

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

GENERAL MEETING

FIFTEENTH DAY

December 3, 2013

Verbatim Transcript

**MEETING HELD AT THE WILLIAM H. ROGERS LEGISLATURE BUILDING
IN THE MAXINE S. POSTAL LEGISLATIVE AUDITORIUM
300 CENTER DRIVE.
RIVERHEAD, NEW YORK**

Taken By

Lucia Braaten & Alison Mahoney - Court Reporters

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

(*The meeting was called to order at 9:34 A.M. *)

P.O. HORSLEY:

Mr. Clerk, are we ready for the roll call?

MR. LAUBE:

We are. Good morning, Mr. Presiding Officer.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Good morning.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature).

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Here.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

(Not Present)

LEG. BROWNING:

Here.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Not Present)

LEG. HAHN:

Present.

LEG. ANKER:

Here.

LEG. CALARCO:

Present.

LEG. MONTANO:

(Not Present)

LEG. CILMI:

(Not Present)

LEG. BARRAGA:

Here.

LEG. KENNEDY:

(Not Present)

LEG. NOWICK:

Here.

LEG. GREGORY:
(Not Present)

LEG. STERN:
Here.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Here.

LEG. SPENCER:
Here.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Here.

LEG. CILMI:
Cilmi's here.

MR. LAUBE:
Twelve.

(Legislator Montano entered the auditorium)

Thirteen.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All righty. Good morning, everybody, and welcome to the General Meeting of December 3rd, 2013, at the grand County Center in Riverhead.

We will now, please all rise for a salute to the flag, led by Legislator Kara Hahn.

*(*Salutation*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:
The invocation will be given by Rabbi Aaron Benson from the North Shore Jewish Center in Port Jefferson Station