Administration that once this has been adopted, that this is essentially the mechanism that would allow for the lag payroll to go into effect, if that was needed, so it does not need to come back in the form of another -- another piece of legislation, because it's being adopted in this piece of legislation now. That's our position.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. And I'll state again, I hope that the Administration will respect the fact that the membership have in their contract two zeroes, and to do a lag payroll when they have two zeroes would be I think a little difficult for them.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Mr. Vaughn, you want to answer that? But before I do that, I just wanted to note that Counsel Nolan has agreed with that interpretation as well. Okay.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Thank you. And I would just say that as having personally gone through at least one lag, I believe, I would agree that I would not like to do that again, but -- so we understand, and, you know, it's there as a safety mechanism.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I'm good.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Thank you, Legislator Browning. Legislator Montano.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yeah. Tom, were you at the committee meeting the other day when Mr. Cohen gave the explanation and fielded some questions on this?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yes, sir, I was.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Do you recall, there were several questions that I had posed with respect to the contract, one of them having to do with whether or not positions could be abolished during the term. And I don't have the transcript in front of me, but he said he would get back to us. Do you have the --

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yes, sir, I do.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Can you give me a general statement as to what we discussed?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Right. So, generally, there was a question as to whether or not positions could be abolished. Now, it is our position that we have the ability to abolish a position. So let's say, for example, you know, we just spoke about --

**LEG. MONTANO:**

You were talking about filled positions.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Right. If you would just for a moment.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Go ahead.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

So let's say we had an individual that was serving in a title, make one up, but for this case, we just appointed Mr. O'Neill. Let's say that we had somebody serving as his Deputy and we wanted to eliminate the spot of Deputy DSS Commissioner, for whatever reason. We would be allowed to under the terms of this contract to do that, but it could not result in a layoff, so that person would have to be reassigned somewhere else.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

The Commissioner doesn't fall under the contract, does he?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

As I said, if we were just making up --

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

-- an example position. That was the first one that came to mind.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

All right. And, I'm sorry, would you just repeat the last part of your statement?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Sure. So our -- forget Deputy Commissioner of DSS. Let's say that we had a -- let's say that we had a clerk typist over in the Department of Social Services, or in the Executive's Office for that matter. We would have the ability to abolish that position, but that person could not be laid off as a result of that abolishment, they would have to be transferred somewhere else. So let's say, for example, if we abolish the position in the Exec's Office and someone had retired in DSS, we would move them over to DSS.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

All right. The follow-up question I believe I had with respect to that is that when you abolish a position, as I understand Civil Service, that person -- let's say that person had another position that they could fall back on, like bump and retreat, would the employee who's in a position that was abolished and transferred to another position, would they remain at the same rate of pay under this contract? That was the second question I had. Or could they be forced to take a lesser paid position? I want to make sure I understand my Civil Service. My understanding is you have the bump-and-retreat, right?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Right. So my understanding of Civil Service is that there are bump-and-retreat rights as well. You know what, I was very clear on what the answer was to how we would handle the abolishment of a position, that follow-up part of the -- of your question I don't have an answer to and wouldn't want to speculate on. I would say that there are Civil Service laws; we would follow Civil Service laws.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay. So, just to be clear, what we're saying is that you're not -- we won't abolish -- lay someone off during the life of this contract, or someone can't be laid off, but we're not clear whether or not they could be forced to take a lower paid position or their salary could be reduced; is that a fair characterization of what you said?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I would say that I am not clear of that, yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Thank you very much.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Wayne.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes. Okay. Legislator Nowick.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Tom, I just wanted to go back to the lag payroll to see if I understand it. The contract allows for the possibility of a 10-days lag, is that how it works?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yes. That would be two pay periods, yes. I'm sorry, one pay period, yes. Two weeks equals one pay period.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Two weeks equals one pay period. Did you just say that at any point during the contract period, is it the County Executive's Office that would decide, oh, well, the lag is going to be in 2014? How does that work? How does that decision get made?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

It is my understanding that once this contract is approved today, that it is at our discretion, yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

So does -- do the employees get a warning, so to speak? Is there any --

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I'm certain that we would -- that we would provide a warning. And I know that the last time, having been through the lag payroll, the last time that we did one, or maybe the last two times that we did one -- I lose track -- I know that there was even discussion with AME as to exactly how that lag payroll was going to go into effect, and it was -- I think the exact implementation of that payroll, at least my recollection of it, was that it was done at -- the exact implementation was done at the -- and how we implemented it, it was done at the request of the AME President at a time. So I know that --

**LEG. NOWICK:**

I think I remember that myself.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yeah.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

I think it was one day -- one paycheck.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yeah, it was one entire paycheck, whereas I know that exempts, it was each -- it was spread out through like an extended period of time.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Right. Well, I don't like the idea of the lag being at the discretion of the County Exec, but I must say that it seems that AME is supportive of this contract, and because of that, of course, I will support AME.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Thank you very much.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator Nowick. Legislator Kennedy. And Mr. Kennedy, be advised that BRO is now in the -- in the room.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

And you can reference questions to them as well.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

So what I'll do, then, is, is, Tom, I have two questions, and one with the lag. And I think I want to

ask Michael to make sure of AME's understanding. Through the Chair, could I invite Vice President Finland up as well, please?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

I don't see why not.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Tom, don't go away.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Mr. Finland is all right with that.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yeah.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Come on up.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I'll never leave you, Mr. Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. No, you don't, do you? That's a good thing, I guess, hopefully.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I guess.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Tom.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes, Mr. Finland, you want to --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Michael, I haven't gone through five lags in a municipal career. Nobody ever likes a lag, period. But, fortunately, I never had to forego a week's salary in one fell swoop. I was always one day less per pay period over whatever that time cycle is, you know, the 10 pay periods or the 15 pay periods, however it worked out. What is your understanding of how a lag would be imposed, should the Administration elect to impose one?

**MR. FINLAND:**

First of all, just to answer your question, I want to say that there's never an easy way with regard to a lag process. Come this January, I'll be with Suffolk County government 36 years. I went through my first lag in 1991. That was difficult and cumbersome because there was a staggered pay period. Every two weeks, your pay day moved up a day.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Listen. Mario Cuomo paid me in script, so I understand. There's all kinds of issues when it comes to lags, I get it.

**MR. FINLAND:**

So that was difficult in 1991 because of the staggered days. In the 2009 format, that was difficult as well because people found it very cumbersome. Even though it was only affecting two paychecks,

one in July and one in December, people were essentially just getting half of a paycheck in the 2009 lag payroll process.

To my understanding, if the County Executive so chooses to move forward and consider a lag at some juncture during the life of this contract, we would maintain continuity of a pay schedule, and by that, I mean the County workers would still get their paycheck every other Thursday, but for the duration of the lag process, they would be paid for nine days as opposed to being paid for 10 days, when they get their paycheck. That is my understanding of how it would work.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. And that is based on your discussions, or there's language referenced in the contract to that effect?

**MR. FINLAND:**

That is correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No. That's an either/or. I don't know. Which one? There's specific language in the contract referencing nine days salary in a 10-day period over whatever the particular cycle is?

**MR. FINLAND:**

There is specific language addressing the lag, that it would be in that fashion.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Does the Administration have to give the membership -- do you have to be put on notice at all, or -- I mean, can the County Executive decide, you know, March of, you know, whatever isn't looking too good, we're going to start a lag?

**MR. FINLAND:**

We don't have that in writing as far as when the notice of implementation would go into effect. We were just given an advisory during the negotiations process, that we would be given advanced notice if the County Executive was going in that direction. And to this point with regard to lag, it's something that may or may not happen. It may happen for 10 pay periods, it may happen for just five pay periods, it's something that may never happen at all. It is at the discretion of the County Executive, but, you know, there could be different formats as far as its implementation. It may just be for five days, it may be for 10 days. It cannot exceed 10 days during the duration of the four-year contract.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Through 2016. Okay. So let's shift gears, then, and let's go to what the conversation was just before with Legislator Montano and Mr. Vaughn about the right of the Administration to abolish a position. So let's say, I don't know, at some point in 2014 or maybe into 2015, public health nurses, maybe five or six public health nurses are going to be abolished. Most of them have a bump-and-retreat. So if you take a half dozen PHM Is and you abolish those positions, they would drop down to clinic nurse, or whatever they're at. At some point in bump-and-retreat, there's somebody at the end other end who's occupying a position who winds up, you know, now no longer in a valid position or a bona fide position.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

No. I understand, Mr. Kennedy, exactly what you're saying -- pardon me, Legislator -- but the contract specifically says that there is a no-layoff clause. It's a very broad, very overreaching no-layoff clause. So that is why when, as to the first part, as to whether we can abolish a position, I am quite clear that we have the ability to abolish a position, but I also am quite clear on the fact

that somebody can't lose their job as a result of that abolishment.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

So that would mean, then, by definition, Tom, you would be not only abolishing, but you would be creating, because an individual can't be on a payroll without a position.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Well, the one thing that I would say, though, is that that assumes that the size of our workforce is completely unchanging over the course of a year, sir.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, no. We always have people come in, come out, there are normal retirements, there are simple separations, there are vacancies. No, I understand that, I get that, but -- so it's almost, then, the abolishment can't commence unless there's a sufficient vacancy at the back of the ladder for an individual to land in.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

That sounds approximately right. The one thing that I would add is the fact that, you know, we do have people coming in and coming out of service constantly. And I would also -- I would also, you know, just reiterate that this is a very broad agreement that was agreed to by both sides as to not go forward with the loss of jobs as a result of this contract. And I think that while it says that there is a no-layoff clause in the contract, there is nothing that requires the County Executive to sign a SCIN or fill a SCIN. So that is why we believe that we have the flexibility to, if needed to, abolish a position and move resources around, that we would be able to do to so.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Michael, is he -- Tom just explained to me the Administration's position with that. What's AME's position?

**MR. FINLAND:**

AME's position is in accord with what Tom had just stated.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. All right. I'll yield, Mr. Presiding Officer. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Mr. Kennedy. Mr. Schneiderman.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Well, we -- you know, we've suffered through a recession that certainly wasn't caused by AME, yet you have suffered probably the biggest hit of any organization in the County, you know, with the layoffs, all of the various cutbacks. And, you know, as Legislators, we have been faced in numerous occasions -- on numerous occasions with having to make decisions on layoffs, etcetera. So having this no-layoff clause, I'm sure a great relief to us as well as to you. And, you know, AME has done a terrific job through all of this.

**MR. FINLAND:**

Thank you.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And I'm really, again, applauding the County Executive on working with you to put together a contract that really is -- is fair to AME, and applauding you guys for endorsing this contract, which, you know, is not the best contract in the world, it's two years without raises, but it does have this

no-layoff clause.

I want to focus in -- I just want to zero in on the definition though, because this has come up recently when the Comptroller merger was in play, in terms of what an AME employee is, so -- and I support the fact that we're not going to lay off any AME employees, but is there a legal definition -- because there may be some individuals who are AME members who are paying dues that are in exempt positions. Would this be affecting them as well, or are they outside of this? Does anybody know the answer to that, because we may see that Comptroller/Treasure merger reappear in the future as well.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Is there --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Does anybody know the answer to that?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Mr. Vaughn, do you have a Labor Relations person --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Michael, do you know what -- there's a number of employees within the County who pay dues to AME, but are in exempt positions, not civil service positions. Do you know how many there are?

**MR. FINLAND:**

I don't have a total number, but my belief would be that those employees would be covered, they're AME members.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

They would be protected under this?

**MR. FINLAND:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**MR. FINLAND:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Maybe get a clarification from the Administration, in which case, if they do bring back that merger, then those members that were dues-paying members -- and if other exempt positions start to pay dues, would they become protected?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I think those are very excellent questions, Legislator Schneiderman. I would just say, look, there's a very, very broad no-layoff clause in the legislation. I, unfortunately, don't think that I can answer every version of a hypothetical on this.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I would just ask that this become clarified between the Administration and AME prior to, you know, the full authorization of this, so there's a clear understanding and, you know -- because a lot of

exempt employees may start paying dues to protect their positions if that's the case. So I think it's a hole we need to look at carefully, so at least we understand what the ramifications are.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay? All right. I think -- I think we've hit an impasse. Legislator Barraga.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

I'm sure in your negotiations you had discussion with reference to the County health clinics. And why don't you relate to me, if the remaining County health clinics are privatized, how do you propose to deal with those employees? What is the strategy? What is the game plan, because you're talking rather large numbers of employees here that are County employees.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

That actually was a topic that Deputy -- Chief Deputy County Executive Cohen spoke about at the Government Operations Committee. And I think that you're right, sir, that is absolutely a topic that's going to need to be dealt with, and I think that dealing with that and finding a way to convert those clinics to FQHC clinics within the bounds of this contract is certainly going to be one of those challenges, and may very well provide with some very creative solutions. And I think that at least one of the scenarios, as I understand it, would be a scenario under which we may convert to the FQHC clinic, but we would either use the employees that are County employees at those clinics and either redistribute them to places -- to jobs still here in the County, or, if not, that we would then -- that there's a possibility that some of those would remain on the County payroll while we were in -- while they were in the process of finishing out their careers.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Because you have such large numbers. I think it would be very difficult to redistribute them in other agencies or department.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Actually, sir, I'm not -- I would have to take a look at the numbers, but I want to say that I do believe that the only two clinics left that are using County employees are -- is the clinic that is in Amityville, I believe, and the clinic that is in Riverhead.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

What is the total number of employees, do you know, in both those clinics?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

You know what, sir, I'm not sure, but I do know that as -- I know that we are committed to the no-layoff clause. I know that it is a parameter that we need to work through, and I also know that I would be happy to get you the number of employees in both those. But I do know that when we -- that when we were looking at the process, we had actually talked about doing a step -- a phased-in approach at those three clinics, because, remember, we went from Southampton, where we promised that we wouldn't be laying anybody off, to bringing people in, and those individuals --

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

They were much smaller clinics.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Right, absolutely, sir.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

And that's my concern --

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Sure.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

-- because Amityville and the other one have a large number of County employees and you have a no-layoff provision.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Right.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

So either you redistribute them or you keep them on as County employees working for the private sector. I don't know how that influences the reimbursement to the private sector when they have County employees on their payroll.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

And all of these are the challenges that we're going to have to work through as we're dealing with -- going through the FOHC process at those two clinics specifically. I think that we have --

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

But it is your understanding -- it is your understanding, from a union perspective, those individuals will be saved, those jobs will be saved, they will not be laid off?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I'm not even going to answer.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

No, not Tom, the gentleman next to you.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Absolutely.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

What is your understanding with reference to the health clinics and the employees there?

**MR. FINLAND:**

It is my understanding that their jobs will be saved, that they will not be subject to layoff. This is pervasive, all inclusive as far as a no layoff --

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

So either saved either through distribution, or they remain as County employees under another entity?

**MR. FINLAND:**

They would -- in essence, it could possibly be both, you know, their positions would be saved. It would be my belief, my hope, that they would be doing job-specific, job-related work that they had been previously doing, and could conceivably -- in moving forward, they may be working under the auspices of a different entity, but they would still be Suffolk County employees, AME members.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Because if they're working as County employees under a different entity, hopefully this is thought through in terms of how that entity receives its reimbursement. It may be an impediment from a reimbursement perspective to have Suffolk County employees within their group. So you have to

really take a look at the rules and regulations governing reimbursement at the State and Federal level to these clinics.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Legislator Barraga, can I suffer you an interruption? Apparently, BRO has something to say about this matter.

**MR. FREAS:**

Legislator Barraga, there are currently 78 employees at the Tri-Community and Riverhead Health Centers, 94 current total positions. With respect to the reimbursement issue, the --

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

You have Amityville's figure?

**MR. FREAS:**

I'm sorry. I did them as a total between the two, and there's some --

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

So you're talking 94 people?

**MR. FREAS:**

Seventy-eight current -- 78 current employees and 94 positions.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Okay.

**MR. FREAS:**

And some of them move back and forth. That really used to happen more on the East End, but as our numbers have gotten smaller, we also have some flexibility.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

It's a sizable number, that's the point I'm making. You know, it's not 10 or 15 where, you know, you could redistribute them, maybe, but, you know, between 75 and 90, that's significant. I'm not so sure you'd find other positions in the County for them to begin with. So the question is, you know, if the jobs are going to be saved, what really happens to them? What is the work ethic in our environment that they're going to find themselves in? Are they still going to be County employees working in the private sector? What's the rationale here? Well, he doesn't have the answer, but was there any discussion on this? I mean, it seems to be sort of up in the air based on what you're telling me.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

They absolutely are going to stay County employees, Legislator, and whether or not they are County employees who are working for a private entity or a not-for-profit, that's -- that part is certainly up in the air, but --

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

So you're on the record indicating that these people will stay as County employees?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yes, sir, I am.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Okay. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Thank you very much, Legislator Barraga. Legislator Montano, for a point of clarification?

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yeah. I just wanted to be clear on one thing. My understanding, correct me if I'm wrong, is that there are 25 County employees at the Brentwood Health Center, is that correct?

**MR. FREAS:**

There are additional County employees throughout -- throughout the -- throughout the health center system. Our Family Planning and WIC staff right now are County employees. Whether we would maintain WIC Program or the Family Planning Program is a subject to negotiation between us and whoever the takeover person would be.

The largest issue in discussions I've had with the Health Department about this -- regarding the budget is that the issue is really Tri-Community and Riverhead, and we would either find other places to move them, or figure out a way to keep them in their current position.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

All right. Since you took me out of order, I'll go back after Legislators and deal with them later, unless it's my turn.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

I think you're -- Mr. Barraga, you're done, right?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yeah.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

No. Go ahead, Mr. Montano. Why don't you finish up?

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Thank you. I'm not sure I understood, or I'm not sure I got the full answer to the question. There are, as I understand, about 25 County employees currently at the Brentwood Health Center; is that accurate, 25 to 30?

**MR. FREAS:**

Off the top, that could certainly be so. There are, I want to say, maybe five or 10 who have a specific appropriation for the Brentwood Health Center, and then you have some Family Planning folks and some WIC folks.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

All right. So what you said, then, if I understood this correctly, is that the Family -- assuming that there was a move to privatize the health center or to turn it over to either Southside Hospital or Hudson Valley, or anybody else, the WIC and the Family -- what's the other component?

**MR. FREAS:**

Family Planning.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

The Family Planning component, did you say that they would be eliminated or --

**MR. FREAS:**

No.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

-- or they would be moved?

**MR. FREAS:**

No. I would say they would either -- we would either continue to run the program -- we actually staff Family Planning and WIC, for example, at the Dolan Center, where we are already not -- that health center is not operated under our --

**LEG. MONTANO:**

So you don't have plans, at least none that --

**MR. FREAS:**

I don't have any plans at all.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

You don't have any plans, I understand that, that's true. What I was saying was at least we don't know of any plans at this point to eliminate those two components --

**MR. FREAS:**

No.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

-- WIC and the Family Planning.

**MR. FREAS:**

No. And because there are --

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Federally funded?

**MR. FREAS:**

-- the models that exist where those employees have been retained for many, many years.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Right.

**MR. FREAS:**

I don't --

**LEG. MONTANO:**

And are those programs that are federally funded or federally reimbursed?

**MR. FREAS:**

The WIC Program is a Federally -- is a 100% Federally-funded program and --

**LEG. MONTANO:**

So we would be -- we would not be eliminating those because we'd lose the funding; is that accurate?

**MR. FREAS:**

Well, if we'd -- we'd lose the funding if we stopped doing it.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Eliminated it.

**MR. FREAS:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Right. And does that apply to the Family Planning?

**MR. FREAS:**

Family Planning is Federal -- is Federal money that's passed through New York State. The reimbursement is not 100%.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

All right. So, in addition to those two components, which are unlikely to be phased out, there are a couple of employees that are County employees stationed and working currently at the Brentwood Family Health Center, correct?

**MR. FREAS:**

Correct.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay. And we've already established that they will not lose their positions? That's not -- that's not to you, that's a statement.

**MR. FREAS:**

Yeah.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you, Legislator Montano. Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**

I just want to clarify. Now, you did state that the employees that are working at the health care centers will not be laid off?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

We are saying that this contract has an extensive no-layoff, broad-sweeping no-layoff provision in there. I cannot promise someone that if they are working, for example, at the Riverhead Clinic today, that one day they might not be asked to be reassigned to another location, but I can tell you that under the terms of this contract and this -- that we are asking to be adopted today, that AME has agreed to, that that individual cannot be laid off.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Okay. So, again, I have a number of constituents in my district that work at the Riverhead Health Center, and I've given them my word that I will look out for them, that I will advocate for them. And I would like, also, to be part of the discussion. I mean, I wasn't aware when you guys were

heading towards privatizing these centers, and here I am telling my constituents, "No, you guys are good, we're going to keep these" -- "the County's good," and, you know, I need -- we, the Legislature, needs to be part of the discussion when it comes to privatizing, and I'm asking that, you know, include, and if you could put that on record just as a "yes, we will," or, you know -- and, again, out of great respect for the County Executive, you know, include us in the process. Is that agreed upon? Is that acceptable?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yes, I think that that is a very acceptable thing. We propose, you guys vote; it's a very inclusive process.

**LEG. ANKER:**

And, also, as far as the salaries, now, you said, you know, that if those employees get moved out of where they are right now, and these are nurses, will they have similar salaries, or how will that be worked out?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

So, Legislator, it is my understanding, and I hope that AME will jump in if I say something that is incorrect, we, of course, have people who are, you know, coming in and leaving service all the time, and I think that part of that will be how we deal with this, with these practices going forward. The fact that we do have -- that we would have an ever-in-flux workforce will make up for the ability to allow us to take care of that. People are going to be subject to Civil Service laws. I don't think this contract changes Civil Service law by any stretch of the imagination, but I would just repeat that it is our -- the reason that we went down this road is that this was -- that this was something that was very important to AME, and it was a contract that was negotiated in good faith, and we are committed to that no-layoff clause that is in that contract. So I realize that that doesn't answer all the components to your question, but that is probably the best answer that I can give at this point in time.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Well, again, I appreciate your response, and I would appreciate even more if we could be inclusive in the discussions, the ongoing idea of, you know, what's happening to our employees, because those employees of Suffolk County are my constituents and I need to answer to them, but thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. That concludes my list that I have as far as this vote. Would everyone be --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Could I ask one more question?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Just on the FQHC discussion, you know, because other areas have gone this way where there are County employees who have stayed County employees, but the administration of the FQHC has gone to an outside contract agency, be it Hudson River, or whatever that entity may be. So it doesn't -- this provision doesn't necessarily preclude the County from moving in an FQHC direction, but it might favor that type of direction where the outside entity is more administrative over the County employees.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Right.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I certainly don't disagree with that.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Thank you for that clarification. I have a motion to approve and seconded. Are we good? Everybody ready for a vote on this? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Gentlemen, congratulations, you have a contract.

*(\*Applause\*)*

All right. I was asked by Legislator Krupski to do this real quick. He says it's not controversial. Legislator Krupski, you want to --

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Now everybody's looking at me. Thank you. Everything I propose is noncontroversial, for the record. Could we take resolution 1973 (Amending the Adopted 2013 Operating Budget to transfer funds from Fund 477 Water Quality Protection, amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds in connection with Town of Southampton stormwater abatement to Mill Pond (CP 8240) (County Executive) out of order?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Where is it?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'll second.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Thirteen, Page 13.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Page 13, 1973, four down. All right.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I will second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Now, a second on the motion. Legislator Schneiderman seconds the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been taken out of order.

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Seventeen.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Legislator Krupski, you want to make a motion?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'll make the motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Legislator Schneiderman, it is his district, makes the motion to approve, I assume, second by Legislator Krupski. We have a motion it approve are there any other motions? Any other motions? Any conversation? Anyone has anything on this? Okay. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been approved.

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Seventeen.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. We're recessed for lunch. Don't forget the picture, all 17.

***(THE MEETING WAS RECESSED AT 12:34 P.M.)***

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

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Will all Legislators please come to the horseshoe? We're about ready to begin. Okay. Mr. Clerk, we might as well --

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fire away?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

-- call them all in.

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

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Here.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Here.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

*(Not Present).*

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Here.

**LEG. HAHN:**

*(Not Present).*

**LEG. ANKER:**

*(Not present).*

**LEG. CALARCO:**

*(Not Present).*

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

**LEG. CILMI:**  
Here.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**  
Here.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**  
Yeah.

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

**LEG. GREGORY:**  
Here.

**LEG. STERN:**  
Here.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
Here.

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

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Here.

**MR. LAUBE:**  
Ten.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
All right. Good afternoon, everybody, and welcome back from lunch. The Clerk advises that the Affidavits of Publication are in proper order; is that so true?

**MR. LAUBE:**  
That is.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
That's good to hear, for the following **Public Hearings**. And the first Public Hearing is for **Procedural Resolution No. 16-2013 - Approval of ferry license for South Ferry, Inc. (Presiding Officer Horsley)**. All right, I do not have any cards for this. Would anyone like to be heard on Procedural Resolution No. 16? Would anyone like to be heard on Procedural No. 16? All right. I'll make a motion to close.

**LEG. CILMI:**  
Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Second by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been closed.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eleven (*Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Anker, Calarco, Montano, Nowick & Spencer - Vacant Seat: District #8*).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. The second one is **(Public Hearing on) IR 1570, A Charter Law to improve the County's Budget Approval and Amendment Process to Increase Transparency and Accountability ("Taxpayer Awareness Act") (Cilmi)**. I do not have any cards on this. Would anyone like to be heard on 1570? Would anyone like to be heard on 1570? Seeing none, Mr. Cilmi, what do you want to do with this?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Motion to close.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion's to close. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been closed.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eleven (*Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Anker, Calarco, Montano, Nowick & Spencer - Vacant Seat: District #8*).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**(Public Hearing on) IR 1591-13 - A Charter Law to Institute a Departmental Omnibus Budget Amendment Process (Cilmi)**. I do not have any cards on this. Would anyone like to be heard on 1591? Would anyone like to be heard on 1591? Seeing none, Mr. Cilmi, what do you want to do?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Motion to close.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion's to close. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Ten (*Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Anker, Calarco, Montano, Nowick, Stern & Spencer - Vacant Seat: District #8*).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

It has been closed.

**(Public Hearing on) IR 1666-13 - Proposal to Form Suffolk County Sewer District No. 4 – Smithtown Galleria (County Executive)**. I do not have any cards on this. Would anyone like to

be heard on 1666? Would anyone like to be heard on 1666? Seeing none, Mr. Kennedy, do you want to do this one, or how --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes, yeah. As a matter of fact, the principals have some fine tuning that we're doing with Public Works, they've asked that I hold it open one more cycle, so I'll do that.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'll make a motion to keep it open, if we can, please, Mr. Presiding Officer.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion's to recess, and I'll second the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Ten *(Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Anker, Calarco, Montano, Nowick, Stern & Spencer - Vacant Seat: District #8)*.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***(Public Hearing on) IR 1678-13 - A Local Law to Provide Assessment and Tax Relief to Property Owners Impacted by Superstorm Sandy (Browning)***.

I do not have any cards on this. Would anyone like to be heard on 1678? Would anyone like to be heard on 1678? Legislator Browning?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Motion to close.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion's to close. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Muratore. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been closed.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Twelve. *Thirteen (Not Present: Legislators Montano, Kennedy, Nowick & Spencer - Vacant Seat: District #8)*.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you.

***(Public Hearing on) IR 1690-13 - A Local Law to Amend Section A13-10 of the Suffolk County Administrative Code to Authorize Donation of Property Held by the Police Property Bureau (County Executive)***. I do not have any cards on this. Would anyone like to speak on 1690?

1690?

Mr. Vaughn, no? You're just hanging around?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I was just going to ask if you would please consider recessing this.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. It's yours anyway, so, yeah. That's --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Motion to recess.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion's to recess -- first of all, no one wanted to be heard, right? Okay, that being the case, Legislator Cilmi motion's to recess. I'll second the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been recessed.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Thirteen (*Not Present: Legislators Montano, Kennedy, Nowick & Spencer - Vacant Seat: District #8*).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***(Public Hearing on) IR 1877-13 - A Local Law to Strengthen the Animal Abuse Offenders Registry (D'Amaro)***. I do have cards on this. The first speaker will be Paul Llobell. And Paul, you have three minutes.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Unless there are questions, of course, from the Legislators.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

You're welcome.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Ladies and gentlemen of the Legislature, we're not quite sure why we're trying to strengthen the law on the pet offender registry. That law was specifically written to have the Suffolk SPCA handle that reporting and website and all the works that go with it.

The Suffolk County SPCA, as you all know, has been serving the Suffolk County residents for approximately 29 years. We have about 60 volunteers in our organization, we have one paid employee who is the secretary who answers the phone. We respond to all sorts of calls from the public. We also respond to calls originating from Suffolk Police, Suffolk Sheriffs Department, different animal control units within the County and different townships, DEC, elected officials, State Police, Town and Village Police, Adult Protective Services, County Executive's Office, and even from many of you in the Legislature have called upon us.

We're responsible for training the pet detectives in the different precincts. We train them once or twice a year over at the Police Academy; we do that all at no charge, obviously. We train all of the different agencies within the -- that serve Suffolk County, the DEC, Animal Control Office, Fish and Wildlife, County Police, Suffolk Sheriffs, how to handle wild and dangerous reptiles -- snakes, turtles, alligators; as you know, we had our twentieth alligator yesterday, we picked up in Suffolk County.

We additionally bought food to the hard hit areas after Superstorm Sandy. We operate the pet-friendly shelter under an MOU from the County of Suffolk. We've been maintaining, which is very similar to the pet offender registry, the dog bite registry for the past 16 years in the County of Suffolk. I don't know if you're all aware, if somebody gets bit by a dog, the Police Department -- whether it was Suffolk County or one of the East End townships -- they have to report back to us. They have to register the bite and we keep tabs on the bites, on the types of bites, and it's reported from us up to the Board of Health, the State Board of Health.

We take dangerous animals off the street: Twenty crocodiles this year, alligators or crocodiles, we've have had mountain lions, a bear, pythons, rattlesnakes, cobras, leopards, dangerous dogs and other dangerous reptiles. We conduct an amnesty day in Suffolk County twice a year, at least twice a year, with the DEC and the Fish and Wildlife people. You know, we have people walk in with, you know, 8-foot boa constrictors and, you know, stuff that you just couldn't imagine that they have in their homes. People don't realize when they pick up these alligators; they're very cute when you bring them up from Florida or in from Pennsylvania, but they grow a foot a year. Five years later you have a 5-foot alligator in your house and little kids running around your dog, your cat, whatever.

I think we've -- last year we seized about 500 animals in the County. We're the only agency that handled the West Nile Virus outbreak. When the birds were dying, Suffolk SPCA was called, we were charged with retrieving the dead birds and bringing them to Suffolk County Department of Health for testing, that's where you guys get your statistics from.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. Mr. Llobell, you're going to have to start to wrap it up.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Okay. Well, I don't see any valid reason to take this registry and offer it to some other organization. There's no reason for it, we've been handling it -- we've been handling this for many, many years. We have the website we've spent a fair amount of dollars on putting it together. We've been waiting for two years for the okay to get this going. There's no reason, actually, for any other agency to handle this except for the Suffolk SPCA.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. You know what we're going to do, Mr. Llobell? Apparently Legislator Browning has a question, so maybe what we'll do is we'll pass it off to her and then you can finish up.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Good. I hope I can answer the questions to your satisfaction.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Well, you may or may not be able to answer it today. But, you know, I know you came to our committee meeting last week and I know there was an incident in my district where the Police Department called you to go to a gas station regarding an animal abuse incident. And I'm just curious over the past year how many calls -- okay, how many calls you have overall and how many calls -- how many of those calls were from Suffolk County? Do you keep those numbers handy?

**MR. LLOBELL:**

We do. I don't have those exact figures with me. I can tell you we answer -- in the County of Suffolk, we take in in excess of 2500 to 3,000 calls a year. A majority of them originate from the E-911 System. Many of them come from local shelters, many of them come from different outside agencies, you know, it could be the DEC, it could be whatever. But to answer your question, Kate, I don't know what the exact number is that originates specifically from -- and when you say Suffolk

County, you mean the 911 system?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Suffolk County 911, you know, Police Department, whatever. And again, you know, whether it be FRES that's calling you for gas leaks or whatever. You know, I would be curious to know exactly how many, because if you're not going to be called to do those -- to respond, who is?

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Correct, who are they going to call. I would say the majority of our calls do originate from some sort of Suffolk County agency or authority, the majority of our calls. The rest of them come from local townships.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Thank you. And, you know, obviously we have another meeting. If this gets closed or whatever, you know, we still have another committee process.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

And by the way, the law calls for a \$50 fee to be paid for the -- to the Suffolk County SPCA. We don't want the \$50. I mean, we would obviously do it for nothing. There's no indemnification issues here, there's no -- I know that was a big issue at one point. There's no reason for this animal abuser registry to go to some other agency that probably doesn't have any of the experience that we have.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay, thank you very much. We do have another question; Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thanks, Mr. Presiding Officer. Paul, thanks for being here. In your packet that you distributed, on page -- not the letter, but page two of the actual -- I guess it's a summary of services that you provide, things that you've done, that the organization has done. It says, "*Animal Abuser Registry, the website has been developed and set up at the expense of the Suffolk County SPCA.*" It's been up since the law has been passed, and then you said something a minute ago that you're just kind of waiting for the go ahead. So I guess you guys have invested some of your own time and money to develop this website that we asked you to develop?

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Uh-huh.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And what's the holdup exactly?

**MR. LLOBELL:**

We are ready to go. The initial holdup was there were some discussions, pretty vibrant discussions regarding indemnification, going back and forth.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Oh, that was the issue. Okay.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

You know, it's a computer; you put bad information in, you get bad information out. So all we're really asking for is the information comes from one centralized source, whether it be somebody in the PD or somebody in the District Attorney's Office. It comes from one source, it goes to one

source and our agency.

If the County gives us bad information and we put in *Tom Cilmi* and it's supposed to be *Thomas A Cilmi*, and you all of a sudden say *Hey, I'm on this registry, I'm not supposed to be here*, that could be a problem. But if we're putting the information in that we get from the County and we get it from one source, it's very simple to control. If we put in the wrong information, if we put in *Thomas Cilmi* and put the wrong middle initial or something in, hey, it's going to fall on our shoulders. If the County gives us bad information, obviously it would fall on your shoulders. It's fairly simple.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So the indemnification issue that had been an issue some time ago, you're here in an official capacity as a representative of the SPCA to say that that's not an issue any longer.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

Correct. That's not even on the table for the pet offender registry --

**LEG. CILMI:**

For this purpose, anyway.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

For this purpose it's not, not even a question.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. Thanks very much.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

My pleasure.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. Thank you very much, Legislator. Are there any further questions? All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Llobell. We appreciate you coming down here.

**MR. LLOBELL:**

My pleasure. Thanks for listening.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. We do have a second speaker that would like to question this public hearing is John Collins.

**MR. COLLINS:**

Good afternoon.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Mr. Collins.

**MR. COLLINS:**

My name is John Collins, I'm a Humane Investigator with the Suffolk County SPCA. And I'd like to start by thanking the Legislature for allowing us the time to speak today on behalf of the Suffolk County SPCA regarding the animal abuse registry. I understand you have a lot of topics today, so I'll keep it short.

Since Suffolk County was the first to pass the law requiring the animal abuse registry, it is imperative that we lead by example and place the obligation of maintaining this list with an

organization that is qualified and accustomed to handling such a task. The registry will never expire and will be constantly changing, which is why it must be maintained by an agency that is established and credible. As you're all aware, Suffolk County SPCA is a law enforcement agency. The animal abuse registry and all sensitive information contained within should only be handled and maintained by an agency with the experience and knowledge of keeping material, thereby ensuring its integrity.

For over 20 years, the Suffolk County SPCA has been an integral part of prosecuting animal abusers. Given the deep-seated roots within the community, I believe the residents of the County would look to our agency first in search of such a registry. Since the agency already has the shared procedure with local law enforcement regarding the dog bite registry, this would allow for a seamless transition when sharing information to be added to the animal abuse registry. As the Suffolk County SPCA already has the dedicated system through the animal abuse registry, the registry could be active and available as soon as the information is received.

Lastly, the penalty for any person required to register with the animal abuse registry and fails to do so, there's a charge of a Class A Misdemeanor and punishable by incarceration and/or a fine. For this reason, the registry should only be placed in the hands of an agency equipped and authorized to enforce this penalty by means of an arrest.

There is no other humane organization in Suffolk County with the history, credibility or structure of the Suffolk County SPCA. It is my firm belief that the only organization that can maintain the registry to its full potential and purpose is the Suffolk County SPCA. Thank you again for your time.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Mr. Collins. Are there any questions; we're good?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I have a question.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Oh. Mr. Collins, please, we have Mr. D'Amaro that would like to ask you a question.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Mr. Collins, thank you. How long have you been an investigator with the SPCA?

**MR. COLLINS:**

I've been with the agency for about four months.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Four months? Okay. Well, we appreciate your service. I wanted to ask you -- I agree with you that it should only be a qualified organization maintaining and running the registry and contracting with the County to do so. Do you think that the Suffolk County Police Department is qualified to determine what agency would be sufficient to run the agency?

**MR. COLLINS:**

Absolutely.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you, Mr. Collins. All right, that's the last card I have on this public hearing. Would anyone

else like to be heard on 1877? Would anyone else like to be heard on 1877? Seeing none, Mr. D'Amaro, what would you like to do?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Motion to close.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion's to close. Second by Legislator Stern. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been closed.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fifteen (*Not Present: Legislators Montano & Nowick - Vacant Seat: District #8*).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. The next is ***(Public Hearing on) IR 1888-13 - A Local Law to Improve the County's Property Redemption Process (Gregory)***. I do have a card on this; Jose Campos. Javier, I understand you're going to be acting as translator?

**JAVIER:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay.

**MR. CAMPOS:**

Good afternoon. The reason why we're here is because we find out lately that the original mortgage company we have, the house, they didn't pay their mortgage -- the taxes for -- I think it's 2007, and they sell the mortgage to another company, all right? And at the end no one decides like who's going to pay these -- this year and they -- we've been trying to find out what the best way, or who is the company responsible to pay and they don't want to respond. So the conclusion is we have to pay this year, these taxes, and that's the major problem we have. We got to this point, like we're about to lose the house because some company didn't pay our year taxes and we've been paying on time our mortgage every single month and we've got this problem now.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Thank you very much.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Wayne?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes, Legislator Gregory.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Just to kind of flesh it out a little bit more. So you have a mortgage, and included in your mortgage payment you have the property tax portion that you've been paying regularly for years.

**MR. CAMPOS:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

And the mortgage company who is putting those monies in escrow hadn't been paying the property

tax portion.

**MR. CAMPOS:**

Yeah, they didn't pay for that year.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Right. So, in essence, what happened is the County Department of Real Estate had started the process to take the deed for your property for back taxes.

**MR. CAMPOS:**

Yeah.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

And there -- and you found out coming to my office that there's no provision in the law, the 215 law, that identifies or addresses your particular situation.

**MR. CAMPOS:**

Yeah.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

To your understanding, right?

**MR. CAMPOS:**

Yeah.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

So that's what we're trying to address here today, is if anyone who -- oh, and I forgot, the original mortgage company who didn't pay the taxes, the mortgage was sold -- I forget the first one, but the second was Ochwen?

**MR. CAMPOS:**

Yeah, I think so, yeah.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Right, which we've -- in my office, we've had a lot of issues with. They -- at that point, they're saying *Well, we hold the mortgage, but we're not in a position to pay any back taxes that were neglected from the prior mortgage company.*

**MR. CAMPOS:**

Exactly, yeah.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

So that's why we're here today. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Campos.

**MR. CAMPOS:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Well, that is interesting. Are there any further questions of Mr. Campos, or Javier? Okay, thank you very much for coming down today. We appreciate that.

**MR. CAMPOS:**

Thank you so much.

**JAVIER:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Would anyone else like to be heard? I have no further cards. Would anyone else like to be heard on 1888? Would anyone else like to be heard on 1888? Okay. Seeing none, Mr. Gregory, what would you like to do with this?

**LEG. CILMI:**

DuWayne?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

DuWayne, what would you like to do with this?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Close; motion to close.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Close? Motion's to close.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fifteen.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right.

**MR. LAUBE:**

No, it's fourteen (*Not Present: Legislators Montano, Nowick & D'Amaro - Vacant Seat: District #8*).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

The next **IR** is **1910 (Public Hearing) - A Local Law authorizing an Exemption in County's Backflow Testing Law (Schneiderman)**. I do have a card on this; Mr. Medina. David Medina?

**MR. MEDINA:**

Good afternoon, and thank you for allowing me the time to speak.

My name is David Medina, I am the Supervising Instructor for New York State Department of Health Cross Connection Control Program, Backflow Certification. We are the agency who issues backflow certifications in the State of New York. In August of 2011, Suffolk County made a change in backflow testing limiting it to Suffolk County licensed plumbers and Suffolk County water supply companies; understandable. What we're trying to figure out is why the issuing agency, the New York State Department of Health, was dismissed from its own testing program.

So I can continue for the full three minutes and sort of kind of speak, drag this on. So I am simply requesting, respectfully, that we be put back into our own program, and at the request of any New

York State licensed plumber that requires a test in Suffolk County, that we can continue. That is pretty much it.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Medina. We appreciate it. Are there any further -- are there any questions of Mr. Medina? All right.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Oh, a question.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Oh, Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Just to clarify, and maybe Legislator Schneiderman could help me understand the purpose of this. So you work for the Health Department?

**MR. MEDINA:**

I do not work directly for the Health Department. The Health Department utilizes sponsors for training. We are the sponsor for the New York State Department of Health.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So you --

**MR. MEDINA:**

In Copiague, New York.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

You train.

**MR. MEDINA:**

Yes, correct.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

You train people that work for the Health Department?

**MR. MEDINA:**

We train licensed plumbers, city/town/village agency, water supply companies, irrigation people, fire/sprinkler/mechanicals. If you require a license for backflow testing, you must attend a 32-hour cross connection control course by one of the sponsors of New York State which there are seven.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So what does the law -- I don't understand what the law would provide; an exemption from the County's law?

**MR. MEDINA:**

Suffolk County, limited backflow testing to Suffolk County plumbers only and/or Suffolk County water supply companies. Where anyone that had backflow certification for the State, whether it be Nassau County or New York City, if they required a testing in Suffolk County they could come and do so; they no longer can.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Let me try to add to this. So years ago, and I don't remember the day or the year that the requirements came into place where suddenly you had to have these backflow valves, and then the

State established a system for inspecting those. And they didn't require plumbers to inspect, they required somebody to have a certification from New York State, and Mr. Medina is one of the instructors. So we passed a law saying that you had to now -- you could work with that certification, but you had to be associated with a plumber. You had to be working under a master plumber.

Now, Mr. Medina, who's teaching all these people who are certified and giving the certifications, still occasionally gets calls from plumbers because he's the expert on this, but he can't work on the -- he can't inspect these things without being under a plumber. Didn't understand why the guy who's certifying even the plumbers to do these tests couldn't himself do these tests. It's an interesting issue. So what the bill does is it makes an exception for the certified New York State instructors, as long as they're inspecting at the request of a plumber, a master plumber, could do these inspections. It's a very narrow exception and it's really up to the Legislator but -- Legislature to decide, but I wanted to clarify what the bill does. If that makes sense.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator. Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

How are you, sir? Thanks for coming down again. Just a question for you. Have -- how do you get paid, your organization? Do you get paid by the -- by your students or directly from the State? You know, coincident with the number of students that you certify or is there a flat fee that you charge the State to be one of the licensed agencies? How does that work?

**MR. MEDINA:**

We get paid by the students attending the certification course.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. Have you noticed a difference? Has your business been impacted at all by the law that the County passed limiting the different types of people who can actually test backflow devices?

**MR. MEDINA:**

Honestly, it hasn't increased or decreased.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Stayed constant.

**MR. MEDINA:**

We pretty much pack every single certification course.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Good for you. Okay, thank you very much.

**MR. MEDINA:**

You're welcome.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

If I might. Even a plumber has to go through this class.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I understand.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

You can't inspect the backflow devices, because only plumbers can do the repairs to them.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

But apparently some of them are so -- some of the problems could be so complicated that they'll go to Mr. Medina because he knows more about -- I guess than anyone -- these types of devices; right, is that correct?

**MR. MEDINA:**

That would be correct. I have six backflow certification cards here, three of them belong to Suffolk County plumbers, three of them belong to Suffolk County water supply companies who have attended our course in the last four months alone. Their names are on the front with their license numbers, they're sealed and they're signed, the signatures on the back of the card belong to me. So the question is, is how is it that the instructors for the State of New York said we can't do a test on behalf of a New York State licensed plumber if they request us to do so, as they have in the past?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Mr. Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I don't know if this is a question for you so much, sir, or if it's to the sponsor. Is it the issue that this gentleman is exempt or preempted from our local licensure based on the fact that he's engaged by State Health? I still don't understand the premise here.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

You know, nobody's challenged our law legally, if that's what your question is.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, and they should, as a matter of fact; it's valid.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yeah. So what I think is a matter, I think, of principle -- I mean, most -- there was concern initially that some of the guys he trains could no longer do their job unless they affiliated with a plumber. I think for the most part, and you can confirm this, I think most of the guys have affiliated with plumbers at this point. But I think it's a matter of principle for Mr. Medina who feels that he's training the plumbers, he's training all the backflow inspectors, yet he and his other -- the other teachers can't do this under our law. So I think it's a principle issue.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

He could go out and he could do it if he affiliates with a plumber.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, let me ask the gentleman, then. So -- I don't know, we must have 800, 900 journeyman plumbers, I guess, in Suffolk County. Presumably, all of them have the ability legally, then, to do

backflow testing, or not?

**MR. MEDINA:**

No, only if they have State certification.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. And those 800 or 900 journeyman plumbers can only get that testing through you?

**MR. MEDINA:**

Correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

You're the only authorized entity to give certification in this backflow procedure.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Not in the State, there are seven sponsors in the State. We're in Copiague, our facility is in Copiague; there are two facilities in Queens, there is a facility in Peekskill, New York, Rochester and Binghamton. There are six separate training facilities in the State of New York, and the New York State Department of Health also recognizes the New England Waterworks Association which is in Massachusetts, New Jersey, Connecticut, etcetera. But we're not the only training facility in the State.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

He's the only one in Suffolk County.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. No, I get that.

**MR. MEDINA:**

Think about this --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

So if a plumber is out there jobbing, he's going to want to be able to go ahead and take in whatever kind of work is referred to him, or comes his way. So it would seem to me it would behoove him to be able to have this certification. I mean, you know, if you're doing heating, if you're doing a boiler or if you're doing whatever, backflow I guess comes in with all different types of systems, right?

**MR. MEDINA:**

Backflow is part of the plumbing industry, absolutely. But the State requirement, in order to test a backflow device in the State of New York, is that you must be State certified. And we have absolutely no limitations on who can attend our course. Could you imagine if we became selective of who couldn't come to the training facility? There would probably be an uproar in the community.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, I don't know about that, sir. Because quite frankly, I'm not a plumber, but you're telling me I could go sit and go through your course and be backflow certified?

**MR. MEDINA:**

That would be correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, that would be a frightening thing, sir.

**MR. MEDINA:**

Everyone is required -- you don't just come to the course. You are required by the State to pass the course and be competent in training a backflow device. This is not the installation of a device, this is a backflow tester certification license only. It does not allow anyone to do any installations, repairs or replacements.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right, thank you very much, Legislator. Any further questions of Mr. Medina? All right. Thank you very much. We appreciate --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

One question. How -- if this were to pass, how many individuals would be affected by this? It's just --

**MR. MEDINA:**

It's thousands.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It's you and how many teachers?

**MR. MEDINA:**

Well, there are --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

In Suffolk County?

**MR. MEDINA:**

Every sponsorship is required to have a minimum of three instructors. At the Copiague facility, currently there are three instructors. So if you take the seven certification courses or sponsorships, 21, but it's probably around 21 to 30 instructors in the entire State.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Right, but they're working mostly in other areas --

**MR. MEDINA:**

Upstate and --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Just in Suffolk County there's three of you or four of you?

**MR. MEDINA:**

There are currently three, there will be four some time in January, February.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Including yourself you said.

**MR. MEDINA:**

Correct.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay, who would then be able to do these inspections as long as a plumber or master plumber requested them to do it.

**MR. MEDINA:**

Yes. And as long as they are New York State Department of Health certified instructors, yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay? Very good. Thank you very much, Mr. Medina.

**MR. MEDINA:**

Sure.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Would anyone else like to be heard on this IR? Would anyone else like to be heard on this IR? Seeing none, Mr. Schneiderman, what would you like to do?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'll close, make a motion to close it.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

He makes a motion to close, second by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fourteen (*Not Present: Legislators Montano, Stern & D'Amaro - Vacant Seat: District #8*).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***(Public Hearing on) IR 1949-13 - A Charter Law to Increase Budget Transparency (Calarco)***. I do not have any cards on this. Would anyone like to be heard on 1949? Would anyone like to be heard on 1949?

Mr. Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion to close.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion's to close. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. CILMI:**

I'll second it.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been closed.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen (*Not Present: Legislator Montano - Vacant Seat: District #8*).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***Public Hearing on) IR 1963-13 - A Local Law to Update the County's Child Protective***

**Advisory Board (Gregory).** And I do have a speaker on this; AnnaMarie Weber.

**MS. WEBER:**

Good afternoon. I'm Chair of the Suffolk County Advisory Board on Child Protection. We meet every month, except for the two months of the summer, at the Legislative Building on the fourth Thursday of the month at 10 AM, except for holiday conflicts and then we switch it to the third.

The original intent of the committee was developed in 1973 to monitor the response of the New York State Central Registry that is assigned the task of receiving all the reports on child abuse and neglect for Suffolk County as well as for New York State. At this time, the board has voted to update the resolution, expanding our mission to include a wider spectrum of issues regarding the protection of children.

In addition, current laws have expanded for mandated reporters. And throughout the years, we have worked to strengthen the reporter and worker relationships which we continue to do and would like to expand. We present a conference each year in collaboration with various County agencies. We also host the 30th Annual Award Ceremony that will take place in 2014 for professionals as well as volunteers, and I think a lot of you have been involved in that and that is sort of the heart of our board to support our professionals and volunteers in the community.

At this time, there have been amazing improvements with the registry, with CPS, with the staffing of CPS, and as we have looked at this, we see so many issues for children for their protection, but it's a wider range. And so we have naturally expanded to other issues, whether they be child mental health, school, a variety of issues. At this time, we would also like to update it, due to the fact that the appointments that were made by the Legislature the last time were in 1999 and we'd like to just bring ourselves up to a current standing. So I do support this resolution. Any questions?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes. Hi, Ms. Weber. Can you go through what some of the changes are?

**MS. WEBER:**

Certainly.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Well, one is there is a -- the original legislation, there aren't any term limits, so there is a term for the members.

**MS. WEBER:**

The four-year term limit is one. We also requested to ask a member from the County Attorney's Office to be present; the County Attorney's Office is always involved when there's a petition for the court. And in addition to this, what's been happening, due to the increase in prescription drugs, there is an increase in petitions before the court. And in response to that, we thought having the representative from the County Attorney's Office would help to inform us and let us know what the needs are for these children.

In addition, some of the -- the State Central Registrar, it's not called the Central Registry anymore, it's updating of names; and also looking at expanding the committee to include all those who are working with children in the County. And let's see what else. The other piece that we are doing, we've made it a little bit more specific, it's number five, *"Review and make recommendations concerning the Suffolk County Child and Family Services plan for the protection of children."* We already have been contributing to that every year and it would just -- we would like to make that formal.

And besides monitoring the central registry, it's important to expand the research regarding child abuse and maltreatment and identifying community needs, and we want to look at current trends as they relate to protecting children. So most of this is just an updating of the wording and expanding our scope.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

All right, thank you.

**MS. WEBER:**

Anyone else?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

*(Laughter)*. Hi. How are you? Thank you for asking, though. Would anyone else like to be heard? Apparently not. Thank you very much. We appreciate you coming down here today, AnnaMarie.

**MS. WEBER:**

Thank you all.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Would anyone else like to be heard on this? Would anyone else like to be heard? Seeing none, Mr. Gregory, what would you like to do on this?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Motion to close.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion's to close. I'll second the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it's been closed.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fourteen.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. 1977 --

**MR. LAUBE:**

Thirteen *(Not Present: Legislator Hahn, Montano, Nowick & Stern - Vacant Seat: District #8)*.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you.

***(Public Hearing on) 1977-13 - A Charter Law to Improve Budget and Fiscal Communication in County Government (Cilmi)***. I do not have any cards on this one. Would anyone like to be heard on 1977? Would anyone like to be heard on 1977? Seeing none, Mr. Cilmi, what would you like to do?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Motion to close.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion's to close. Is there a second on the motion? Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Calarco. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been closed.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Thirteen (*Not Present: Legislator Hahn, Montano, Nowick & Stern - Vacant Seat: District #8*).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. I am now going to be setting the date for the following Public Hearing on December 3rd, 2013, at two different times, at the Maxine Postal Auditorium in Riverhead;

The first one, the *Southwest Sewer District Assessment Roll*. I will set that for 10 AM at the Maxine Postal Auditorium in Riverhead, that's the Southwest Sewer District Assessment Roll.

And *IR 2032, a Charter Law to implement Common Sense Home Rule Reforms*. We will set that public hearing at 2:30. We'll set that public hearing at 2:30. Okay? Ten o'clock for the sewer --

**MR. NOLAN:**

You need a second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Oh. May I have a second on the motion?

**LEG. CILMI:**

I'll second it.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fifteen (*Not Present: Legislators Montano & Stern - Vacant Seat: District #8*).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

We are now moving to page ten, everybody. Page ten, **Resolutions Tabled to November 19th, 2013:**

Everyone got it? We're all good?

All right, the first one is ***1307-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Charter Law adopting and incorporating 2% Property Tax Cap into the County budget process (Cilmi)***.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Motion to table.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion to table by Legislator Cilmi. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Calarco. All those in favor to table? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fifteen (*Not Present: Legislators Montano & Stern - Vacant Seat: District #8*).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1347-13 - Directing the Department of Public Works to conduct a traffic study on a portion of County Road 86 (Spencer).** Legislator Spencer? I have -- this is 1347, page ten.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Sorry about that.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

It's okay. Take your time.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It's County Road 86, traffic study.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Oh, motion to table.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion's to table. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

*(Raised hand)*.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fourteen (Actual Vote: *Sixteen - Not Present: Legislator Montano - Vacant Seat: District #8*).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you.

**1510-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to safeguard employees displaced by privatization (Browning).** Legislator Browning?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I'll make a motion to approve.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Makes a motion to approve. Is there a second on the approval?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second's by Legislator Calarco. Are there any other motions?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'll make a motion to table. And I have supported this every time so far, but I think in light of what the -- you know, the contract we just agreed to with AME, which basically guaranteed four years of no layoffs, I don't see the necessity for this at the moment.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay, I'll second the motion to table. Is there -- on the motion, Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yeah, just real quick. I mean, obviously it's a four-year contract, it's not a contract that's going to infinity. And I basically -- this bill is basically setting a policy, as far as this Legislature would be concerned, that in the event privatization at any time, maybe we'll never be in office when this happens, but it's just to say let's set a policy on how we feel about this.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Call the vote.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

*(Laughter)* All right. Are there any further --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Mr. Vaughn, maybe?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Oh, Mr. Vaughn.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

We remain opposed to this. But if the Legislator is content to call the vote on tabling it at this point in time, so be it.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. We have both a tabling motion and an approval motion; the tabling motion comes first. Roll call vote.

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

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes to table.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

No.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

No.

**LEG. HAHN:**

No.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

No.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

*(Not Present).*

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

The closing of the hearing to --

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

To table.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

To table.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

No.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes to table.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Nine.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

The tabling motion fails. The motion to approve; roll call vote.

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

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Absolutely yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

No.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

No.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

*(Not Present).*

**LEG. CILMI:**

No.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

No.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

What just happened?

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Tabling failed.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Take your vote.

**MR. LAUBE:**

No?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

How are you voting, Mr. Gregory?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

I said no.

**LEG. STERN:**

No.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

No.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

No.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Six.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right, the motion fails. All right, we're moving along.

***1599-13 - Establishing new fee policy for County health centers (Calarco).***

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I'll make a motion to table.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion's to table. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Cilmi. Are there any other motions? We're good? Any discussion? We have a motion to --

**MR. NOLAN:**

Table.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Table, right. Table. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

1753 --

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (*Vacant Seat: District #8*).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you.

***1753-13 - A Resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the establishment of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 4 – Smithtown Galleria (County***

**Executive).**

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

We're going to make a motion to table one more cycle, Mr. Chair, in conjunction with the public hearing.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay doke. I'll second the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen (*Vacant Seat: District #8*).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right, we've moving over to page eleven, **Introductory Resolutions:**

Everybody ready? Okay, starting with **Budget & Finance.**

***1854-13 - Amending the 2013 Operating Budget and appropriating funds in connection with bonding for a settlement for a liability case against the County (County Executive).***

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Motion to approve.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion's to approve by Legislator Gregory. A second on the motion?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

(*Raised hand*).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Legislator D'Amaro seconds the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen (*Vacant Seat: District #8*).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you. On the corresponding Bond issue (***1854A, Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$120,000 bonds to finance the settlement of a General Liability case against the County***), same motion, same second. Roll call vote.

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

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Oh, yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

*(Not Present).*

**LEG. CILMI:**

*Yes (repeated vote).*

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yeah.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

*Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okey doke.

***1883-13 - Tax Anticipation Note Resolution No. -2013, Resolution delegating to the***

**County Comptroller the powers to authorize the issuance of not to exceed \$410,000,000 Tax Anticipation Notes of the County of Suffolk, New York, in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied or to be levied for the Fiscal Year commencing January 1, 2014, and to prescribe the terms, form and contents, and provide for the sale and credit enhancement of such notes (County Executive).**

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion's by Legislator Gregory to approve. Seconded by?

**LEG. NOWICK:**

I'll second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Legislator Nowick. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it's been approved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

*Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1960-13 - Amending the 2013 Operating Budget and appropriating funds in connection with bonding for a settlement for a medical malpractice case against the County (County Executive).**

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion's by Legislator Gregory. Second on the motion?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator D'Amaro. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

*Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Same motion, same second on the corresponding Bond Resolution **(1960A.**

**Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$175,000 Bonds to finance the settlement of a Medical Malpractice Case against the County),** roll call vote.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

No.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

*Sixteen (Vacant Seat: District #8).*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay, **Economic Development & Energy:**

***1818-13 - Appointing Jim Vignato to the Suffolk County Motion Picture/Television Film Commission (County Executive).*** He was at the committee meeting. I'll make a motion. Is

there a second on the motion?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Second by Legislator D'Amaro. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**  
*Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
***1819-13 - Appointing Jake Gorst to the Suffolk County Motion Picture/Television Film Commission (County Executive).*** He was also at the meeting as well. Anybody? Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**  
*Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
***1876-13 - Authorizing a Lease Agreement with Rysam Productions Inc. For use of property at Francis S. Gabreski Airport (County Executive).***

**LEG. CALARCO:**  
Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. I'll second the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**  
*Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
All right. 1887 and 1950 we've already done.

We're now on to **Environment, Planning & Agriculture:**

***1465-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Charter Law to strengthen farmland and open space preservation in Suffolk County (Krupski).***

Mr. Krupski, what do you want to do with this?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**  
Motion to approve.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Motion's to approve. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Legislator Schneiderman seconds the motion.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Motion to table.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion's to table by Legislator Hahn. Is there a second on the motion to table?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Calarco. On the motion?

**LEG. MONTANO:**

On the motion?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

On the motion.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Can we have an explanation?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yeah. Do you want to, Mr. Krupski?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Please. Please.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

This sounds like your thing.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

It is; how did you know?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

*(Laughter)* I can't imagine why.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Okay. So the whole purpose here is in looking at the County's -- mechanically, the County's land preservation procedures and the lack of money that we have to spend. And so the whole -- for the purposes of discussion today, I would like to take -- I would like to take the personalities out of it, because somehow this has become like a personal issue and I've been attacked publicly.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Really? *(Laughter)*.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

This is about -- I know, I know. It's unusual for government, I know.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Particularly East End.

(\*Laughter\*)

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I'm shocked. Go ahead, it was very intriguing (*laughter*).

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

This is really about our children and our grandchildren, because at some point someone's going to say in the future *How come that got built up and how come that got -- that didn't get preserved?* And what this does is this prioritizes the way the money is spent.

We have a Master List, I am not trying to change the Master List. We have a rating system, I'm not trying to change the rating system. I'm trying to leave the rating system in the hands of the planning professionals and let them rate each parcel according to its merits based on their current system, and then not have the people in Planning and Real Estate order appraisals on parcels that under the current system are never going to be preserved. So instead of making work for people who already work in government, it kind of eliminates -- it kind of -- it streamlines government.

There's an exception, and the exception was played out today with the North Shore Land Alliance where they partnered with the Town of Huntington and with Suffolk County because it was a parcel of importance. A very expensive parcel in Huntington, which I supported the acquisition because it was a true partnership between municipalities and a private land alliance and it made sense for the locals there to put money in to preserve this, because it's important for that community. So my bill would provide for that relief if a parcel did not come up to the rating. Which by the way, 45% -- some of the criticism of this bill was that it puts farmland, prioritizes farmland above open space. If you know anything about math, 45% is the same for both, so that would -- it's an equal -- it puts it on an equal playing field.

You know, if you look over my shoulder, you see the picture of John Klein and he started the land preservation in Suffolk County, and it was a Farmland Preservation Program. And after years of preserving farm -- after years of preserving farmland, people realized we should be preserving as we should, open space also. And so there was parody and the old Greenways Program provided \$20 million for farmland and \$20 million for open space. And then the system kept evolving into it, now it's quite -- it's quite a difference. I have the figures here, I think last year or 2011 we spent ten times the amount of money on open space as we did in farmland. So it's evolved from just a farmland program to something else.

So all this would do is put both programs on an equal footing and provide a safety valve for parcels that aren't rated highly by the County to still be preserved.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Thank you. One question directed at Legislator Hahn, if I may. There was a motion to table. I've gotten an explanation, I'm not sure I fully -- fully understand the bill. Could you explain why you want this bill tabled?

**LEG. HAHN:**

Through the Chair, is that okay?

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Is that appropriate?

**LEG. HAHN:**

I mean, I'm on a list, so.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

You're speaking next. You want to wait for then?

**LEG. MONTANO:**

All right, if you want to answer it in your presentation --

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Then I'll step back and listen to the debate. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Well, I appreciate that. Legislator Krupski, are you finished?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

For the moment, unless I have to answer something.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Sure, that's always your prerogative. Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Well, I have two chief concerns about what this bill does. First, it codifies the threshold. So right now we have a threshold that is a policy statement that we've tried to adhere to: Ten points out of 25 for farmland, 25 points out of a hundred for open space; I can't even remember what the active rec is. But we have a policy where we try to meet that, and things that don't meet that pretty much don't get approved. But we do have discretion, as a Legislature, to say something that comes in at 24 points on an open space scale, maybe it's on the west end, maybe there's a whole lot of support from a community -- in a community that doesn't have matching funds; we do have discretion, as Legislators, to approve something that doesn't quite meet the threshold.

But in addition to codifying the threshold, this also equalizes the percentage of threshold required to meet between open space and farmland. Right now, when you're required to get ten points out of 25, do the math, that's 40% of the available points on that scale that the threshold is. So this bill would raise the threshold of farmland five percentage points, but it moves the threshold for open space from 25 out of a hundred to 45 out of a hundred. So it raises the open space threshold 20 points, so that they're both 45% of the available -- you know, point systems that they operate on, equalizing the two, whereas the current system they're not equal.

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

**LEG. HAHN:**

The current system requires farmland to meet 40% of its existing scale and open space to meet 25%. Because this is a -- the current program is a drinking water protection program, I believe that we should maintain this equilibrium, or what's the right word, I'm not sure what I am looking for, but we should maintain the current preference to open space parcels or wooded parcel is much more valuable from a drinking water perspective in my mind. So while this bill doesn't get us to a place where the two are in-equal, this bill treats them -- does not treat them equally. This bill only raises the threshold for Farmland Program 5% and raises the threshold for Open Space Program 20%, thereby this bill favors farmland from the current system and those are my chief concerns.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Ric, did you want -- did you have a question on the follow-up to that?

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yeah.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Well, I'll give you a little leeway here.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I just want to make sure I get this. The point that you're raising is that the open space, is that what you said, the open space component is based on a rationale of preserving the drinking water?

**LEG. HAHN:**

Well, the dollars that we use is from the Drinking Water Protection Program, the quarter cent money. It's meant to preserve land. It does say farmland is a piece of that, there's no question. I think that the voters overwhelmingly look at this, it's called the Drinking Water Protection Program, it's been always thought of it that way, it's to preserve the quality of our water. Through doing that farmland certainly if we preserve a piece of farmland we don't build a hundred houses on it, or whatever the case may be, and there's no question that that's good for our economy, that's good for our tourism, as is open space is good for our economy and our tourism. But from an environmental perspective a piece of wooded -- a wooded piece of property, it's trees, it's forest, a forested piece of property is more valuable to our drinking water than one that's being farmed, actively farmed, because of the concerns of pesticides and fertilizers et cetera, and just the usage. But we -- I'm not saying I don't think we should be preserving farms. I'm just saying that if we're raising the threshold -- my finger's on the button -- it's unequal now, and if we're going to raise it {inaudible} inequality, so I don't think we should.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

So what I'm getting at is your -- the position that you're espousing is that if we move under this bill to equalize the weight that we give, in essence we're going to be decreasing the money available for open space to preserve drinking water?

**LEG. HAHN:**

Look, the main problem that we face is that we don't have enough money, so we're really fighting over the scraps at the moment.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Right.

**LEG. HAHN:**

So what this will do is it makes it harder for open space to reach a threshold of 45 --

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Where we want to be is what you're saying.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Of where we want to be, yeah.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I gotcha. Thank you very much.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right, thank you very much, Legislators. Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. As Legislators, we all represent roughly the same number of people, but my colleague and I, Legislator Krupski, represent more than half of the geography of Suffolk County, and in that geography there are some unusual characteristics. In Legislator Krupski's district there's a tremendous amount of farmland, more than anybody's district. And in my district I have some of the most unusual habitat in open spaces, the Peconic Estuary, which is nationally protected. We are all competing for a small pot of money at this point, maybe five or \$7 million in open space and we have competing priorities.

You know, I try to focus on habitat protection and access to waterfront beach access, but that's also aquifer protection. That money goes toward creating active recreational, you know, ball fields and the like, farmland protection, whatever it might be. There's not a lot of money out there. Now, I support what Legislator Krupski is trying to do and maybe that's the kiss of death, but I believe we need to prioritize heavily with the amount of limited funds we have, to focus on what are the absolutely most -- absolute most important things we can do with our money. To me that's habitat protection. To Al it is farmland protection.

This bill raises the bar so that fewer properties can be looked at. That means we don't have to waste our time appraising properties that we really shouldn't be going after. We should just be focusing on the most important pieces. Now, I understand, we all have our districts, preserving a park or an open space in an area where there's very little open space can be a politically smart thing to do, it could be the right thing to do for the community. But we have so -- our funds are so limited at this point that I think we should raise the threshold and focus on really the environmental attributes. So that's why I support it and, you know, I said my piece. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator Schneiderman. Legislator Spencer.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I made it to the top of the list? Okay. Can I go or you want me to wait?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

What are you doing to me here?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Good questions.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Putting the bulldog in the doghouse.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

It's the Kennedy mystique.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Mr. Chair, I yield to the senior Legislator.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Very senior.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Slowly I turned. To the sponsor. This is a bill that I believe has a good spirit or a good intent, and in my own opinion has a poor mechanism of implementation, and it's very simple as to why I couldn't vote for it. And, quite frankly, I think most of us as Legislators would truly be challenged to be able to support this, because in essence, I would voluntarily be diminishing the validity of any parcel in my legislative district that would come forward. Now, in the 12th Legislative District we're nowhere near the volume of acreage in the First or for that matter in the Second, but I will tell you the few acquisitions that we've been able to accomplish in my nine years have been significant, be it a quarter acre that's next to the Lily Pond Preserve has made a tremendous difference going towards chronic flooding issues. You know, things next to the greenbelt.

I think to ask us to go ahead and to support this is almost to ask 16 of us to acquiesce that we will in essence be almost creating two super Legislators and, quite frankly, none of us with half a brain can voluntarily do that, because then our constituents in 23 months from now could say, *"Why did you dumb us down? Why did you make it less likely for anything we bring forward to you to be able to succeed or prevail?"*

And I'll go one step further. For the two of you, you do have the benefit and the luxury of the CPF, the Community Preservation Fund. I was in the Clerk's Office when it was first done by Fred Thiele and it has been a wildly successful land preservation program, but it gives you a built-in ability to meet that local match. So that even if a parcel doesn't hit that threshold of 45 that you establish, there's a ready, available, local based, town based fund that you can go to. Pigs will fly before I will ever see five cents out of Smithtown to actually money match a purchase piece.

But so what I'm saying to you is, is you're looking at, I guess, a desire to maximize the volume of acquisition, but in doing so you're almost asking us to voluntarily step away from what our responsibilities are as Legislators for the districts. So that's why I can't vote for it.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Just to answer that, and I -- you have to get past your CPF envy first of, because --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you very much. I like that, but I told you, I worked on it in the beginning.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Because you really -- there's nothing stopping any town from voting for a Community Preservation Fund, so that's not -- that shouldn't put the East End towns at a disadvantage.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, it's not a disadvantage, Al, to be candid with you. And as a matter of fact, in your district, less so than Legislator Schneiderman's, but to a certain extent you have a lot of second homes up on the North Fork.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Uh-huh.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

The majority of what you see here -- nobody is going on vacation in Nesconset. You know, folks live there and that's it. So purchasers aren't going to come in and pay another 2% in order to establish their vacation home here, you know, in Hauppauge or out there in Ronkonkoma. That's not where they're going for vacation. They're going to the North Fork, they're going to the South Fork, they're doing things like that in the summertime. They're not coming to us. So remember, that's where that CPF fund comes from, it's the purchasers who are willing to actually preserve exactly what you

speaking about when you talk about some type of an East End experience. So envy? No, it's more reality or practicality.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So then why wouldn't you want to support this, because what you said is on the East End people come out there, and that's become part of the industry, part of the economy. This is something, then, that you should support. And not to say that it gives the East End the advantage, the only advantage is that we have more land left to preserve, and that's just happenstance. That's not because Jay and I engineered this in the last hundred years, that's because that's the way it is.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Very much so, you're right, it is the way it is, and even as each one of the farmland preservation requests come before us, primarily as a body we all continue to support them. Former Legislator Romaine, North Fork Preserve. Probably one of the largest ones that we've done. Yourself in your short time here, we had a parcel I think that was adjacent to the school district but nevertheless farmed, and you made a valid and meritorious case. We don't ever buy property from another municipality because we get all hung up with why are we preserving public funding from someplace else, but you made a compelling case. So I don't think that you're at a disadvantage now. As a matter of fact, the likelihood is you'll continue to come and bring forward meritorious purchases and we'll probably agree, but not with us saying guess what and we're also going to say we're never going to have a chance to go ahead and purchase in our own districts. That, I think, is a step too far to go.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Maybe we could get clarifications from our Planning Director about the merits of this bill and actually the amount of parcels on the County's Master List that would be eligible for purchase.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Why don't we do this. Why don't we let the Legislators go first and then we'll ask them to step up and give their opinion on the matter.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Sure.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I'm sorry. It's just that they might provide clarification for the argument going forward.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

My question is actually for Sarah.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. Fair enough. Guys, clarify.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Just one quick point. One of the interesting things that we did when we took a look at this was the notion of a 45 or above, and quite interestingly there are 78% of the Master List parcels that are awaiting purchase qualify with that 45 rating or above, okay. That equals about 2,121 acres. And, for example, the Town of Babylon with 544 parcels or 544 acres actually has more parcels that would qualify then, for example, the Town of East Hampton at 317. They have more parcels than Riverhead at 391 and they have more parcels than Shelter Island or Smithtown.

The point is that we think that this is a very fair and equitable way to divide up what remains of this very small amount of money left. There's not a lot of money left to do this, and what we want to do

and why we started and looked at this with Triple A and why the Administration supports Legislator Krupski's bill now is that we want to make sure that we are getting the best -- the best product for our dollars left.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Tom, can I tell you that that statistic that you just threw at me sounds very strange.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

If it's wrong I'm blaming the Planning Department.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

I have trouble believing it, to be frank. Ms. Lansdale.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

It's accurate.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

And I never doubt you.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

Tom maybe, but you?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Yes, just to reiterate that 78% of the Master List has a rating of 45 and above. Initially when this legislation was crafted it had a higher threshold for open space and we worked with the Legislator to ask that the rating be dropped to 45 so that more of the Master List, more than three-quarters of the Master List could be encompassed in that, so that's why it's at 45, to encompass 78% of the Master List. And just to confirm, there are 544 acres still left to purchase in Babylon Town on the Master List.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

How about that.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Well, there you go. Get going guys. We want to see some action. Legislator -- are we all done? Legislator Spencer?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

First of all, I do support farmland preservation and I do appreciate my colleague Legislator Krupski's, you know, efforts, but there's some things that I think we're very much concerned about. What Tom was speaking about was parcels, he wasn't speaking about acres, and that's the trick here. So what we're looking -- you're talking about acres. But, you know, in looking at the total amount of acres preserved in Suffolk County, we've preserved about 58,000. In Brookhaven, 15,000 acres; East Hampton, 5,000 acres; Riverhead, 9,000 acres; Southold, 15,000 acres; in South -- I mean Southampton, 15,000 and in Southold 2,811. So about 48,000 acres out of the 58,000 acres have come from two Legislative Districts. We're at disadvantage in the west. Our Real Estate is more expensive and it's harder, even though there are parcels.

My concern here when we look at this, and in fact, if you look at farmland, if you take in Riverhead alone, my colleague's district, in farmland alone he's had 5800 acres preserved in farmland, which is three times more than all the open space in Huntington and the rest of all the townships combined.

And when we look at the aquifer, the aquifer has an elevation. It flows downhill from north to south and it flows out from the center of the Island, so land that's preserved in Brookhaven and the Pine Barrens doesn't do anything for the drinking water quality in Huntington.

It's -- when we look at the Open Space Program the waters are being muddied. Open space for drinking water preservation, all open space isn't equal. There's open space when you look at agricultural activities, which I support and I appreciate my colleague and what he does there. When you look at fertilizers and things that are involved, it's not the same as open space for preservation of the aquifer. There is a disproportionate inequity when you talk about 48,000 acres out of 58,000 acres that go to two Legislative Districts. I realize they take up half the geography, but that's not half. The 48,000 on the 58,000 is a lot more than half, and then I can go down the rest of the list for the western townships where it's a few, you know, less than a thousand acres for a lot of them.

So when I look at the aquifer, when I look at -- when we talk about open space and drinking water preservation I have trouble supporting this because there's already an inequity and this would further tip that inequity away from those western townships, and when we have a fund that is depleted to pass this I think would put us western Legislators at a disadvantage. I'm all for any of my colleagues who have a project that they're representing in their district as a one time thing or many time thing, supporting them, but this would change the ball game. This would change the rules of the game. So I love you, Al, but I have a hard time swallowing that pill.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

There you go. Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, there's two points that I want to make today on this bill. And the first is I think we can talk about how many parcels are on the Master List and all of that, but I think the point that we need to consider today is that we're removing our discretion. We're limiting our own authority and our ability to have it come -- to have parcels come before us one at a time and for us to make a case by case determination as to whether or not they should be preserved. So -- and that dovetails into the point that Legislator Hahn was making, that the codification of the rating system was never intended. And if you recall when I sat as Vice-Chair on the Environment Committee for seven years, and Director Isles was here at the time, he always went out of his way to make the point, and he had been with the County for a very long time right, Sarah.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

A long time. He was around, I think he probably helped design the rating system, and he would make the point that this is not something to be an end all in your decision making process on whether to preserve open space, it's only a factor, and there are many other nuanced factors that go into deciding whether or not you want to preserve a particular parcel. So I don't think it's good policy to codify the rating system and rely on it. I don't think we should do either of those things. They were never intended to be relied on in that way, it was never intended to be codified. They were only intended -- the rating system was only intended to be a guide, and an imperfect guide at that, on determining whether or not to go ahead and preserve a particular parcel.

The second point I want to make is that I understand Legislator Krupski's concern and Legislator Schneiderman's concern about the fact that we have limited funds available, and in a sense we are competing for those funds for our respective districts, but I thought we had put a new system in place already to address that where, again, when I sat on the Environment Committee for many years, one of my chief complaints was that we have a parcel in front of us today, which looks like a

great parcel and should be preserved and maybe we're going to spend \$15 million to do it, but the next meeting we may get four more parcels that should have been prioritized ahead of this one that we're considering today, so how do we know. And I thought we had changed the rating -- the procedure where we would not be voting specifically on a case by case basis any more for these parcels but rather we would be getting them in blocks so that we could then look at them together and then rate in our -- and prioritize as a committee what parcels should go first, second, third, et cetera down the line and on the list of priority.

So in effect we have a rating system in place and we have our own discretion to make those decisions, and we can have the debates about a particular parcel whether it's in the committee or whether it's here. I don't see the need to codify this and I don't see the need to limit our discretion and I don't see the need, especially in light of the fact that we addressed this issue already of a shrinking pot of funds available and a need to prioritize by putting our new acquisition process in place, because we're going to consider these in blocks of parcels.

Unless I'm mistaken, Commissioner, or Director Lansdale, that is, in fact, the way we're going to consider parcels now. It's not one at a time. We're just doing the appraisals up front and then your department is packaging them and bringing them all over to us, to the committee, in a block and we're going to prioritize.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

That's right. That's the new Triple A process.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right. So I understand your position as far as they're on the Master List and, you know, we all want to be competing on a level playing field with respect to the limited pot of funding available, but we have that discretion to compete. We each have one vote and we each have the debate and we each are going to be prioritizing through the Environment Committee not just one parcel, but a lot of parcels altogether. So I don't really see the need to take this additional step. And I would defer to Legislator Hahn as Chair of Environment Committee because when we sat together was when you put in place this new rating system and have we even gone through this yet. I think we need to give that an opportunity to succeed as well.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. Anybody else?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yeah.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yeah, I thought so. Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Wait, wait.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

I got you. You'll be next.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I was actually just taking a look at this on line here. Ms. Lansdale, I had a couple of questions about the way the rating form actually works. So we have -- we're talking about codifying our rating sheets and the forms and the scores that you get and whether or not you qualify for the program based on these rating forms. So I kind of want to get a better understanding of them. I think the one for the Farmland Program is a pretty straightforward rating form if I'm not mistaken, correct?

Oh, you're going to go get a copy? Yeah, I was hunting one down. In fact, we don't actually make these publicly available very easily for people to look at, even for properties that have already been rated and scored, which I'm actually kind of surprised about.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. So I guess the first question is with the -- let's do the farmland rating form first, because I think that's a little bit more straightforward. For a Farmland Program every question pretty much on the form really relates to the viability of that property as farmland; correct?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

That's right.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I guess with the exception of the vistas. I don't think vistas necessarily matter whether or not you farm -- it's going to be a viable farm, but I guess it likes nice, right, to look at it. But it's all very directly related to the farm operation; right?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. On the other rating form, and I know this is, you know, part of the question. What's the top score you can get on this form for open space?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

One-hundred points.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Has anything ever scored 100?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

We do have properties on our Master List that have scores in the 90's.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

In the 90's.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Uh-huh.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Do you get different points or is there different designations, and I always assumed that there was, if your property -- if the property is going to be used for active recreation versus open space?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

There's a different rating form for active recreation as there is for --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

There's a different form altogether for that one too, huh?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Yes, we have three forms.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Three forms, okay. So the active recreation form, that's got a top score of 100 as well?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Is that being affected by this resolution?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

I'd have to ask the sponsor.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Sponsor?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

No.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

So we can still get a 24 for active recreation and buy the property?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Uh-huh, sure.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. Interesting. I didn't know that, and that's I guess part of the question, because my concern lies in the same way as many of my colleagues, how this will impact the ability of the western properties. I thought we had a single form, and that lends to how much information I have been able to get, but active recreation properties are ones that I think we'll on the West End will be looking to acquire a little bit more for and it's interesting here that you're not changing that. Okay. I think I got my questions answered. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I might need some clarification on that, too, because now we might be creating a preference for active recreation over farmland or open space. Sarah, is that the case? There's no threshold in the bill?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I'm being told that's inaccurate. Counsel just told me that active recreation does need a score of 45.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Forty-five as well.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

And hamlet parks.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Yes. In looking at the bill closely it does say hamlet parks, hamlet greens pocket parks, 45 and above.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. And that's kind of where my concerns lie. I've got many parcels in my district that are both -- are very good parcels for active recreation and very good parcels, for that matter, they rely on some of our last rivers that are important for open space acquisition, and they rank 41, 40, 36, which I always assumed to be a very good score and now we're finding out is not according to your rating system.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. I think we're good. I have one more, Legislator Gregory.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. As we debate the bill more and more, the more questions I have. You know, Al, I think Al has been a great asset coming on to the Legislature. In these areas I kind of defer to him a little bit. I know in our early conversations when you came on you kind of talked to me about I guess the thought process of preserving a farm. In my estimation, and I'm characterizing your - our conversation together, so correct me I'm wrong. When a farmer is looking to preserve his land there's different considerations that go through that person's mind. There's estate considerations generally because the farm is being preserved and generally they're going to work it and then they may retire some years later. Open space is generally not -- you don't go through the same considerations. It's preserved, you're not working it, it's unworked land, so -- which kind of begs the question. What is this bill really trying to address, because I guess if you look at the numbers, and I haven't seen them, but I guess if I asked, are farm -- is farmland being discriminated in a sense or not given the opportunity I should say, as open space parcels are for being preserved. Or -- and I would -- if you look at the numbers I would guess that farmland, they're less farmland parcels that are coming forward because of those complex considerations that they have to go through than open space. It's more of an easier process. I guess that question would be for the Director.

Is there -- I guess the first question is I don't recall any farmland parcels that have come before us since I've been here, in the five years I have been here, that we've said no to. But certainly if you put them on a scale, and obviously I could be wrong, but if you put them on a scale we'd certainly deal with open space preservation more commonly, frequently than farmland preservation.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

I have some statistics that might be helpful.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Sure, why not.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

If that's okay.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Uh-huh.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Just looking at the Drinking Water Protection Program, which was enacted, passed by law, in 1987 and then enacted in -- or implemented in 1998, since 1998 to the present in terms of acreage of open space versus farmland, we have preserved 16,784 acres of open space. In terms of farmland, we've preserved 1,780 acres of farmland. The monies spent for each: For open space it was -- it's

\$450 million and for farmland it's \$123 million.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Okay. So 16,000 acres for open space, 1,000 for farmland, 450 million for open space, 100 and whatever it was for farmland.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Twenty-three.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

One twenty-three, okay. So that says that there is -- we're obviously preserving more open space for whatever reason.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

For whatever reason, yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

We don't know what that is. One concern that I have that was just really brought to my attention today and it's 78% this bill, because of the increase in the threshold it -- we capture 78% of those parcels on the Master List?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Uh-huh.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

That to me is an issue, because the Master -- if you can just go through and explain what the Master List is and the process we've rated them or went through what, at least several times.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Yes. So we, the Department of Economic Development and Planning, really at Legislator Hahn's request and leadership, and the full Legislature's request, requested that the department look at all parcels that have been on prior Master Lists. There were four previous Master Lists, each individual. So we combined all of the Master Lists to come up with a comprehensive Master List and reviewed each parcel and provided a rating for either the parcel or the assemblage if there's several parcels that are contiguous or in the same area. So there's a rating now. And we've also removed parcels that were already developed and not worthy of acquisition.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

The point I really wanted to get to was we put parcels on the Master List for a reason, and when we had the money we didn't even care about the rating because -- simply because they were on the Master List we would purchase them. Regardless of whatever their rating would be, which we didn't know, or the price, they had a priority. The rating scheme here says now that 22% of those properties that we deem as important, because obviously they are on the Master List so they have to be important, that we're not even going to look at them because of the rating, the change in the rating scheme now.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

My understanding is that it would still -- these parcels are still important to the County. It would require a match from a local town or a non-profit, like the Williams Property that came before us this morning. That had a rating of 36. It is on the -- it was on the -- or is on the Master List.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Right.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

And there was a 50-50 partnership, 25% coming from the Town of Huntington and then the remaining 25% coming from a non-profit partner.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

So that draws another question, or maybe I'm making an assumption that I shouldn't. So now you have a Master List property that's below the threshold is on parity with a property that may not be on a threshold -- I mean on the Master List, but the town or whatever may want to preserve for whatever reason. So they may not be on equal footing. You have a Master List property that's under the threshold and a non-Master List property under the threshold and they both are treated equally as long as they have a matching fund from a local municipality.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

The Triple A process outlines that Master List parcels do not need to go through the three step appraisal step process. So the Master List property under a 45 would still have the advantage over a non-Master List parcel under 45 because you're expediting the review and evaluation by members of the Environment, Planning and Agriculture Committee and the appraisal.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

But it still has to go to the committee, no?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Yes, it does.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Okay. So at some point those two inequitable, I'm going to use that word inequitable, properties would be reviewed in the same -- in an equitable basis when they're not really equal as far as the value of the property, environmental value. Am I making assumptions? I don't know. You're smiling.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

I just -- I'm just having a hard time following your point.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

I'm sorry.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

So, did you say that the Forest Property was a Master List property?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. So there's a property in my district, whatever street, wherever, half acre. It rates a 22 -- it's obviously not -- or a 25. It's not on a Master List, but as long as the Town of Babylon says well, we're going to come up with 50% of the funds the County would preserve that or it would be reviewed for acquisition in a similar fashion as a Master List property.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

That's right.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Right. So my property that's a 25 from an environmental standpoint is not as a priority or valuable of an acquisition, but simply because my low rated property is getting a match from the local municipality it's kind of skipping ahead of the process or it's being reviewed for acquisition as a Master List property would almost.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

And it would still be the discretion of -- it would still have to go through the Triple A process and be reviewed by and prioritized by members of the Environment, Planning and Agriculture Committee and then the full Legislature.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Right, so my --

**MS. LANSDALE:**

It retains more money for the County to preserve more environmentally, like a higher rated environmental parcel.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

So -- but it could also spend money that it necessarily wouldn't spend because if -- on a property that we normally wouldn't acquire simply because there was a match -- because we're spending three million as opposed to six million because there's a three million match, there's three million we could save potentially.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

That would be the discretion of the Legislature.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

I guess my bigger question is or concern is, it kind of takes away from those properties on the Master List if they're going to be treated almost in a similar fashion as those that aren't as sensitive of an acquisition. That's my concern.

But what I do like about the bill is the rating system. I do believe there should be some adjustments. Ever since I have come on to the Legislature I felt the system for open space preservation is totally inadequate. I think out of a system out of 100 points I don't recall for the most part seeing properties very rarely over 50. I'm not saying it doesn't happen, I think that's a problem. So I do like that there's an adjustment there. What I -- what I sense from some of the comments from earlier and from some of my colleagues about preserving farmland as opposed to open space for water quality purposes, I -- it's almost as if there's a -- there's a different type of treatment for farmland and that concerns me, because it's -- the comments were of the nature of, well, because it's farmland, it's inherently against water quality, so we shouldn't preserve them.

**(THE FOLLOWING WAS TAKEN AND TRANSCRIBED BY  
LUCIA BRAATEN-COURT REPORTER)**

**LEG. GREGORY:**

But why are we -- why do we have farmland in the Water Quality Program? There should be -- in my mind, there should be a change. If we're not going to -- if we don't think that farmland is good for water quality, let's take it out of the water quality funds, put it on its own, because, inherently, there's a -- there's a --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Cross purposes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Right, cross purposes, but there's -- I don't want to -- "discrimination" is the word that's coming to mind, but I don't mean -- obviously, I don't mean that strongly, but there's a negative outlook towards farmland. And I think that directly goes to the point that Legislator Krupski is trying to draw attention to, that there's an inequity, and it's even been repeated in some of the comments that have been said. I don't think it was meant maliciously or anything, but if we take the position that farmland is not in the best interest of protecting our water quality, it should have its own program, and I certainly would support that. But to have it in a program where we inherently look at it as well, it's not good for water quality, it's the reverse. So you're saying he's trying to make it equitable to keep the system in place would mean that we would keep an inequitable situation in place, because, obviously, we're not going to change our opinion as to farmland and water quality if we feel that way.

So I think somehow that should be changed. I don't know if that's -- we put up -- I guess we have to put up with another referendum. I don't know where the money comes from, but it's clear here today that people don't think farmland belongs in the Water Quality Program. So I think there's some type of change that should be instituted. I don't know what that is, but I spoke enough. But I'm conflicted, but I understand where Legislator Krupski is trying to go. I don't know necessarily if he has the support here today, but I think we need to address this issue in some way. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yeah, I see your rationale, Legislator Gregory. Of course, we'll start working on that next year right away. Just kidding. Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Sorry about that. So I was -- I hope -- I think I sort of got an answer just now from Counsel on the question I was going to ask, but I wanted to know when we started using drinking water dollars for farmland. Remind me. Those 16,000 acres versus the 1,000 acres was from what year?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

From 1988 to present.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Right. So it wasn't until 19 -- the new -- in 1998 when we started using drinking water money for farmland anyway, so it's really not comparable.

But, yes, I do want to -- I do want to speak to what the last speaker just spoke about, which is drinking water protection. And, of course, you probably weren't listening to everything that we said, because we all said it's clearly better than allowing it to go and get developed, and so there is a reason -- from a drinking water perspective, there is a reason to preserve farmland. We said that the first round, I'll say it again, but when you put a wooded parcel next to a farmed parcel, the wooded parcel that's forest only is better for drinking water than the parcel where they're adding nitrogen and pesticides.

So, yes, there is a reason they had been separated in the past. In 1998, you know, we gave more money to open space acquisition, 13.55% of the program, with 7.35% going to farmland acquisitions. That sounds like it's about a doubling, but in 2007, a Legislature that I didn't serve on, but we brought them all under the Drinking Water Program together in 2007. So there -- we now are down to the nitty-gritty of the dollars left, we understand this. I think these are all very important discussions that we need to have, should we separate them. Should we have a different pot of funding for farmland that comes from, you know, another source? Possibly, maybe. You know, as we move forward, these are discussions I think we need to have. And right -- and so right now, this is part of our discussing this. This is part of vetting this whole idea, is we're here debating whether or not we should be equalizing them under a Drinking Water Program, and that's why my argument was no.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Thank you very much. Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thank you. Just to sort of piggyback, I have to say I'm -- this really is a fascinating conversation. I think most of us agree that there's significant value to preserving farming and farmland in Suffolk County for a variety of reasons, as Legislator Hahn just said. There is a water quality impact associated with farming, and there's certainly an economic impact associated with protection of farming, as there is a number of other industries.

And it's interesting that Legislator Gregory said what he said, because I had said in a sidebar with the Presiding Officer a few minutes earlier, that it seems to me that the interest in preserving farming has more to do with economics than it does with drinking water preservation, although -- although there is, as Legislator Hahn said, a drinking water component to it.

The arguments have been very good on both sides. I tend to be leaning towards keeping things the way they are for the moment. And then Director Lansdale cited some statistics which caused me even further question. So I'm a numbers guy, so I enjoyed listening to the -- we've spent 450 million on 16,784 acres of open space, you said, and 123 million on 1,780 acres of farmland. So when you do that math on a per-acre basis, and forgive me if this is irrelevant, explain to me why it wouldn't be or why it would be, but -- so we've spent roughly 26.8 thousand dollars per acre on open space purchases, versus a little more than \$69,000 per acre on farmland preservation, so more than twice on a per-acre basis for farmland preservation than we have in open space. And so the next question in my mind, then, is if we give increased weight to farmland preservation, does that skew that number even further? And, therefore, are we getting less bang for our buck in terms of drinking water protection for the quarter cent money that we collect?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Would you like me to answer that?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Why not? You could throw a question mark at the end of it and have a go.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Well, thank you for that analysis, the dollars per acre. I'd have to go back and look at the nuances of each transaction, and look at trends with the Real Estate Division to fully answer that question for you. It's an interesting question that you raise.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yeah. I don't think I have really any other -- any other points. Director Lansdale, you know, I very

much respect your experience and your opinions, Legislator Krupski, as I do yours, and Legislator Hahn, everybody, really, here. Legislator D'Amaro made some great points. I'm just not convinced that this is -- that this is the right move for us to make right now.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Thank you very much, Legislator Cilmi. My pad of -- just so you know, my pad that I've been keeping the names on have now gone over to the other side. I can't fit them on the paper anymore. Legislator Krupski. Let's see if we can start to wrap this up.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. And, yeah, I want to really thank everyone for their thoughtful comments. Everyone's put a lot of time and thought into this, as they should. This is extremely important.

If you look back, Suffolk County has got, you know, the best history of any county in the country in land preservation and we should continue that and build on that heritage going forward. So I really do appreciate everyone's putting the effort into it that they should.

I just want to address a couple of things. The whole thing about the farmland and the water quality, that's like saying, well, you know, there's pharmaceuticals in the groundwater and there's radioactive isotopes in the groundwater because of medicines, we should ban all medicine, because it's -- they're dangerous to the groundwater. So that's really not -- you couldn't ban everything that has an impact on groundwater. You're not going to ban automobiles, and truck traffic, and you're not going to shut down the MTA because they have an impact on the groundwater. So to say that -- and I'm not going to go into the benefits of agriculture, because I think everybody here understands those things.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

You got to eat.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So -- what's that?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

You got to eat.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

We do have to eat and it's better to eat locally grown healthy food. So that was -- you know, that's it. I just want to -- the only cautionary thing I have to say is that if you look at the farmland, it is left on the East End, but that's where the development pressure is going to fall. And that's why it's important to keep the preservation process moving forward, because once you put houses on it and pave it, then you won't be able to produce any food or anything else on it.

But, again, I thank everyone for their thought they put into this, and it's a process, that we'll -- I think we'll have this discussion again.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator Krupski. Legislator Anker?

**LEG. ANKER:**

I have a question for Sarah. I'm sorry. Come on up again. So my question is, was it 2007 when you combined the Farmland Development Rights with Land Preservation? Why was that done?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

I'm going to defer to Laretta Fischer, who can explain that.

**MS. FISCHER:**

Good afternoon. I believe that it was passed by the Legislature to include the farmland acquisitions, in addition to the active recreation to the Drinking Water Protection Program. It kind of came out of the Greenways. That was also part of the Drinking Water Protection Program. And the Greenways Program actually was the first cut of funds for open space farmland and active recreation. I believe it was -- actually, it was split by an amount, 10 million for open space, 10 million for farmland, and two million for other, I think, active recreation, if I'm not mistaken. And then from there, that program had a certain, you know, end point, and after that, it was approved by the Legislature to include them all in.

**LEG. ANKER:**

So, basically, it seems like that, you know it was brought into this so we could really move forward in preserving some of our farms. It just seems like, you know, just get all the funds and -- you know, and focus on just preserving, preserving everything, you know, land, farm, whatever.

But -- so just one last question, because I know we've talked about this for a long time. Is there a way that we could use another source of revenue? You know, we've got the hotel/motel funds, we've got other funds that may be out there to specifically focus on our farms. You know, they're our economic engine for Suffolk County. Would that be possible? Is that something you could look into?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Yes, we could certainly look into that for you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. Thank you very much, Legislator. John, it's up to you. Do you want to do it? Let it go.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Sarah, let me -- I just want to ask you one point. It's almost like a rhetorical question, and I think I'm going to key off of what Legislator D'Amaro had spoken about before. And I just want to see if you kind of concur with what his assessment was, that, in essence, by embracing this, we really are taking away some of the individual ability that we have to assess the value of a particular parcel.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

I think we would still bring all parcels to the Legislature. You know, they would be nominated through the appraisal step process, and then we would present those findings to the Legislature. And I believe that it would still be the prerogative of the Legislature on how to act, but I would defer to the sponsor on that interpretation.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, Al and I talked about it. I mean, I pretty much made my thoughts known about it. I appreciate you with the generic information, but, you know, I think it's good to preserve farm property, but not to diminish any kind of opportunity within our particular Legislative Districts. I'll yield.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All righty. But, Sarah, just to make sure that that was clear, would they get to the appraisal stage, though, if it was something that --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No, it wouldn't.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

So we would never see it.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Right. It would be -- it would be introduced at the Legislature and then reviewed by the -- debated at the Environment, Planning and Agriculture Committee.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Then it would be gone.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes, I thought so. I didn't mean to bring further question.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

The bill says in Section A-3, "Beginning in 2014, only the parcels receiving the minimum ratings set forth below shall be eligible for Legislative consideration."

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

That was my point.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So there it is.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yeah, I thought so, too. All right. I think we've got everybody. All right. God knows I don't remember what we have on this. We have both a tabling motion and an approval motion.

**MR. LAUBE:**

You have a motion and second to table.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right.

**MR. LAUBE:**

I have the motion for the approval, but I didn't get the section.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

There was no second on the approval? Is there a second on the approval?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Well, there might have been, I just didn't hear it.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Legislator Schneiderman --

**MR. LAUBE:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

-- is the second on the approval. Okay. Tabling motion comes first. Roll call vote.

*(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)*

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes to table.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Nay.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

No.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fifteen. (Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. The tabling motion passes. Good job, Al. We're with you, we like you.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

We just don't like that.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. Let's move on. Okay. Local Law amending -- 1700. We're ready, guys? How long was that, was that five hours?

**MR. LAUBE:**

More than an hour.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Excuse me, Mr. Presiding Officer. Since you like me so much --

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

You want me to pay your, bill? What? What?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes, I'd like to -- here's the bill, yeah. Could we -- could we advance some of these resolutions in the -- to try to get some of our County people moved on with their lives? I gave you a list earlier; I don't know if you still have it.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

I threw it away because -- but I can --

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Can you pass that down.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

I could find it, though.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

He got his picture, that's it.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Oh, you got it coming back? All right. You want to take them out of order is what you're saying. Okay. Make a motion.

**MR. NOLAN:**

He doesn't know the numbers now.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

What does this say?

**LEG. HAHN:**

Make a motion to take it out of order.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Legislator Krupski, why don't you -- you want to make a motion?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I'll make a motion to take the following resolutions out of order.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

One at a time.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

All right, the ones that I passed to you, starting at the top of the list.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

1826, is that the first one?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. 18 -- where is that?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Environment.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. **1826 (*Appropriating funds in connection with Development of Blue Point Laundry Site (CP 8244)(Calarco)*)**. All right. Are we ready? Okay. 1826. Krupski makes the motion to take 1826 out of order; seconded by Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been taken out of order.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Stern/Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Mr. Calarco, this is for yours. Do you want know to --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion to approve.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion is to approve. Is there a second on the motion.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Hahn. Appropriating -- this is to appropriate funds in connection with the development of Blue Point Laundry site. All right. We have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. Same motion, same second --

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

-- on the corresponding bond issue. Roll call vote.

*(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)*

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

We shouldn't be spending money on a study now. No.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Pass.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yeah.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen. (Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. The motion passes. The next one is ***1860 (Amending Resolution No. 1108-2010 in connection with a continuous water quality monitoring station in the Peconic Estuary (CP 8711)(County Executive).***

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Motion to take 1860 out of order.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Page -- okay. Legislator -- you're lucky we like you.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So lucky.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

I'm just kidding. Motion to take out of order 1860; seconded by Legislator Schneiderman?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Sure.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. We have 1860 taken out of order. It is to -- in connection with the continuous water quality monitoring station in the Peconic Estuary. Everyone got it? Okay. We have a motion on the -- on 1860?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'll make a motion.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, second by Legislator Krupski. Anything on the motion? We're all good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

It's been approved.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Motion, we take 1863 out of order.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Was that a study, by the way?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

No.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Just checking.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It's actually monitoring.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

That's actually monitoring. Okay. The next one is ***1863 (Extending authorization for Brownfields Program, former wallpaper factory site in Lake Ronkonkoma (CP 8223)(County Executive)***, the next one down. Legislator Krupski makes the motion to take it out of order, seconded by Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. This is to extend the authorization for Brownfields Program, former wallpaper factor site in Lake Ronkonkoma. Motion by Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Seconded by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

You got another one.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Motion to take 1870 out of order.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Where is that now? Oh, it's the next one down. Okay, we got it. Okay. **1870 (Appropriating funds for the Water Resource Management Program (CP 8237)(County Executive)).** Legislator Krupski makes a motion to take 1870 out of order, second by Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

This is to appropriate funds for the Water Resource Management Program.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. ANKER:**

(Raised hand).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Seconded by Legislator Anker. All those in favor?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

On the motion, Mr. Chair.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Sure, on the motion.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Can we just at least get a little bit of an explanation on this one as to what the funding is for? Walter, what is -- what are we doing with this? Is this for the water modeling?

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

Yes. Walter Dawydiak, Environmental Quality. Yes, Legislator Kennedy. This is to update and refine the actual groundwater model with digital elevation model coverages to get better coverages of surface water, stream beds and near shore coastal areas.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

To BRO, how much, Robert, on this, and what is it coming from?

**MR. LIPP:**

It's \$25,000 in serial bonds.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Time out, hold on. Why are we bonding 25 grand?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. Who's -- this is County Exec's? Why are we doing this?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Why are we bonding 25,000? We don't have 25,000 that we can appropriate or expend to this from on-hand funds, anybody?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

What offset are you thinking about, Mr. Kennedy?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, there's that nifty 1755, Mr. Presiding Officer, that we could work off of, if it's that important for 25 grand.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

It's bonded money.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'm sorry?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

It's bonded.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yeah, I know, that's what 1755 is.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

No 477 left to do this?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

I don't know. Let -- Mr. Lipp?

**MR. LIPP:**

No. First of all, this is a County Executive resolution, it's not ours, number one. It's their determination to do serial bonds, number two. And there -- really, the funding, the Water Quality Funding under Fund 477, as you know, the Operating Budget is sort of like really at the break-even point. There is a fund balance, I believe it's in the neighborhood of three-and-a-half million dollars, that we have to be very careful with to utilize, but that's a discretionary determination.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

So you're saying we could?

**MR. LIPP:**

Well, it's a possibility, but, you know, we're --

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

But you're frowning on it.

**MR. LIPP:**

Well, I'm just saying that it's very difficult with what we've been doing with 477 with the water quality. We have to be very judicious on what we choose. I'm not saying we should or we shouldn't.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay.

**MR. LIPP:**

It's the Executive's determination, it's his resolution, is to use serial bonds.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Got it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Walter, is this an ongoing study that we are adding another 25,000 to for a consultant, or is this a new contract that's going to be let.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

Legislator Kennedy, my understanding is that the capital project is structured to add approximately \$25,000 a year for the next three years to do modest implementation of the Comprehensive Water Resources Management Plan. This will be let out to a contractor. It's undetermined yet whether this can go sole source or via RFP, but it's going to have to go one of those two routes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

This reso, Robert, is for 25,000 only for this year or are we --

**MR. LIPP:**

Correct, only for this year.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Important to do, but I'm not in favor of bonding this.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

All right. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Mr. Kennedy. What do we have as far as motions?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

On the motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

On the motion.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Just to address Mr. Kennedy, but you just voted to spend 50 -- borrow 50,000 for an undetermined use for a study on a brownfield site that's been cleaned up. This is actually water monitoring that the Health Department's going to use for a -- as a tool.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Al, I -- Legislator Krupski, I have absolutely no issue with it at all. And, as a matter of fact, I'll tell you what I'll do. I'll introduce a motion to table, and then I'll speak to Robert Lipp and to the County Executive to find an alternative to fund the 25,000 to do the study and not put it on a credit card. I

did vote for the 68,000 for the water monitoring in the Peconic because I know that's important to preserve our shellfish industry and to try to find out why brown tide is so persistent out there. But if we can't find 25,000 to fund our groundwater without putting it on a credit card, we're in a world of pain. So I'll make the motion to table.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. There's a motion to table. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. NOWICK:**

I'll second it.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Nowick. We have a --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

On the motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

On the motion.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Maybe this is really to Dr. Lipp, but, yes, it sounds -- Legislator Kennedy, it sounds like a small amount of money, 25,000, but the way the County does the bonding, there wouldn't be a separate bond issue for that \$25,000, which would, you know, take a lot of work, and a lot of paperwork and bond counsel, etcetera. It's bundled, right, Dr. Lipp, into many other related bonds?

**MR. LIPP:**

Okay. So, to put this in perspective, yes, typically each bond issue is about 120 different purposes, this would be one of them. The 25,000 would probably equate to approximately 35,000 over, say, a typical 18 years, or less than 2000 a year. That being said, if we're going to continue, as Mr. Dawydiak stated, to do the same thing for each of the next perhaps 20 years and that's going to be layered on top, number one; number two, if we wanted instead to consider 477, it should go through the Water Quality Review Committee first, and they could better perhaps determine what the priorities are, at least to guide us, and then we can make a determination then, and that's how the process is supposed to be if we're going to use 477 Water Quality Funds.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Which I believe is a perfectly good use for this. So I just wanted to clarify that the bonding wasn't necessarily -- to me, the 25,000, it sounds small, but it's bundled, but I think we could pay for this without having to pay interest on it, because it seems to fit under the Water Quality money.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Right. Through the Chair, I understand that, Legislator Schneiderman. I read the bond issues, I do, and I see the multiple items that are in there. But in this case, you know, at some point we have to go ahead and decide that we're willing to actually spend what revenues we have coming in for the priorities. We just spent an hour talking about farmland and, you know --

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

John.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

-- protection of properties in our individual districts. So I don't think it's unwise for us. I mean, do we have the consultant starting in two weeks, Walter?

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

No, we don't. Legislator Kennedy, if I might, just by way of point of clarification, somebody mentioned the study. It's not really a study, this is for development of a model, which is really a durable tool which serves as a resource for us to do our work. In that sense, it's much like a vehicle or a well-drilling rig. It's a piece of intellectual equipment that we use to assess impacts and designs of sanitary systems, wastewater treatment, coastal resiliency policies, groundwater impacts, and a whole series of issues, so --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I understand, Walter. As a matter of fact, then when we had Sy Robbins on staff, he did the work for us. We don't have that inhouse capacity anymore, so we have to go out and get the tool upgraded. I understand the value of the tool. I'm not -- that is not my issue at all. My issue is that we're borrowing or factoring 25,000 to go ahead and to help us with the proper decisions for the only source for our drinking water, that's all.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Thank you very much. I'm not sure Mr. Schneiderman disagreed with you, by the way.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I don't think he does, no.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yeah.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

That's why he's going to support my tabling.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. We have a motion and --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I will, because I think there's a more -- there's an appropriate fund to take this money, which I think there's enough there, and we don't want to pay interest, so why wouldn't we do it that way?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Right.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Makes sense.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. All right. We have a motion to table and we have a motion to approve. Tabling motion comes first. Roll call vote.

*(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)*

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

No.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes to table.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

No.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

No.

**LEG. ANKER:**

No.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

No.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

No.

**LEG. STERN:**

No.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

No.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Eight.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Motion to approve. Roll call vote.

*(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)*

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

I'm sorry, I didn't hear that. Yes?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

It's on the bond.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Thank you.

*(Roll Call Continued by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)*

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes to approve.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

No.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fifteen.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Tim, did you get me?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Oh, Rob Calarco, Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fifteen. (Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. The same motion, same second on the corresponding bond resolution. Is that all right with you guys? All those in -- roll call vote. I'm sorry.

*(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)*

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

No.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

No.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fourteen.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. I think that's it, right, Al?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

(Indicated thumbs up) Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. We passed over -- we're going back --

**LEG. HAHN:**

Wayne, Wayne. Wayne, one more.

**LEG. ANKER:**

We've got one more person in the audience. Resolution 1915, I'll make a motion to take that out of order.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

That's two down? 1918.

**LEG. ANKER:**

No, 1915.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

1915, I'm sorry. 1915. Okay. *1915 is amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the Environmental Quality Geographic Information and Database Management System (CP 4081)(County Executive).*

So Legislator Anker just made a motion to take that out of order, seconded by Legislator Hahn; is that good?

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it is taken out of order.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

**LEG. HAHN:**

I'd like to make a motion.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Legislator Hahn makes the motion, second by Legislator Calarco, to approve. Everyone good? All those --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Can we get a bit of an explanation on it?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Sure. On the motion.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Don, you want to come up?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right, guys. I've just been informed this is a three-quarter vote, because you're switching from bonding -- from grants to bonding.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Don, you don't have a computer monitor, you have old-fashioned paper on this?

**LEG. HAHN:**

This is the point, so pay attention.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Don Rodgers, Commissioner of IT. Yes, Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It's part of the point? Okay.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

I am bringing paper with me today. This is a -- before you is a resolution for the appropriation of funds that I appeared before this body about a year ago, at which point we had asked for funding to do an assessment of converting the existing wastewater management environment in the Health Department, and you politely asked me to leave and find another way, which I believe we did. We have spent that time in taking a look at the overall environment and assessing it and automating part of it. What Mr. Vaughn is holding is the method that the Health Department currently utilizes to record all of our wastewater changes in the County. This book --

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Vanna.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Highly advanced. Is that a stone tablet or no?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

I have samples I can pass around.

**LEG. HAHN:**

We got Vanna White.

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

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

I'm not giving you the book, because we're concerned about its well-being.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Not mine.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Some of these pages -- most of these pages are 30 years old, and when staff makes a change to wastewater in the County by putting in sewers, septic, various other changes, they go to the book, they open it up, they find the map and they write on it. And they do it in various colors to indicate different changes that have been made. There are over 30 of these books out in Yaphank. They paste documentation on here. This is their only methodology for being able to trace and track these maps. So when I left here a year ago, we said we're going to do something about these maps as our first step in changing the wastewater management environment in the County. And what we did is we are in the process of digitizing these. Now, these are important documents for our staff to use. They rely on these. However, one of the issues is that if Legislature -- Legislator Anker were to work in wastewater and go in and make a change on this, she's really the only person that knows where that change is that she made. And if somebody else needed it, they'd either have to ask her or go find it, which is not particularly expeditious. So we are in the process of scanning these maps in. They will be done by the second quarter of this year. We've got a lot done. By the way, this is just Shelter Island. We have multiple volumes for some of the other towns.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I asked him to bring the smallest one.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Yeah. And what we have now is something that looks like this on a computer screen where staff can actually go in now and bring the property up, and they can mark it up and they can have multiple layers come up and they can actually access data from some other areas as well within the department. This has been a significant success for us, in my opinion, and working with Walter

Dawydiak's staff and IT and GIS people, this is a major step for us in moving forward in implementing a standardized process for us to be able to get data and use it in the County across the Board.

**LEG. HAHN:**

And to facilitate permit approvals for businesses.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

The next step is for us to move towards that, which is what we are asking for the funding for today. We have over -- more than half a dozen disparate databases where data that is associated with this information is stored, and they have been built over a period of time and they do not connect to one another. The staff utilize them, they rely on them, they make good use of them, but the information stops with them.

We will be using the funding to consolidate that data into a standardized format to facilitate permitting, to facilitate being able to provide data out to the public, to facilitate working with other municipalities. That is what we are here for today. And within these maps some of the various information you would find on there would relate back to projects. It would relate to subdivisions. It would relate to transfer of development rights. You have to keep in mind, though, these maps are static, so we have maps in Real Property and we have maps in Yaphank. Except these don't change.

**LEG. HAHN:**

The spirit of the Gettysburg Address.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

If they change they have to get drawn on, and our goal here is to make sure we have a set of maps.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. I think we got that.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yeah, yeah. I think this is a no-brainer. I think that we've been really anxious to see this move forward. There's been a delay in permitting for businesses. Really a major part of it has been that our staff has had to check not only that book but a map like that, and an index card in another file cabinet, and maybe go talk to someone else because they couldn't understand the handwritten, you know, whatever was handwritten on the map. And so this really will help us to facilitate business permitting, to make it possible to even follow some of that online. It's a real step forward from an economic development standpoint and in the spirit of the Gettysburg Address I'm going to like leave it there. It's almost like enough has been said. This is a -- it's just such a no-brainer to move us forward in this way, technologically in this way. And so thank you for all your hard work on this issue. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. I just have a quick question. I put myself on the list. Ms. Lansdale, I have been at forums touting how far Suffolk County has come as far as their GIS system involving sewers and all that. And I'm hearing that this is our records? What -- how does this -- this doesn't compute. I thought you had the most updated system in the world. Are they using something different or can we just, you know, send the CD over?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Well, last year we won a National Association of Counties award for our efforts in mapping where the sewage treatment plants were in the County private and public.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Right. And the lines and all that kind of stuff, right?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

And where the sewer districts were, and this takes the -- this project is the next step in --

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

You mean those lines aren't in the GIS system that you have?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

They are.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Oh, they are.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

And then this deals with individual homes, so this is the next step.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. But they are coordinated?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Yes, they are. Our work in Economic Development and Planning is in the central GIS database, yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

So there'll be one GIS system that we can all share and everyone will be happy?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. Now I understand. Okay, just checking. Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. So I can see why Legislator Hahn looked at me with bright eyes and said we have to do this. Obviously we have to do this. But I do have a couple of questions. The \$900,000, I think it's \$900,000; correct?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

That we're spending here, what does that actually pay for?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

We are in the process of finishing up an RFP that will go out for us to purchase a software solution that will interface with the work we've already done, and it will also allow us to convert our existing data so that we have that data and can utilize it going forward, because the data is obviously of major importance to us.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So what Director Lansdale was just talking about in terms of the -- sorry, in terms of the sewage treatment facilities and that information is usable in the way that you're suggesting we should be using this information or no?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

It is.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

The information that Director Lansdale spoke about is usable in a GIS manner, correct.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

What we're looking at here is all the properties within the County as compared to the sewer districts within the County.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. But if we have -- if we have an infrastructure in place, a technological infrastructure in place to deal with what Sarah Lansdale described, why couldn't we use that same infrastructure to do what we're proposing to do here?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

We are, and we're building off of that infrastructure to put the notes that the Health Department makes on these maps into that infrastructure, so we're building off of previous efforts. So we're going to put in or what the project is proposing is to put in notes about septic systems for instance, to put in notes about underground storage tanks and building off of that and Brownfields and things like that.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Oh, okay. But if the technological infrastructure currently exists, are you proposing to make that infrastructure more powerful, or is this money going to be used simply to input the data that's currently on those maps into the infrastructure that currently exists?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

The infrastructure that currently exists will be significantly enhanced. It will become a lot more powerful. The money that we're looking for will be used both to implement software and to convert the data, and the data conversion is a significant project here. It is no small feat. And as I said, there are over half a dozen different databases that are storing information in various formats that have to be converted and standardized for us.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. So initially you said that this -- that the \$900,000 was predominantly for software. Is that -- did I hear you wrong or?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

No. It's for software and the data conversion, and in all likelihood the data conversion will cost us more.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. Explain to me -- I understand the intent of the data conversion, but explain to me from a technological point of view, don't get too crazy with me, but explain to me what are we converting and what are we -- what data are we converting and what -- how is it going to be converted?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

So, Legislator Cilmi, we have multiple versions of this with multiple books and multiple colors, as we've just learned.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

So what the conversion will do is bring all this into one spot. So it will take the colors and the -- that are in the various books and will take the information at the various sites and implement this on to the one system.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So when you say -- Commissioner, when you say data conversion, you mean convert from an analog set of data like you have in that book to digital, or do you mean converting digital to another form of digital?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

I'm referring to both, all right? And primarily we're going from a digital format to another digital format. We have -- some of the data that we have has been stored for 30 years, and these formats are singular to a particular application that they are using for a particular group right now, and that data is not readily available to other people. So what we have is we have systems that work for you, but not for your neighbor.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So what do you anticipate, then -- what do you anticipate this being able to achieve. I mean, I understand from a generic sense, but give me a sense of right now, you know, X, Y, Z department uses the digital data that we have but it's not accessible to A, B, C department. Just fill in the blanks for me if you would. Why will it help us to be more -- aside from the obvious, why will it help us to be more efficient?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Well, first of all, we're going to move to a web based environment. This is going to open an enormous number of doors to the entire County in terms of the standpoint of us being able to decide who needs this information available to them, and that we can make it available to them.

Additionally, it's going to allow us to have these disparate data sets interact with one another and really allow people to look at a more comprehensive picture, an overall scene of what's going on. It will work towards the permitting process, and how can we expedite that process and work to be able to obviously expedite economic development when people want to come in and actually get things done quickly from us and not have to wait as long.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So you expect that it will make us more efficient, it will improve the back or the lead time on processes in terms of approving permits and a variety of other things, you think it will save us some money?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

I look at this system as being a major impetus in us being able to introduce the technology that we really need in this County and leverage that into other departments as well. All right? I have a significant amount of interest from the standpoint of what else we want to do beyond here in terms of laying the groundwork. So, yes, I believe that this will not only assist the Health Department in doing what they need to do in wastewater, but I also believe that we can then expand that capability into other areas within Health and into other departments in terms of being able to make data available to those departments.

**LEG. CILMI:**

All right. I apologize for taking so much time, but I do have two other questions for you. In allocating \$900,000 for this, how confident are we that that is going to be enough or might it be way too much to accomplish what it is you're trying to accomplish? What research have you done in order to come up to \$900,000?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

We believe that the -- well, that wasn't my number, that number was there, okay? But I do believe it's a fair estimate in terms of resources that we would probably need. Our biggest issue, as I said, I do not believe is going to be our software costs. I do believe it's going to be in our data conversion, which is imperative that we get it right, because otherwise it's garbage in, garbage out, and we're nowhere.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right. Okay. The last question I have to ask has to do with performance management. So you're coming to us and obviously we're going to make processes more efficient here. We're going to make data available to multiple customers within our own environment, theoretically will save us money, may improve lead times on some permitting and some other things, but do we have data to be able to show that? Are you able -- are you able to tell us where we're going to improve lead times by two weeks? Have we set the metrics --

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

We do have studies that have been presented to us by different vendors who we've spoken to.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Studies that are -- that are specific to our current situation?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

That are specific to automating environments of our nature.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Just case studies.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay, but that doesn't tell us -- in other words, we can't look -- we can't say, for example, that because we don't have this data digitized and available to multiple constituencies right now it costs us "X" to do this versus, you know, and at the same time our goal is to reduce the cost to, you know, whatever, and here's how it's going to improve our lead time. We don't --

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

No, I cannot give you those numbers, but what I can say to you is this. We're going to make data

available that we either do not have readily available or can't get.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I believe you. I believe you, and from what I've heard so far, I'll be supportive of this. But my final point in asking that question is that you're asking us to approve this money based on, you know, an educated guess as to, you know, that this is going to save us money, it's going to improve processes. Obviously it is going to, but my point is without knowing the metrics we're going to look back a year from now and you're going to come to us and you're going to say, "Well, it helped," and my question would be, "Well, how much did it help?" And anecdotally you're going to talk to me about that, but we're not going to really know. So while I support it, I'm just disappointed that we don't have those metrics in place, unless we do and Sarah's going to enlighten us.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

If I could just give you an example. For instance, we are conducting a transfer of development rights study currently that's funded by HUD and we are looking at -- one of the data points that we're collecting right now with the Health Department is the number of properties that have been sterilized for a wastewater credit. And because this information is not readily available, my staff has spent -- I've dedicated for the past 12 months one staff member one day a week, eight hours a -- or seven hours a day, to go through the Health Department records to collect that data. So -- and when this database is -- and the data is converted, that would have been, you know, an hour's worth of work.

**LEG. CILMI:**

See, that's what I'm talking about. We know what this particular function that Ms. Lansdale was talking about is costing us now, at least in terms of man-hours. And we know what doing this will achieve in terms of savings, enabling us to do more with less. And I'd like to see those types of examples coming from -- coming from these proposals in the future, so that we can actually, you know, put some meat behind the question. Anyway, it sounds terrific, and I appreciate the presentation, and look forward to talking to you a year from now, whence this is all up and running and we can see how it has improved. Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Again, it's always -- visuals are always good and I think we're going to call Tom Vaughn, Tom Vanna White with the book, and let me describe the book. The book is an old, green, it looks like a schoolbook. It's about a foot-and-a-half by two feet and it has got these metal hinges on it. I'm surprised there's not rust on it. It's just amazing. We were looking through it -- the Legislators had a chance to look at it. But the mistakes that I can see happening. It was smudges, if someone spilled coffee or water on this book, and this is one of 30, that could be very expensive for Suffolk County, those mistakes that could be happening right now.

So I just wanted to, you know, state on the record that not only is it hard to read, you know, and again, trying to clarify, you know, the permit process, you know, mistakes could happen. And I think it's a good investment. I think we're actually going to save money by investing in this process. I worked very hard with the County Exec on facilitating the health permit process and this will help with that and I'm in full support.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator Anker. Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Thank you. And I just want to make sure I understand this. So what you're doing is you're putting all of this data that you have in books and these other handwritten databases, I assume is what you're talking about. Is it mostly handwritten or it's mixed?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

There are -- they're electronic databases some of them, they are Excel spreadsheets.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

You're going to migrate all existing data to a new system.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

That's correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

All existing data. So what you're doing is you're taking data from all these other sources, including these books, and you're going to put it into a searchable database, a comprehensive one database.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

That's -- who's going to maintain that database?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

The Department of Health Wastewater Management.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So is that the same department that's maintaining all these other sources that we have now?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Yes. This is their job.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So you're going to make it more accessible, and probably more accurate as well once it's input correctly, but on a going forward basis there'll be less margin of error in collecting data, storing data, searching data --

**COMMISSIONER RODGER:**

Accessing data as well.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Accessing data.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And to do all of that, to go from that book to a powerful, searchable database that integrates with the GIS system, right, you need to spend \$900,000?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

That is the -- that is the estimate, Legislator D'Amaro. And, again, as I said, I expect the software to be less. The --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I have a note here that says -- I apologize for interrupting. Go ahead, finish your thought.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

The wild card is the cost of the data conversion.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right. Of the amount requested, 850,000 will be used to purchase software licenses. Is that accurate?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

No.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

That was written prior to --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

This is the old proposal.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. So --

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

When I came before you guys and originally spoke to you about \$100,000 to have a consultant come in and do an assessment for us.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Request was that we try to find another way to address this.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

And I believe that is what we did by putting into place the first piece that does digitize these maps and give the worker an availability to bring the map up, the old map, and now also to use GIS going forward.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I'm not following you.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

We've written an application already, that is the first step. That is the first step on this. That first step is digitizing these maps. We're doing that inhouse now.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So inhouse instead of purchasing licenses for an off the shelf software system --

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

For that part of it, yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

For that part of it, you are doing it inhouse and writing this program or whatever it is you guys do.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And that's going to be able to handle all of these different databases you're talking about?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

That is the next step. The next step is for us to purchase the software that will work with integrating these databases and then also hook into the piece that we've already written. And the software that we're looking for is specifically designed to work within the wastewater management world.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Here's, you know, and forgive me as a layperson on all of this, but what you're basically doing is taking information from various sources and putting into one database that's searchable.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

That's one part of it, yes. That's absolutely one part of it.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, what's the other part of it?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

The other part of it is that we're putting software up that will also expedite the process that workers have to go through to do their jobs.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

But doesn't the County -- we have centralized all the servers in the County in IT, or almost all of them.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

We've centralized many of them, yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right. So -- and what department is this affecting again? I'm sorry.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Health.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

In Health.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Right.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So using the existing hardware and software that we have we can't just enter data into a searchable database? I don't understand why we need the expenditure here.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Centralizing -- we've significantly reduced any hardware requirement for this project because we centralized the servers in the County.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Centralizing the servers, however, does not mean that the data is all connected.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

It's just sitting in, for lack of a better word, drawers.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Okay. So while we've significantly reduced the need for the hardware component for this, all right, the ability to actually convert this data, which as I said is in many disparate formats and be able to eliminate duplication and make sure that the data will actually interact is an enormous effort, and no, actually we cannot take on that task.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So -- okay. So we can't do that in-house. We need to buy a program, if you will.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

We're buying a product that provides not only software to replace the functionality of what wastewater staff do now, but will also integrate this data.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right. So let's say we get to a point where we approve this, now you eliminate all these diverse databases, whether they're books or old systems or whatever, one doesn't talk to the other, they can't integrate with each other, they're not all searchable. So now I'm in the Health Department and everything's up and running and running correctly and I want to research a property, let's say. Is this the purpose of the software, so I want to know -- or I want to say in a particular town in Suffolk County how many, you know, permits have been granted for septic systems in new construction since 1985. Is that the kind of data you're looking to pull out of this?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

I would expect that we would pull that out amongst a lot of other things, yes, as well. Now, we

could pull that out because the data is now in a standard environment for us to operate in and, quite frankly, we would expect to be able to put that kind of capability at the supervisory and managerial desktop for them to make that decision instead of coming to us and asking us for --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, no, this is not about ultimately coming to you. This is about being able to do it within the department.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

You're just putting all the pieces together.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Right, but beyond putting the pieces together the software itself is designed to help the current wastewater management staff do their job today.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, to do it on a new platform or database as opposed to writing in that book.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

As opposed to writing in the book, as opposed to operating in more than one particular program that they may have to go to or look at.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

But why is that so egregious?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

It results in an enormous amount of lost time. It results in an enormous amount of duplicative effort, because you may go into three different applications that if they had 20 data elements, 20% of them may be duplicative. So they're reentering the information again. Any time you have to reenter you increase the higher level of --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So you have a certain set of information that needs to be entered and you go into application, it handles -- you put it all in but it handles some of it, then you have another application and then maybe you have to write something in the book.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

You can have these levels of overlap, correct. Now, this is not unusual as systems evolve over years.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right, I agree with you.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

But as I said, we're looking at maps that are 30 years old that people have been writing on. You know, these maps were printed in the 70's. Most of the towns have digitized all this information. We're behind them in doing that. And for us to be able to go and, again, just to answer your question in terms of why is this egregious, the amount of time it takes us, as Director Lansdale said, for us to go in and get information is enormous in comparison to what we expect to be able to do.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right, but the question becomes how much time, if it's up and running the way you envision it, are we actually saving? Is there a demand for this at a time when we're trying to be careful on how much we bond?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

I think if we go back to Legislator Hahn's statement with regard to our ability to produce permits in a timely manner, and the impact that it does have on us in terms of allowing people to actually do work for the County, that that is a significant --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, you would have to tell me, what is the average time for a permit that you're speaking to?

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

About four weeks.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

About four weeks.

*(The Following Was Taken and Transcribed by  
Lucia Braaten - Court Reporter)*

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So when we're talking about any type of Health Department permit that you need, maybe a septic system or something like that. So you're telling me, from when I submit an accepted application, which means there's no errors in the application, to getting the permit, barring any issues, of course, is about four weeks; is that right? Hi, Walter.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

Walter Dawydiak, Acting Director of Environmental Quality. Four weeks is the time from submission of a plan to initial review. That's what we refer to as a backlog, and that's usually the rate-determining step in terms of getting a process in full gear and moving toward fruition toward closure.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, so it's only four -- it's four weeks, then, from submitting and when someone first picks it up.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. So this wouldn't help that time.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

It actually would. This would help on multiple different levels. One of the ideas is the staff could be made much more efficient. So if you can achieve even a 10% efficiency in the staff with a 10 million dollar budget, you're saving a million bucks a year and you're doing things a lot faster, and I think that that is on the order of the minimum goal that you'd like to see here.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. Let me ask it another way. So your system is now up and running.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And now the same person comes in and submits a completed application. How long now until someone picks it up?

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

Ideally, faster than four weeks.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, but come on.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

That's a policy goal for the County Executive to determine for the resources.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I agree with the policy goal, but I just want to know that you guys have thought about this, and you have to be able to stand here today and give us some assurance that if we have this expenditure, that we're going to meet the policy goal.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

We have.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

You can't just like say, "Let's try it and see what happens," right?

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

We are inherently engineers and measurers by nature and we have statistics like you wouldn't believe. We have measured turnaround times for types of applications and review times, and this will be tracked to ensure that we are processing applications more quickly and with less downtime --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

You're not answering my question.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

-- to the benefit of the constituent.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

You're not answering my question, though. My question is, when we spend \$900,000, and Legislator Hahn talked about we need to do this because we want to speed up the application process, and I agree, well, you're the guy that's coming here and telling me if you spend this money, we are going to speed up the application process, but you're not giving me a definitive answer.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

If I can just say this, Legislator D'Amaro: A significant part of the permitting process also involves the towns. The towns cannot respond -- a lot of the towns are already automated.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

We can't provide them with the automated information that we could now by doing this, which, again, can I quantify that for you? I cannot. But what I can tell you is that we will be able to

transmit this information to the towns electronically. And part of this overall approach of what we're doing here will be for us to enhance that process as well and work more closely with the towns on ensuring that we have that integration of the data between us and them.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So how much time does that save us or an applicant?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

I can't answer that question for you.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

What if it doesn't save any time?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

If I didn't think that this was going to save us man-hours in performance, I wouldn't be standing here today, because there is absolutely no reason to automate any process, whether it's manual -- because this system's old doesn't make it bad. All right?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No, I understand, yeah.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

There is absolutely no reason to automate something if we're not going to see improvement from it, and I wouldn't be standing here today asking you about this if I thought otherwise. What I can tell you is this: The improvement, and I think Director Dawydiak would back me on this, the improvement that we have already seen in the staff's ability to do their job from the small piece we have done has been nothing short of phenomenal. And we literally have just touched the surface on what we expect to accomplish there.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

But, ultimately, does it result in getting the public served more expeditiously, is my question?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

I am standing here today saying to you, yes, it will --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Because the problem is --

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

-- and I don't have a number for you.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

The problem is that if there's a delay, it's not necessarily because of the systems that are old and outdated.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Absolutely, I agree.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

It could be for other reasons such as lack of manpower.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

It could be. However --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

There are other reasons for this.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Yes, absolutely. However, if we can put more streamlined processes in place, then we free up --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

-- staff's time to be able to deal with those problems.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right. But you can't really quantify -- you really can't quantify how this expenditure results in a time savings.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

No, we have not done a time study analysis of that. All right? I can present studies that were done by vendors who have automated similar areas in terms of improvement, but we have not done that with regard to --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. And my last question, of the 850 or 900,000, how much of that is earmarked for the actual data conversion, the expertise you'll need to do that, the time required to do it, you know, entering those books and putting them in a digital format?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

I'm expecting it to probably be at least half.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Half?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Yeah, I'm expecting it to be at least half.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And is that something that's done inhouse fully, or are we hiring to do that, a consultant?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

It will depend upon the proposal and what they can present to us from the standpoint of security, of the data, if we were to allow it to go offsite, and the speed that -- you know, what the benefit is to us of doing it. Normally, I'd prefer on-site.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And this will -- this will then put this part of the system in place for the Health Department?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

That's correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Are there other plans in the future for other aspects of digitizing or of modernizing data storage

retrieval and searchability?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**  
Absolutely.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
For which other departments? And would this help do that?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**  
As I mentioned earlier, I have a lot at stake in this game because I believe it is an initial step for us in going where we need to go with standardizing data. Now, that being said, we have an enormous repository of paper in the County that is not easily retrievable that which begs for a countywide imaging solution.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
Right.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**  
All right? This, of course, would allow us to assess some of those issues beforehand.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
Okay. So the 900,000 is more than just storing the data that's on those books.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**  
Absolutely.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
It's several other databases that need to all go into one system, a uniform system that's searchable, retrievable, accessible.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**  
This is a -- yes. This is a very large project.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
Right.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**  
And it will be -- and I will stand here today and say this to you: It will be an enormous success story for the County.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
What are you going to do when you run out of the 900,000 and you're only a third of the way through?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**  
We're not going to get started if we're not going to be able to finish.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
Okay. Well, no. I mean, as far as needing more funding.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**  
I would expect that -- as I said, we are -- we are finishing up an RFP now for release.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Okay? We expect that we are in the right place with the funding on this.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

And if we're not, I will be absolutely happy to let you know that before we ever do anything.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And you'll have a better handle on that when -- you're doing an RFP for this?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

We are.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So you'll get responses and there'll be a lot more discussion about the cost?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. Thank you, appreciate it.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

You're welcome.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

You're welcome, Mr. D'Amaro. All right. It's been so long, I almost -- the list has grown. Legislator Krupski, you're up.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

All right. Some of my questions have been answered mercifully. What's your timeline on this project? I mean, I understand the merits of it. And I'm going to steal Legislator Schneiderman's line, and he said you're bringing the -- trying to bring the County into the '90s. So --

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

You're just way too kind, Legislator Schneiderman.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thanks.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

What's your timeline on it? And based on like if you can -- when you start it. Is that -- and it's something that you and Legislator D'Amaro talked about. Is that something that's going to be available sooner to the towns, or some of the towns? Are you going to do Shelter Island first and they're going to have the information? Or how are you going to -- how are you going to -- how are you going to schedule --

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Again, I'll be better able to answer that when we get the responses from the RFPs in terms of what the proposed implementation processes are. Okay? But I would fully expect we'll be done with this in a year.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. You're true to your word, nice. Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Oh, I'm good.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

You're way beyond that. You've reached the tipping point. Okay. Legislator Barraga.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Let me ask you one question. Let's say we're in the private sector, a private company, and you work for me, and you came in and said, "Look, you know, Tom, I want to spend \$900,000 to upgrade the computer system to bring us into compliance, to be more efficient. I think one of the questions I would ask you, if you want the company to spend \$900,000, what's in it for us? What do we get out of it from a quantifiable perspective? Are we going to save on the expense side, are you going to generate additional revenues? What do we save by investing 900,000 into this program? And you should be able to give me an answer, or at least an estimate, because if you can't, why would I possibly want to spend \$900,000 on your system?"

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

And as Director Dawydiak said, right now, we know how long it takes for us to process an application, and we know that we can reduce that time with this software. Now, beyond that, what we also know that we will get out of this is we will get an environment that actually starts to allow us to connect the disparate GIS pieces that are in this County that we're spending money on every day with different people using, and they're limited to specific areas.

So you're right, Legislator Barraga, that I cannot give you a number. What I can say to you is this, is if we were in the private sector, what I would also be saying is we are running technology that in some cases is 30 years old and we cannot possibly expect to be competitive in that environment.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Is there a hue and outcry at some level from a constituent perspective that people are unhappy with the current system in terms of the amount of time they have to wait for these permits? Are there many complaints coming in?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Yes. Yes, we do get complaints with regard to the amount of time it takes for permits to actually be processed, and, in addition, to how does the County interact with the various towns.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

But you have not been able to express a reduction in that time if this system is in place. If it's four weeks to get a permit, it's my understanding, listening to this, it would still be roughly four weeks to get a permit, because you're saying somehow the towns are involved. So how does that increase the efficiency from a constituent perspective?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Excuse me for one minute.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

Just a clarification about the backlog. Once that four-week turn around is done and the permit application is processed, every time the applicant resubmits, it's turned around in a matter of a day or two, one week at most. So that four-week number is really the rate determiner to get the project going to where it needs to be. We probably attain that number 80 to 90% of the time, and I'm giving you a ballpark estimate. It's those times when it goes above; somebody retires, goes out on sick leave, we have a problem with our data information systems. You have some perturbation in the process.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

So are you able to meet your goals and objectives 80 to 90% of the time under the current system?

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

The goal should be 100% attainment --

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Under the current system.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

-- which means that the backlog --

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

But this \$900,000 is to close that 10% where you're behind at times?

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

It's going to bring the initial backlog average number down, and it's going to increase the attainment to at or near 100%, is going to be the goal.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

So you're going to go from 89 or 90% to 100%, so it's a 10% differential here from \$900,000.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

Somewhere in the -- somewhere, 10 to 20%.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

All right. Thank you.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

The other thing that it does is it greatly increases -- if you walk into a town like Southampton or Huntington, a constituent can find all the records that they need related to their applicant -- application instantly. This is time and money and this is economic development. You can't do that in Suffolk County. We process roughly 5,000 applications a year and we have 50,000 samples that are analyzed between lab, water, wastewater, pollution control and ecology. Each and every one of these feeds through the central nervous system of wastewater. Every one of those steps where you

need to reach out manually to get a tentacle of information from another hard copy file costs time, money, human energy for both the County and the applicant.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

But if I understood you correctly, if you have 5,000 applicants -- applications, you're processing them on time 90% of the time under the current system, right?

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

We are processing them within our four-week goal.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Okay. Yeah, under the current system.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

Correct.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

With the current system that you have.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

It should be done faster.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

This 900,000 is to pick up that 10% that you're sort of running behind to bring you to 100%.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Right. Well, if we want to keep it within the four-week time frame. The four-week time frame right now is what is defined as acceptable.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

So 10% are going beyond the four-week time frame.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Right. And what we're saying --

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

So this eliminates that 10% to stay within the four weeks.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Well, to stay within the four weeks, correct. Okay? Now that's that part of it, but it also doesn't speak to the availability, as the Director just said, the availability of this data.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

So one out of ten applications, under the current system, are late, go beyond four weeks?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

I'm sorry?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

So one out of ten applications, based on the numbers, go beyond four weeks?

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

That's a gross assessment. Don't hold me to the exact number, but that's the right order of

magnitude. Also, applicants and people in the business community can't go online, click on a parcel, find out what activity is going on there with respect to water supply, pollution control or wastewater. They need to get a consultant, they need to prepare an application, they need to submit it, they need to wait four weeks to find out, "Oh, gees, I have a superfund site sitting right underneath me." That's just not good Health Department practice.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. Thank you very much, Legislator Barraga. Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. Just a couple points, one first before I tick up with you two gentlemen. With Counsel, I want to make sure that I understand, and with BRO. This resolution requires 14 votes, George?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

And why is that?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Because the method of financing is changing, and the Capital Budget right now, it's supposed to be G money, which I'll let Budget Review explain that, what that is, and this is changing to bonded.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Craig, can you explain that for me so that I understand that.

**MR. FREAS:**

Yeah. G money is money that would have already been placed in the -- in the Operating Budget for capital projects. The most typical example in recent years is we often buy vehicles through a capital project, but occasionally, we sent -- we put a couple of million dollars in there that's -- we would buy the vehicles through a capital project, say, but it's G money, it's not -- we don't bond that fund, it's just money that's placed in the Operating Budget that's used for capital purposes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. So when we last adopted this, we had intended to put the funds there to do this?

**MR. FREAS:**

Correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Funds are not there now.

**MR. FREAS:**

No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

And we're still being asked to do it.

**MR. FREAS:**

Correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**MR. FREAS:**

I would like to point out that the BRO recommendation in the Spring was to fund this as a serial bond project, because there was no G money placed.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**MR. FREAS:**

There was no G money available at the time.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

All right. Thank you. Don, if I can just talk to you a little bit about this for the time being.

I think the concept is a meritorious concept. I'll be candid with you, I don't think this project is ripe yet, and I'll tell you why. It is something that I dealt with similarly when I was with the County Clerk, nine years there, and you're very familiar with the imaging and the scanning project. We talked all about what happened with a contractor who held us hostage, they were terminated. Ultimately we got an inhouse product and off we've gone.

What I didn't hear you talk about at all was the subscription potential. Walter spoke about the industry, and this information typically is what's used by our design professionals when they're proposing construction, or modification, or renovation on parcels, right? Walter, you would agree?

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

To a large degree, yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. So now you're familiar with the County Clerk's subscription program, right?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Six -- I think it's sixty-eight hundred, I just racked it up, for deeds, liens, mortgages, judgments, the whole megillah. So, in some respect, the multi-million dollar investment that the County of Suffolk made in the first instance, and continues to make with upgrading the hardware that supports almost 23 million images now, is at least in some respect offset with the customer base out there, those individuals that come to us that need it to support land development, land sale, land modification, what have you. Is there any of that contemplated with this at all?

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

As of now, I believe that most of the information is considered FOILable. It's just very cumbersome for the community to find it and FOIL. I don't know that we're talking about subscriptions at this point.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, deeds and mortgages, as a matter of fact, are public by definition. And prior to the online

service, what happened is abstractors would drive out to Riverhead and they'd actually pull the information. Now somebody can do a title search in China for a piece of property here in Suffolk County.

Gentlemen, what you're speaking about actually cries out for action, but you're not ripe yet. You don't have a fully distilled or cooked proposal to put before us. And, quite frankly, to agree to borrow 900 grand on a good idea that will get better is -- I'm not prepared to go that way. I don't -- it's not ready, it's not ripe yet.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Call the vote.

**LEG. CILMI:**

One last thing.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

I got Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

One last thing. One last thing.

**LEG. STERN:**

One last thing in 10 subparts.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**LEG. CILMI:**

Steve knows me too well. No, no, just very quickly. The -- I was hoping that maybe Director Lansdale -- she gave us an example while she was up about how some -- how savings could be quantified as a result of this, and I was wondering if you could put, Sarah, sort of a financial color on what you -- on what you talked about, because, ultimately, that's what -- that's what I'm looking for here. I can see the need for this, but you're asking us to spend \$900,000. You're asking us to borrow \$900,000, so -- and, obviously, what you're talking about could be used across a broad range of issues throughout the County. Maybe you could just give us one example of how this could save us some money.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Would be happy to. So the staffer that visits the Health Department once a week, seven hours a day, for the entire year, for the past 12 months probably makes approximately 50,000, and then, I don't know, another 10 to 15,000 in benefits. So, you know, you take 20% of that, and then, if we had this system in place, it would take a few hours and be, I don't know, \$300 worth of time.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. So we have an employee making 50 or \$60,000 a year that's devoted to going back and forth and looking through these maps just for this particular function.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Yup, and using a County car, so there's gas incurred and wear and tear on the County vehicle.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And once you get this new system implemented, it's a couple of clicks of a button and --

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

That's right.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And so, if you extrapolate that across the wide range of functions that this system could help us accomplish, we could save a ton of money.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

That's absolutely right.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I just -- this goes to the Administration. I just -- and to you, Don. And this is not -- Commissioner, this is not really your -- you know, you're proposing to spend this money, but this information wouldn't necessarily come from you. I just wish that sort of analysis would come to us more freely; it might save some debate. But I see the value in this, so I'm going to support it.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. That is all I have. I think we should call this vote. If I have one more cup of coffee, I'm going to speed away here.

All right. Let's -- we have a -- what do we have?

**MR. NOLAN:**

We have a motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

We have a motion to approve?

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

That's it, right?

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

We should do a roll call vote. This is a 14, so roll vote.

*(Roll Called by Ms. Ortiz, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature)*

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

No.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

No.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

No.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

No.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes, if that matters.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**MS. ORTIZ:**

Eleven. (Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. The motion fails. All right. We're going back to 1700 in EPA. That's Page 11. Everyone got it? Everybody good? Let's get moving here. Okay, are we ready? All right. Let's go.

**1700 - A Local Law amending Chapter 8 of the Suffolk County Code (County Executive).**  
Anyone have a motion on this?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**  
Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
1700, Page 11. Motion by who, Legislator Krupski?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**  
Sure.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Okay. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. GREGORY:**  
Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Second by Legislator Gregory. We have a motion to approve. Okay? Is everybody all right? This is on the motion. Everybody good? All those in favor? Opposed?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
Time out. No, no. Are you crazy?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
I just thought I'd try and move this along.

**MR. NOLAN:**  
1700.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
On the motion, 1700. This is Environment, Planning and Agriculture, Page 11, three from the bottom, 1700. We had a motion to approve and seconded. Would anyone like to be heard?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
This is the -- I would.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Okay. Then Mr. D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
Yes, thank you. So this is the legislation that allows farmers on land where we've preserved or we've purchased the development rights to sell T-shirts and souvenirs, right? Is that this bill? Is this the right one? Yeah? Is this that one? Okay.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Was it 10%, is that what --

**(Laughter)**

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
I wanted to make sure I was on the right one. And it allows them to bring the produce in from

Brooklyn and process it on the land that's supposed to --

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Only in October.

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

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right. So I had a few questions, if Director Lansdale wouldn't mind. But I'm really not concerned about any of that because I understand the policy motivation behind doing this and I would assume, Director, that you believe that although there are some permitted uses that go a little beyond the traditional concept of farming, that it's still only accessory to the farm use and maybe even complements the farm use and promotes the farm use.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Definitely. These proposed changes would enhance the economic development opportunities on the preserved farmland, but they would be certainly ancillary to the farm use and production.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

The point is that the program, when we're spending to purchase farmland and preserve farming, that may not in and of itself be enough. We want to assure and give the farmer and the owner an opportunity to succeed and this, without destroying the intent of the program, enhances their ability to succeed with the farm use, right?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

That's absolutely right. If I can just add one point to that. Contrary to what was said previously this morning in the public -- public testimony about this, we did do extensive outreach for the past two years on the proposed changes and had more than 40 meetings, specifically we invited all of the farmers who are currently in our program to a couple of meetings to talk about the proposed changes and to get feedback, as well as towns and their farmland committees, particularly the towns out east for their input as well as environmentalists and local farmers.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. But let me ask you this. The -- and I read through this, there's a lot to it and I'm not going to, of course, you know, go through every detail. But basically what I was pointing to at the beginning of my comments that we're now going into processing, we're expanding the ability to sell retail, again relating to farm use, I understand. We're allowing hay rides and codifying a lot of different uses that hopefully promote the farm. Isn't that in and of itself, though, an admission that the Farmland Preservation Program is failing?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

This is about preserving the future of farming on Long Island. You know, Long Island -- Suffolk County farms lead the State in the value of agricultural commodities produced.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right, but we're preserving farms that are not economically viable without permitting something beyond farming.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

This is about attracting the next generation of farmers to use the land that's already preserved.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

But not the farm.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

To farm and to have ancillary uses that create value added products.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Let me explain in another -- you know, I understand what you are saying but I need to be convinced because if I own a farm and it's 50 acres, and we know that farming is a use that must continue in Suffolk County. So the County's going to say to the farmer, to the owner, to me, "If you're willing to continue to farm we'll purchase 80% of the value of your property and give you a boatload of money," right, "but you have to continue to farm". And that's really the understanding that I think voters had when this was put in place, and certainly my understanding when I vote for them that, you know, we're giving you an awful lot of the value of the land, of your land, but at the same time I know farming is going to continue on Long Island. So without these revisions and without all of these ancillary uses to farming, would these farms thrive?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

No. These changes are needed in order to entice the next generation of farmers --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

-- to continue farming.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So would we then wind up paying less for the farmland development rights? Do you know?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

I don't have an answer to that.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Because why should we give the same appraised amount, but yet the farmer can do more than farm now and go into let's say a retail business, processing, manufacturing, retail, selling souvenirs, tourism, hay rides, etcetera. We're not deriving any revenue from that, but yet we've purchased the farm rights, the development rights to continue the farming, but we're allowing you to go beyond that and keep the revenue from that. So really the farming is not economically viable. So would that lower the cost to the County of the farmland development rights?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

I don't have an answer to that. I could research that.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

It seems to me that it should. Now, I had another question. The prohibition section says, the proposed sections reads, "Abandonment of agricultural use." Beginning on January 1, 2014, "No owner shall leave agricultural land uncultivated and not engage in agricultural production or the horse boarding operation or equine operation for more than two consecutive years." Okay, and that's a good thing, because I've always made the case that if we're paying for the development rights we're meeting our end of the deal and giving you the funding up front, and so the farmer needs to meet their end of the deal and continue to operate as a farm or sell to someone who is willing to do that, the remaining interest, the residual interest. And if they don't and they do that for -- first, I want to ask you why does it have to be two consecutive years. It's almost like you're saying you can farm every other year.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

After extensive consultation with our Soil and Water Conservation District, as well as farmers, it became apparent to us that two years -- after two years it becomes harder to open up the fields, you know, there's forest succession that begins on that farmland.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

But there is a standard agricultural practice of leaving land fallow to rest for a year or 18 months.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So that's part of the farming process.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Yes, but anything more than two years is not.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right. So that makes sense. So going back to my initial example, if we go ahead and purchase the farmland development rights for a substantial sum and I don't farm for three years, let's say, and I'm off traveling the world with the money I got from taxpayers of Suffolk County, what's the consequence?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

The consequence would be the enforcement section of Chapter 8, which is --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Can you point that out to me, please?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Yep. It is Section 814, or 815. Page 27 of the bill.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

The new 815.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And can you tell me briefly, you know, what the enforcement mechanism is and what the penalties would be?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Yes. It would be under Section G, Civil Penalties on page 28, which is a violation shall be punishable by civil penalty of up to \$5,000 per day with each day constituting a separate violation.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Does that begin from the initial abandonment or after the two year period?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

After the two-year period.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So the penalty would be after, you know, due process and fair hearings and all of that, which everyone is certainly entitled to. The penalty imposed would be \$5,000 a day to -- to the person who received the funding.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

That's right.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And what was the other part of that, is it a criminal offense or something like that? What did you say?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

It is a civil penalty.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

It's a civil penalty, 5,000 per day, with each day constituting a separate violation.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. And then there's a second provision that says if the violation results in a substantial reduction in the viability of the resource then it's \$10,000 per day. What -- give me just an example of what would effect a substantial reduction of the viability of the agricultural resource. If the property became contaminated, let's say, or something like that.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

That's right, through the storage of cars, for instance.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Storage of cars is a great example. Okay. So, finally we have now at least codified an enforcement mechanism and an enforcement penalty that protects taxpayers in the event that the person receiving the payout does not live up to their end of the bargain.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

That's right.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. Very good. I think the revisions are very tempered. I think it makes sense. I think we want to help the farmers to succeed and I think that this is not going over the line in permitting uses that go beyond the farm use. I think it really just helps keep the farms viable, so I'm going to support it. Thank you. Thank you for all your work on this, too, by the way.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator. Good job in your questioning. Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I just wanted to answer some of the concerns. It is really important that last part of the legislation about the abandonment of ag use because there is a problem in the County with people buying development rights sold land and using them for non-ag uses, and without that enforcement mechanism it is difficult for the County to keep track. The land should be in production and it should not be used for someone's lawn. I think this is one of the most important parts of this change and I

want to thank Director Lansdale for her work on this.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. That's my list on this issue. We have -- we only have a motion to approve. Why don't we just call the motion.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Mr. Presiding Officer, one quick question for Director Lansdale. Sarah, we talked about the parcels that your office knows of right now that are non-compliant on the enforcement side, and I appreciate the conversation you had with Legislator D'Amaro, because that part has troubled me somewhat. But also obviously, folks should not have taken funding from us without intending to follow through with the purpose of the program. But as Legislator Krupski pointed out, then County Executive John Klein started this program back in the 70's. So when the program was first begun and property started to go into the inventory, have the requirements changed over time and will the enforcement hold to whatever the requirements when the property came in?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Thanks for the question. So the deed of development rights has -- the language has evolved. This program started in 1974 so obviously there's been an evolution of the program and the tools to preserve the land. In our research going back to '91, 1991, and moving forward to 2013, that's where we see deeds of development rights that say -- that have the language as amended. So two-thirds of the farms in our program have deeds of development rights that have the as amended language. So these proposed revisions would apply to those farms.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Two-thirds.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Two-thirds of the farms in our program.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Pretty good.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

And how many do we have in total in the program, Sarah? Approximately.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

We have 235 farms in our program.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

So -- so roughly 80. A little bit less than 80 of the farms would not be subject to this type of enforcement language? Because I don't know what the original representations and requirements were.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

That's right and, you know, some of the original deeds of development rights have some pretty interesting language in them allowing for airfields and things like that to land airplanes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

So each deed of development rights prior to '91 is unique. Moving past from '91 to the present it's

where there is more uniformity on the language.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

We spoke about one particular property, as a matter of fact, in Legislator Nowick's district up in the 13th. Do you know when that parcel came in? Just curious.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

If you give me a minute I have -- I have a database here and I can find it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

You know what? I don't want to hold everybody up with that. But my point is so that generally we'll have these -- I mean, they're onerous enforcement provisions, but nevertheless folks should be farming. But then I would assume that it's kind of incumbent on the department, if you are going to commence enforcement, you have to do it at a time where, you know, if a parcel was follow the property owner can remedy. You can't start enforcing in November when the whole planting season's expired because they just get thumped all the way over until April I would assume, right?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

That's right and the easy way to remedy this would be to simply lease your land to another farmer.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, I agree with you, yes, that's right, but I mean, we're beginning to bump up against, I guess, what we can compel individuals to do with their properties. And let's face it, if you're talking about something that went in in '74 or '75, you're talking about maybe another generation or folks that never were even parties in the first instance now. All right.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

So specifically the parcel that we've spoken about --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

According to go my notes it was purchased in 1983.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

So then it would not be subject to this, presumably.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

That's right.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Mr. Kennedy. Let's -- that's all I've got. We have a motion to approve. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'm going to abstain.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

And abstain -- one abstention.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen. (Abstention: Legislator Kennedy; Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I'm back here.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Good job, Sarah.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Good job, Sarah.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Did we do 1827?

**MR. NOLAN:**

No, we haven't.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Next page, top of the page, **1827 - Authorizing an appraisal for the purchase of Development Rights of Farmland under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007, Chicanowicz Farm – Town of Riverhead (SCTM No. 0600-008.00-03.00-007.001) (Krupski).**

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Krupski, seconded by Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. **1881.** Go down the page. We're one, two, three, four, five, six down, **Authorizing the County Executive to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Towns of Brookhaven, Islip and Smithtown, establishing the Lake Ronkonkoma Watershed Intermunicipal Organization (Kennedy).**

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Motion to approve.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion to approve by Legislator Kennedy, second by Legislator Cilmi. On the motion?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

On the motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

On the motion.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

This is a great idea. All the communities around the watershed should be taking responsibility and ownership of it and it's a good -- it's the way to go.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Absolutely. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

The East End is with you, John.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Absolutely.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. All right. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Now go down a couple more. ***1921 - Authorizing the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (effective December 1, 2007) - open space component - for the Bivona property - Pine Barrens Core - Town of Southampton - (SCTM No. 0900-277.00-08.00-020.000) (Co. Exec.).***

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

*(Raised hand).*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, seconded by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. ***1927 - To reappoint member of the Suffolk County Planning Commission (John Paul Whelan) (Co. Exec.).*** Did he come to committee?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

It's a reappointment.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

I'm sorry. Okay.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Calarco. Seconded by --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Legislator Kennedy. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***1943 - Making a SEORA determination in connection with the proposed replacement of CR 16 bridge over LIRR and LI Avenue, CP 5855, Town of Brookhaven (Horsley).***

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Calarco. Second by Legislator Muratore. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. ***1944 - Making a SEORA determination in connection with the proposed interchange improvements for CR 111 at LIE, CP 5123, Town of Brookhaven (Horsley).*** Same motion, same second. You guys all right? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***1945 - Making a SEORA determination in connection with the proposed Sewer District No. 3 Southwest, Electrical Substation Protection, CP 8170, Town of Babylon (Horsley).***

Legislator Gregory, you want to do that one?

**LEG. GREGORY:**

*(Nodded head yes).*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

And I'll second the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you. ***1946 - Making a SEORA determination in connection with the proposed increased flood protection for the proposed Sewer District No. 3 Southwest, Pumping***

**Stations No. 9 and 10, CP 8181, Town of Babylon. (Horsley).** I'll make the motion. Legislator Gregory seconds the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1947 - Making a SEORA determination in connection with the proposed replacement of Sewer District Emergency Electric Generators, CP 8103, all Sewer Districts (Horsley).**

Anybody? I'll make the motion. Second by Legislator Muratore. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Page 13. **1948 - Adding a representative of Soil and Water Conservation District to the Long Island Commission on Aquifer Protection (Spencer).** Dr. Spencer --

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

-- makes the motion.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Seconded by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you. **1964 - Appropriating funds in connection with the remediation of the stormwater flooding in the vicinity of North Fork Preserve, Town of Riverhead (CP 7143)(Krupski).**

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Motion to table.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

There's a motion to table. Seconded by Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

On the motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

On the motion.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Is it just like a scrivener's error with the title because it has to be bonded. We have to clear that up before we can pass it.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Very good. Thank you for keeping on top of that. All right. So motion to table. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen -- 16. (Not Present: Legislator Montano; Vacant Seat - District No. 8).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

The Bond Resolution is moot. We did 73. Move down to **Government Operations, Personnel, Housing & Consumer Protection.**

***1533 - Directing the Department of Economic Development and Planning, in partnership with State and County Institutions of Higher Education, to study the feasibility of constructing affordable housing for young college graduates (Anker).*** Ms. Anker?

**LEG. ANKER:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Makes the motion.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Calarco. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano; Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Cosponsor.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Congratulations. I know you worked on that one.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***1922 - Authorizing the sale of County-owned real property pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law to the Incorporated Village of Islandia for Affordable Housing purposes (SCTM No. 0504-017.00-02.00-029.002)(Co. Exec.).***

**LEG. CILMI:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Cilmi. Is there a second? Second by Legislator Kennedy. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano; Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you. **1923 - Authorizing the sale of County-owned real property pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law to the Incorporated Village of Islandia for Affordable Housing purposes (SCTM No. 0504-017.00-02.00-029.001)(Co. Exec).** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano; Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you. **1928 - Authorizing the retirement and use of Workforce Housing Development Rights banked in the Suffolk County Save Open Space Bond Act Workforce Housing transfer of Development Rights Program Registry for use in the development of affordable housing in East Patchogue (Co. Exec.).**

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Legislator Calarco makes the motion. Seconded by Legislator Muratore. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano; Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Did we do this one?

**MR. NOLAN:**

We did.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. All right. Skip 66, we've done that. **1975 - Authorizing the sale of County-owned real property pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law to the Town of Brookhaven for Affordable Housing purposes (SCTM No. 0200-975.90-01.00-042.000)(Co. Exec.).**

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Calarco. Seconded by Legislator Muratore. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano; Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

1738 -- **Health. 1738 - Approving the appointment of Kathleen Brown as a member of the Suffolk County Community Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, and Alcohol and Substance Abuse Planning and Advisory Board (Co. Exec).**

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Spencer. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Calarco. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano; Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***1745 - Approving the appointment of Lou Ann Rinde as a member of the Suffolk County Community Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, and Alcohol and Substance Abuse Planning and Advisory Board (Co. Exec.).*** Same motion, same second, all right?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano; Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***1746 - Approving the appointment of Robert Detor as a member of the Suffolk County Community Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, and Alcohol and Substance Abuse Planning and Advisory Board (Co. Exec.).*** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano; Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Page 14. ***1899 - Amending Resolution No. 313-2013 and amending prior capital authorized appropriation for the improvements and modifications to Health Centers (CP 4082) (Co. Exec.).***

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Calarco. Anybody else? Legislator Spencer, you want the second on this one?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second on the motion. All those in favor? Oh, on the motion. Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

On the motion. Just very quickly.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Very quickly.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So how much are we spending here on health centers?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Mr. Vaughn, you want to answer that?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yes, sir. I just need one moment, please. This is actually a change, sir, to the Capital Project that we adopted earlier in the year that took money -- that took the State money and reallocated it. This is just moving the money around within that same bill. We've actually -- I believe we've actually reduced the amount that's going to be spent and this is the State's money. Not that that doesn't matter, but it is the State's money.

**LEG. CILMI:**

*(Laughter)*. Taxpayers money.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yes, sir.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So -- and which health center is this going towards or is it all of them?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

So, for example, as adopted in the previous resolution it was money that was going to Southampton, Brookhaven, Riverhead Tri-Community and it was -- it's simply we had -- like, for example, Brookhaven planning. We had originally allocated a million dollars. They actually need \$700,000. In the case of Riverhead Tri-Community construction, we had allocated \$1.3 million; they need 1.378. So it's just moving the funds around within the resolution that was adopted prior.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And we're making these expenditures cognisant of our plan of going to FQHC on the health centers?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yes, and again, I would just remind everyone that this is New York State HEAL money, which will expire at the end of the year.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay, very good. We have a motion to approve and seconded. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano; Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

On the corresponding Bond Resolution, roll call vote. Same motion, same second, I'm sorry.  
*(1899A - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, Amending Bond Resolution No. 348-2013, adopted on May 7, 2013 as previously amended by Bond Resolution No. 494-2013, Adopted on June 4, 2013, authorizing the issuance of \$4,736,036 Bonds to finance the cost of improvements and modifications to Heath centers (CP 4082.110 .310 and .510).*

*(\*Roll Called by Tim Laube - Clerk of the Legislature\*)*

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

(Not Present).

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes, I'm sorry.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

No, I'm here.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. 1962 has been done already. 1952. We're into ***Parks and Recreation. 1952 - Approving a License Agreement for Eric Crater to reside in Timber Point County Park, Great River (Co. Exec.)***. Legislator Nowick, do you want to do that one? No, I guess she doesn't.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Kennedy, seconded by Legislator Nowick. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. ***1953 - Approving a License Agreement for Richard Kowalski to reside in the Suffolk County North Fork Preserve, Aquebogue (Co. Exec.)***.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Same motion, same second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***Public Safety. 1871 - Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of replacement Public Safety Vehicles (CP 3512)(Co. Exec.)***. Do I have a motion on this? Vehicles anybody?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Legislator Muratore makes the motion, second by Legislator Calarco. All those in favor? Opposed?  
So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Same motion, same second. On the corresponding Bond Resolution, roll call vote. ***(1871A - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$1,000,000 bonds to finance the cost of acquisition of replacement Public Safety vehicles (CP 3512.514 and 515).***

***(\*Roll Called by Tim Laube - Clerk of the Legislature\*)***

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yeah.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yep.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right, moving on. ***1874 - Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of Custom Fitted Ballistic Soft Body Armor Vests (CP 3153)(Co. Exec.).***

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I'll make that motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Browning. Second by Legislator Calarco. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you. Same motion, same second. On the corresponding Bond Resolution, roll call vote. ***(1874A - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$350,000 bonds to finance the cost of acquisition of custom fitted ballistic soft body armor vests (CP 3153.512).***

***(\*Roll Called by Tim Laube - Clerk of the Legislature\*)***

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yeah.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you. ***1879 - Requesting Legislative approval of a contract award for Canine Veterinarian Services for the Suffolk County Police Department (Co. Exec.).***

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Muratore. All those in favor? Opposed? So

moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***1935 - Approving an increase in fleet for the Suffolk County Police Department's Criminal Intelligence Bureau at no cost to the County through the use of Asset Forfeiture Funds (Co. Exec.).***

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Muratore. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***1936 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funding in the amount of \$17,203 from the United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the Long Island Cyber Crime Task Force (LICCTF) with 77.01% support (Co. Exec.).***

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Muratore. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***1937 - Accepting and appropriating a Supplemental Award of Federal funding in the amount of \$1,200 from the United States Department of Justice, U.S. Marshals Service, for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the Regional Fugitive Task Force with 77.02% support (Co. Exec.).***

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Muratore. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***Public Works and Transportation. 1859 - Appropriating funds in connection with the rehabilitation of parking lots, drives and curbs at various County facilities (CP 1678)(Co. Exec.).*** Legislator Calarco makes the motion. Second by Legislator Schneiderman?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Sure.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Opposed.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen. (Opposed - Legislator D'Amaro; Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you. Same motion, same second. On the corresponding Bond Resolution, roll call vote.

***(1859A - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$750,000 bonds to finance the cost of rehabilitation of parking lots, drives and curbs at various County facilities (CP 1678.323).***

***(\*Roll Called by Tim Laube - Clerk of the Legislature\*)***

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yep.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen. (Opposed: Legislator D'Amaro; Vacant Seat - District No. 8).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right, page 15. ***1862 - Authorizing execution of an agreement by the Administrative Head of SCSD No. 3 – Southwest with 311 Merritt Avenue, Wyandanch (1477.1-005)(Co. Exec.)***. Legislator Gregory makes the motion. I'll second the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you. ***1864 - Amending Resolution No. 467-2012 in connection with resurfacing of CR 111, Daniel Roe Highway from the vicinity of NY 27, Sunrise Highway to the vicinity of I-495 westbound access ramp; and CR 105, Cross River Drive from the vicinity of NY 24 To NY 25, Towns of Brookhaven, Riverhead and Southampton (CP 5599)(Co. Exec.)***.

Apparently this needs to be tabled. Do I need to read it all then?

**MR. NOLAN:**

No.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. I'll make the motion to table it. Second by --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Mr. Calarco. All those in favor? Opposed?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Why does it need to be tabled?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Counsel? Mr. Vaughn, you want to answer?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Our Budget Office is telling us that we need to make an amendment to it. There's a flaw in the bill.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Technical correction.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Technical correction. We've had a couple ourselves, so. 1865.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Did you call the vote?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

I'm sorry. *1865 - Amending Resolution No. 717-2011 in connection with the reconstruction of CR 80, Montauk Highway, Town of Brookhaven (CP 5516) (Co. Exec.)*. Mr. Schneiderman?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

That is not me.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

That's not you. Brookhaven, I'm sorry.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I'll make the motion.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Calarco. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

1866 --

**MR. NOLAN:**

The bond on 1865.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

I don't have one here.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Okay, I'm sorry. Keep going.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Hey, I'm on this. ***1866 - Amending Resolution No. 460-2011 in connection with the County share for participation in the installation of a closed loop signal system on various County roads (CP 3309) (Co. Exec.).***

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Legislator Muratore makes the motion. Second by Legislator Calarco. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***1867 - Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with rehabilitation of various bridges and embankments (CP 5850) (Co. Exec.).***

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Legislator Calarco seconds the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Same motion, same second. On the corresponding Bond Resolution, roll call vote. ***(1867A - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$600,000 bonds to finance the cost of rehabilitation of various bridges and embankments (CP 5850.326).***

***(\*Roll Called by Tim Laube - Clerk of the Legislature\*)***

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yep.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Very good. Thank you. ***1868 - Amending Resolution No. 462-2011 in connection with the County share for participation in the 2011 pavement maintenance on various Federal Aid highways within Suffolk County (strengthening and improving CR 85, Montauk Highway***

***from the vicinity of the Oakdale LIRR Bridge to the vicinity of West Avenue), Town of Islip (CP 5014)(Co. Exec.).***

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Calarco. Legislator Cilmi, want the next one?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Sure.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Seconds the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***1889 - Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with site improvements to Patchogue LIRR Bus Stop (CP 6426)(Calarco).***

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Legislator Calarco makes the motion, seconded by Legislator Hahn. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you. Same motion, same second. On the Bond Resolution, roll call vote. ***(1889A - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$200,000 bonds to finance the cost of site improvements to the Patchogue LIRR bus stop (CP 6426.410).***

***(\*Roll Called by Tim Laube - Clerk of the Legislature\*)***

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you. Okay. *1951 - Permitting Island Harvest to purchase fuel from the County (Co. Exec.).*

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, second by Legislator Kennedy. All those in favor? Opposed?  
So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Cosponsor.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Cosponsor.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

We're good?

**LEG. ANKER:**

Cosponsor.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Cosponsor by Anker. All right. Moving on. ***1956 - Authorizing an Intermunicipal Agreement with the Town of Riverhead, and accepting funds associated with overtime costs for dredging of County waters within the Town of Riverhead (Co. Exec.).***

Legislator Krupski makes the motion, second by Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***1957 - Authorizing an Intermunicipal Agreement with the Town of Shelter Island, and accepting funds associated with overtime costs for dredging of County waters within the Town of Shelter Island (Co. Exec.).*** Same motion, same second? All those -- okay, Legislator Schneiderman makes the motion. Krupski seconds the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you. ***1958 - Authorizing an Intermunicipal Agreement with the Town of Southold, and accepting funds associated with overtime costs for dredging of County waters within the Town of Southold (Co. Exec.).***

Legislator Krupski makes the motion, Legislator Schneiderman makes the second on it. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***1959 - Authorizing an Intermunicipal Agreement with the Board of Trustees of the Freeholders and Commonalty of the Town of Southampton, and accepting funds associated with overtime costs for dredging of County waters within the Town of Southampton (Co. Exec.).***

Legislator Schneiderman makes the motion.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

*(Raised hand).*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

***1967 - Appropriating funds in connection with improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 12 - Birchwood/Holbrook (CP 8143)(Co. Exec.)***

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Legislator Muratore makes the motion.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Calarco. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Same motion, same second. On the corresponding Bond Resolution, roll call vote. ***(1967A - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York authorizing the issuance of \$1,100,000 bonds to finance a portion of the cost of improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 12 - Birchwood/Holbrook (CP 8143.312).***

***(\*Roll Called by Tim Laube - Clerk of the Legislature\*)***

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yep.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you. Page 16. ***1968 - Appropriating funds in connection with improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 9 - College Park (CP 8163)(Co. Exec.)***

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Muratore. I'll make the second on the motion. All those in favor? Opposed?  
So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Same motion, same second. On the corresponding Bond Resolution, roll call vote. ***(1968A - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York authorizing the issuance of \$550,000 bonds to finance a portion of the cost of improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 9 College Park (CP 8163.310).***

***(\*Roll Called by Tim Laube - Clerk of the Legislature\*)***

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you. **1969 - Amending Resolution No. 1384-2006 to reallocate funding in connection with improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 23 - Coventry Manor (CP 8149)(Co. Exec.)**. Motion by Legislator Anker, second by Legislator Hahn. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Same motion, same second. On the corresponding Bond Resolution, roll call vote. **(1969A - Amending Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, amending Bond Resolution No. 1386-2006, adopted on December 5, 2006, authorizing the issuance Of \$700,000 bonds to finance the cost of improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 23-Coventry Manor (CP 8149.111 And .310).**

*(\*Roll Called by Tim Laube - Clerk of the Legislature\*)*

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. ***1970 - Appropriating funds in connection with safety improvements at various intersections (CP 3301) (Co. Exec.)***. Legislator Schneiderman, you're good for that one? Okay. I'll second the motion. All those in favor?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

On the motion, please.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, on the motion.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Certainly. Gil, could you come up for a moment? I just, on that particular one, we were discussing it, I just had a question with regards to all of the other ones that we're looking at it gives kind of a list of things. In this one it just kind of says various and I didn't see a list associated with the particular resolution. I'm just looking at the explanation that, you know, I know that there's a lot of intersections, but we usually have some kind of specific direction where the money is going and this was the only one that didn't seem to have that. I was wondering if you could give me some clarification on that particular resolution, where the money is coming from and why are we doing this one without a specific location.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Certainly. This is not directed towards any specific location. Normally, yes, you are correct, we do generally provide estimated or, you know, probable projects. In this case we don't. This is used on a case by case and a need by need basis. There is nothing associated with it. This will be used in and when we have cases that we can't handle and we need to get out to consultants to do. So at this point I don't have any list that I can hand you.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

So is this typically -- I'm looking at the number. Is this just as you as a Commissioner that you kind of have a quarter of a million dollars or a half of a million dollars just to have that flexibility? Is there a particular number amount? How did we get, since there's not a specific list, where did this number amount come from, projects that we can't do now or?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This is generally -- this is -- every Capital Program each year we base it on the previous year and this is what we have used already and have in the hopper and we're working on. It's -- if it doesn't get used in that year it will be used in subsequent years and we have it available, I believe, for five years based on the sunset rule if we need it.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

You're welcome.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. We have a motion and a second on 1970, right? Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Commissioner, then does that mean that if we need a traffic study done that it wouldn't have to come back here for legislative approval, you could just fund it and do it in-house, so to speak.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Or hire a consultant.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Hire a consultant, but we have the ability to use these funds.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

As opposed to bringing every single traffic study back here.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. That's great. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Very good. We have a motion and a second on 1970. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you. Same motion, same second. On the corresponding Bond Resolution, roll call vote.

***(1970A - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York authorizing the issuance of***

***\$350,000 Bonds to finance the cost of planning safety improvements at various intersections (CP 3301.131).***

***(\*Roll Called by Tim Laube - Clerk of the Legislature\*)***

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yep.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you. All right. **1972 - Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with construction of Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Fueling Facilities (CP 5603 PIN 075961)(Co. Exec.)**. I have been told that the Administration has requested to table this. I'll make the motion to table. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Tabled and 72A is tabled as well. All rightly. **Vets and Seniors. 1869 - Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase and replacement of Nutrition Vehicles for the Office for the Aging (CP 1749)(Co. Exec.)**.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Calarco. Second on the motion?

**LEG. ANKER:**

*(Raised hand)*.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Legislator Anker. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Same motion, same second. On the corresponding Bond Resolution, roll call vote. **(1869A - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$134,410 bonds to finance the cost of acquisition of replacement Nutrition Vehicles for the Office of the aging (CP 1749.524)**.

*(\*Roll Called by Tim Laube - Clerk of the Legislature\*)*

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right, Ways & Means. 1718, what I would like to do is -- oh, 1718 is not, I'm sorry. Okay.

**1718 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to authorize conveyance of real property previously taken for delinquent taxes (Browning).** Legislator Browning? This is the one that Mr. {Jendren} came in I believe?

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yeah, make a motion.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes, make a motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Kara, you want to second it?

**LEG. HAHN:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. The next group of them are Local Law 13's so what I'm going to do is I'm going to ask Legislator D'Amaro, do you want to make the motion for **1839 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Gregg Kephlian and Marlene Meyer Kephlian (SCTM No. 0500-381.00-05.00-016.001)(Co. Exec.)**

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

And Legislator Stern makes the second. I'm going to go through these with motions and the like. Okay? Ready? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you. **1840 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Joseph Zachary Gazza (SCTM No. 0900-064.00-01.00-154.000)(Co. Exec.)**. Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1841 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Garrett Morgan (SCTM No. 0500-482.00-04.00-026.000)**. Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1842 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Stanley Defay and Gina Defay (SCTM No. 0400-211.00-02.00-069.000)(Co. Exec.).** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1843 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Anthony Caldara, Jr. (SCTM No. 0500-019.00-02.00-028.000)(Co. Exec.).** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1844 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Harry Motschenbacher and Virginia Motschenbacher, his wife (SCTM No. 0500-019.00-02.00-057.000)(Co. Exec.).** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. Page 17. Okay. **1861 - Authorizing the issuance of a certificate of abandonment of the interest of the County of Suffolk in property designated as Town of Babylon (SCTM No. 0100-083.00-03.00-013.000) pursuant to Section 40-D of the Suffolk County Tax Act (Co. Exec.).** Same motion, same -- Legislator Gregory and I'll make the second on the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1875 - Authorizing the sales of surplus property sold at the September 24th and 25th, 2013 Auction pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 as per Exhibit "A" (omnibus resolution)(Co. Exec.).** Okay. The motion will be made by -- who wants to make the motion? Legislator Nowick, seconded by Legislator Gregory. Okay. We have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1897 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Joseph Schroeder and Marie Schroeder, his wife (SCTM No. 0500-381.00-05.00-015.002)(Co. Exec.).** Motion is made by Legislator D'Amaro, seconded by Legislator Stern. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1898 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 218 N. Wellwood Avenue, LLC (SCTM No. 0200-284.00-05.00-019.000)(Co. Exec.).** This is my address, 218. What are we?

**MS. MANGELLI:**

No, 121.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

We're 121. Okay, I'm sorry.

(\*Laughter\*)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. I knew things were moving quick. Wow, this is right next door. Okay. There's -- make the motion, Legislator Gregory, second by Legislator Stern. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

That's funny. **1901 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Pablo Diaz and Mabel Diaz (SCTM No. 0500-022.00-02.00-009.000)(Co. Exec.).** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1902 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Miller Place Development LLC (SCTM No. 0200-235.00-03.00-022.000)(Co. Exec.).** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1917 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 A.B. of Sayville, Ltd. (SCTM No. 0200-212.00-06.00-030.000)(Co. Exec.).** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1918 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 A.B. of Sayville, Ltd. (SCTM No. 0200-235.00-01.00-016.000)(Co. Exec.).** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1919 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Miller Place Development LLC (SCTM No. 0200-235.00-03.00-027.000)(Co. Exec.).** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1920 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Miller Place Development LLC (SCTM No. 0200-236.00-01.00-011.000)(Co. Exec.).** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1926 - Authorizing the sale of County parcel bearing (SCTM No. 0200-951.00-06.00-093.001) pursuant to NY County Law § 215(8)(Co. Exec.).** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1934 - Authorizing the transfer of certain properties to Suffolk County Department of Parks, Recreation and Conservation (Co. Exec.).** Do we have a motion on this? Lynne, you want this one?

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Lynne Nowick makes the motion. Second by Legislator Gregory. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1939 - Approving list of Real Estate Appraisers as designated by the Division of Real Property Acquisition and Management (Co. Exec.).** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1940 - Approving list of Real Estate Environmental Site Assessment Companies as designated by the Division of Real Property Acquisition and Management (Co. Exec.).** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

That is it on that. Tax levies. Okay, that's the manilla folder that says tax levies, right. Very good. I'm glad you pointed that out. Okay. Everyone's got the tax levies out? Take your time, take your time. We're good? Okay, let's move.

**Resolution Number 1978-2013 - Levying unpaid sewer rents and charges in Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest in the Towns of Babylon, Huntington and Islip (Pres. Officer).** I'll make the motion. Seconded by Legislator Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1979-2013 - Levying unpaid sewer rents and charges in Suffolk County Sewer Districts; No. 13 (Wind Watch), No. 14 (Parkland), No. 15 (Nob Hill), and No. 18 (Hauppauge Industrial) in the Town of Islip (Pres. Officer).** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. **1980 - Levying unpaid sewer rents and charges in Suffolk County Sewer Districts; No. 1 (Port Jefferson), No. 2 (Tallmadge Woods), No. 7 (Medford), No. 10 (Stony Brook), No. 11 (Selden), No. 12 (Birchwood N. Shore), No. 14 (Parkland), No. 19 (Haven Hills), No. 20 (William Floyd), No. 23 (Coventry Manor) in the Town of Brookhaven (Pres. Officer).** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1981 - Levying unpaid sewer rents and charges in Suffolk County Sewer Districts; No. 6 (Kings Park), No. 13 (Wind Watch), No. 15 (Nob Hill), No. 18 (Hauppauge Industrial), No. 22 (Hauppauge Municipal), and No. 28 (Fairfield at St. James) in the Town of Smithtown (Pres. Officer).**

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Share the glory.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yeah, okay, good idea. I appreciate that. Legislator Kennedy, you want this one?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Absolutely.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second by Legislator Nowick. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Good point, Tom. I didn't realize what we were doing.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

You don't have to read all those, Wayne.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. Counsel is now going to just brief us on a veto message that is in our packets.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Legislator Gregory has a good point, you know, we're doing the levies. We did get one budget veto yesterday from the County Executive on a -- one budget amendment we had approved. You may recall that Dr. Lipp explained it was a technical change to the proposed budget having to do with the Southwest Sewer District but, you know, in the last day or so we realized that the amendment that was approved by us at the last meeting had a problem. And Dr. Lipp maybe could explain that for a minute, but the long and short of it is we should not act on the veto override, we should let the override stand. I will let Dr. Lipp explain why that is.

**MR. LIPP:**

Okay. So simply put, a number was entered incorrectly into the spreadsheet that calculates what the proper distribution is, and as a result, there will need to be a correction next year on next year's warrant, this time next year that is, for a minor amount of money. The total discrepancy, if we override the veto and keep the adopted number that we had would be a little over \$400,000 distribution difference between Islip and Babylon incorrectly stated. In terms of what the impact on the average homeowner is, it's only like a dollar a month or \$12 total. A little less than that, actually. But as it turns out, because of that one number entered incorrectly into the spreadsheet, the closer to the pin number is the recommended number. So we're actually better off if we sustain the veto message, which we requested the Executive to do.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. Does everyone understand that?

**MR. LIPP:**

It's a technical correction basically.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Counsel?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Like I said, we should not act on the veto, so I think the Presiding Officer should just ask are there any motions on the veto.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Are there any motions on the veto?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Nobody should say anything.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Nobody should say anything. How's that? Okay? I'll wait the appropriate 30 seconds.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

That's enough.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Five seconds, better yet. Okay, very good. We're good? *It fails.*

All right. Let's go back to the levies. **1982-2013 - Approving the return of the Fund Balance of the General Fund, Police District Fund, and District Court District to the taxpayers of the Towns of Suffolk County (Co. Exec.).** I'll make the motion. Seconded by -- anyone want this? Legislator Muratore. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Thank you. **1983 - Determining equalized real property valuations for the assessment rolls of the 10 Towns (Pres. Officer).** Same motion, same second all right, Tom?

**LEG. MURATORE:**

(Nodded head yes).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**Resolution 1984 - Approving the tabulation of town charges and fixing the tax levies and charges to the Towns under the County Budget for Fiscal Year 2014 (Pres. Officer).** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1985 - Approving and directing the levy of taxes and assessments for Sewer Districts of Suffolk County under the Suffolk County Budget for Fiscal Year 2014.** Tom, you still good with this?

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yeah, sure.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

I'll make the motion. Second by Legislator Muratore. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1987 - Extending the time for the annexation of the warrant to the tax rolls (Pres. Officer).** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**1988**, same motion, same second, to the ***Approving the tabulation of town charges and fixing the tax levies and charges to the Towns for the MTA Tax under the County Budget for Fiscal Year 2014 (Pres. Officer)***. Oh, everyone hates this one. I already made the motion. Tom, you're still hanging in with me, buddy, MTA tax?

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Sure, no problem.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. That concludes the warrants. Okay, other manilla folder. All right. We have two Bond Resolutions right on -- it's not on the top. 1506A and 1529A, okay. Pick out -- it's every other one, the Bond Resolutions 1506A and 1529A.

**MR. NOLAN:**

I'll just explain that.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Please.

**MR. NOLAN:**

The underlying budget appropriating resolutions were done at previous meetings, but there were no Bond Resolutions done at that time. So these are actually accompanying bond resolutions that we actually approved the appropriation earlier, but we didn't do the bonds. These are them. The County Executive's Office sent these over.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. I'll make the motion -- well, first of all ***1506A - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$6,000,000 bonds to finance the cost of acquisition of interoperable communications equipment (CP 3245.110 and .510)***. Is that what you just said? That doesn't sound like it. That's it? Okay.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Motion.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

On the motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Hang on, let's get a motion. Legislator Hahn. I'll second the motion. On the motion, was that Al that said that? Al?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes. Explanation please.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

John, I see you're here, John Jordan. Do you -- it's a \$6 million grant and it's for upgrades to our communication system with the fire, police -- with FRES and the Police Departments. So it is -- John, I hate to put you on the spot, doesn't some of this grant help with FRES, the \$6 million grant?

**MR. JORDAN:**

If I could just look at it for a second.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

It's a communications grant. I believe this is the \$6 million grant to upgrade our communication system. Oh my god, it's a while since we've talked about this.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. To make it make sense, we have to first instance the money. That's the reason.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Oh, yeah. No, this is a good thing. That's all I can tell you, it's a good thing.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

And, Kate, when you say it's a good thing, it's a good thing.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

No, it's a \$6 million grant and actually there will be more money -- as we all talk about our communication system being very antiquated and needing upgrades, that's what this is for.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Is everyone satisfied with the explanation? John, you did a great job there, by the way, buddy.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Do you know, is this -- because it seems to be Suffolk County P.D., but is it a whole County function, this communication, or is it just Suffolk County P.D.?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

If you wait long enough we'll answer.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I mean, it sounds great. It sounds like it involves FRES.

**MR. JORDAN:**

I can't say definitively, but it says P.D., so I'm assuming just based --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Well, P.D. has certain functions through the, you know, Headquarters Fund, that are Countywide.

**MR. JORDAN:**

Many of the things that they do do overlap and we use portions of it and stuff like that. So I would say that, you know, in some way, shape or form everybody will benefit from it, but I can't speak with --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

No, there is a portion of it, I believe, that goes with FRES.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Is everybody all right? This is a bond so we're going to need a roll call vote. We do have a motion and second, right?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Could I get the motion and second again?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Is was Legislator -- was it Hahn to make the motion, okay, and who seconded it, Miss Browning? Second was by Legislator Browning.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. So roll call vote.

*(\*Roll Called by Tim Laube - Clerk of the Legislature\*)*

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Very good. Okay, now to the second bond, ***1529A - Amending Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, Adopted on December 5, 2006, authorizing the issuance of \$2,800,000 Bonds to finance a part of the cost of the engineering and land acquisition for the expansion and improvement of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 18-Hauppauge Industrial (CP 8126.112 and .210).*** Do you want to do that one, Mr. Kennedy?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Outstanding. I'll make a motion.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

And second by Legislator Nowick. Got that, Mr. Clerk?

**MR. LAUBE:**

I do.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Excellent. We have a motion and a second. Roll call vote.

***(\*Roll Called by Tim Laube - Clerk of the Legislature\*)***

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. We're done with the manilla folder Counsel informs me. The rest of them were for information purposes only. Okay. Move to the Certificates of Necessity. We're ready? Red folder. You guys are doing great. Okay, we're good? All right.

The first one, Introductory Resolution ***1678 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to provide assessment and tax relief to property owners impacted by Superstorm Sandy***

**(Browning).** I understand that's yours, Legislator Browning?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes, it kind of is, but I make a motion to approve, and I guess if anybody has any questions somebody can help with that.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

I'll second the motion.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Can you give an explanation?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Explanation on that, anybody?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Robert, would you want to do this, because you'd do a better job than me.

**MR. LIPP:**

I'll give it a try. Okay. So the State is making eligible for municipalities to give property relief for homeowners that were affected by Superstorm Sandy. And what would happen here is the taxable status state was -- for the current year was March 1st of 2012 and -- rather of 2013, and the storm happened in October. So what would happen is they would be able to have relief for the previous year, 2012, as well as 2013. So this actually gives homeowners a chance to not only grieve their assessments because they lost some valuation from the Superstorm for this year, but for the previous year when they were affected as well. And you have the option here to have an impact as low as a 10% reduction or more as a result.

That being said, the question would remain who bears the burden. The benefit obviously would be the people that lost some property value in the storm. It's not clear if there would be compensation from the State or not. The State legislation speaks to the possibility of funding, but it makes it unclear. If the funding comes forward then we would be held harmless, but that's unclear. The State legislation also allows for us instead of putting it on the tax warrant, the loss of property taxes, which we would do with errors in assessment in the following year, it would allow us to issue a bond to smooth it out. But that being said, it remains to be seen whether it would get redistributed in taxes to all property owners in the County or the government, the Federal Government, would come forth with aid to minimize that or eliminate it.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay, and this is the County section -- portion of it.

**MR. LIPP:**

Yes. And as a matter of fact, other municipalities, it's up to them to vote whether or not they --

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

For instance, the Town of Babylon passed this. Do you know whether or not Brookhaven did, Ms. Browning?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I don't know if they have yet.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

This is by the school district.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yeah, but they've got to opt in.

**MR. LIPP:**

We also did an estimate of what we thought the actual impact would be if the County had the edict and it's hard to come up with a number, but we based it upon the limited available data that was out there. And we figured that it could range for all municipalities of 24 and a half million dollars and the County portion of 2.7 million dollars, which would translate, if property owners had to eat it and there was no Federal aid coming forth and we didn't bond, it would translate to an average homeowner tax bill increase of \$4.90 with the County portion or \$44 for overall all municipalities, if all municipalities opted in. That would be a worst case scenario, though.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Robert, that's not going to be recurring every year. That's just --

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Right, one-shot.

**MR. LIPP:**

Right, that's a one time -- and actually it could be smoothed out if we opt to borrow for this, which the legislation allows for. It remains to be seen whether or not we want to do that or not.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Legislator Krupski, question.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Just so I understand it. So if this happen -- if we vote for this, the total liability for the County would be, what did you say, four million dollars?

**MR. LIPP:**

Two point seven million dollars is a very rough estimate. It will remain to be seen when the dust clears how good that estimate is. On the high end the -- all municipalities schools, towns, if they all opt in, 24 and a half million is the -- I'll say more of guesstimate than an estimate really.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

That would all be the County's liability if they all opted in.

**MR. LIPP:**

Yeah. Actually what happens is assuming though -- assuming we don't bond, which remains to be seen, and assuming there is no Federal aid, which I'm getting some limited information saying that it looks like there may be some Federal aid, but, you know, I'm not at a point where I could say with any candor that that's likely or not. I don't know. So if that came forth it could be little to no impact on the County.

That being said, though, if all municipalities, worse case scenario, opted in, 24 and a half million dollars, that a good number, the County General Fund makes all taxing jurisdictions whole, that's the way the Suffolk County Tax Act works, so the County would have to -- have to initially dish the money out, but typically what we do is we put it on the next year's tax warrant. And the numbers I

was speaking, \$4.90 for the County portion or \$44 for all municipalities would be a worst case scenario for the average homeowner.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So you would increase taxes to pay -- as an offset as opposed to borrowing.

**MR. LIPP:**

That's one possibility, but then what would happen is if you were doing it with borrowing, then that number would be much smaller but over several years, perhaps 20 years.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So why is this slam bam today?

**MR. LIPP:**

Oh, because we have a very limited window to opt in or not.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I believe it's --

**MR. NOLAN:**

Forty-five days from when the Governor signed the bill, which is about December sixth, is when we have to have the local law passed, and we have to give the County Executive time to do a public hearing. I think we need to do it today or we're not going to do it at all.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. We have a motion and a second, correct?

**MR. LAUBE:**

That's correct.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

We need 14, right?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Twelve.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Everyone good with this? All in favor? Opposed?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Opposed.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

So moved.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Cosponsor.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fifteen. (Opposed: Legislator Krupski; Not Present: Legislator D'Amaro; Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Can I get a cosponsor.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. **2031 - Authorizing the sale, pursuant to Local Law No. 16-1976, of real property acquired under Section 46 of the Suffolk County Tax Act Wheeler Road Holding Corp. (SCTM No. 0500-120.00-04.00-024.000) (Co. Exec.).**

**LEG. CILMI:**

Motion.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I'll make the motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay. We'll have -- Legislator Montano makes the motion. Second by Legislator Cilmi. Everyone good on this? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. **2029 - Authorizing the sale, pursuant to Local Law No. 16-1976, of real property acquired under Section 46 of the Suffolk County Tax Act Casa Vieja Realty, Inc. (SCTM No. 0500-160.00-02.00-037.000) (Co. Exec.).**

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I'll make the motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Motion by Legislator Montano. Seconded by --

**LEG. CILMI:**

I'll second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All righty. **2064 - Donating surplus Meals Ready-To-Eat and bottled water to the victims of recent natural disasters (Co. Exec.).**

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Where is that?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Motion by Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. HAHN:**  
Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Second on the motion, Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. SPENCER:**  
Cosponsor.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**  
On the motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
On the motion. Legislator Krupski, you've got a question?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**  
Just give me a minute to read it.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Oh, we won't let do you that.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**  
Okay.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
We have a motion and a second on the issue. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**  
Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
I think we have several cosponsors on this as well. (Legislators Krupski, Schneiderman and Gregory). All right. Yellow folder. Late Starters. All right. We make the motion to waive the rules and lay on the table the following: 2033 to Public Works; 2034 to Gov Ops, Personnel, Housing and Consumer Protection; 2035 Gov Ops; 2036 Gov Ops. We're keeping Rob busy here.

**LEG. CALARCO:**  
Loading us up.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
2037, Gov Ops; 2038, Gov Ops; 2039, Public Safety; 2040, Public Safety; 2041, Public Safety; 2042, Public Safety; 2043, Vets and Seniors; 2044 Public Safety; 2045, Public Safety; 2046, Public Safety; 2047, Public Safety; 2048, Public Safety; 2049 Public Works. It's like a holiday. 2050, Budget and Finance; 2051, Education; 2052, Health; 2053, EPA; 2054, Economic Development; 2055, Budget and Finance; 2056 Budget and Finance; 2057, Budget and Finance; 2059 -- did I miss

November 19, 2013 - General Meeting

one? 2058, I missed this one, Public Works. 2059; Gov Ops; 2060, Ways & Means and set the public hearing for December 3rd, 2:30 at Riverhead. 2061, Ways & Means and set the public hearing for December 3rd at 2:30 in Riverhead.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

County Center, imagine that.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Imagine that. 2062, Economic Development; 2063, Gov Ops.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Public hearing.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Oh, I'm sorry, and set the public hearing for December 3rd, 2:30 at Riverhead. 2065, EPA; 2066, Education. And that is it.

**MR. NOLAN:**

You need a second.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

I'll take a second by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Vacant Seat - District No. 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

That's it, right? We're good and at the end of the meeting Barbara tells me wish everyone and their families, and I do sincerely, a happy and blessed Thanksgiving and Happy Hanukkah. There you go. We're adjourned.

*(\*The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 PM\*)*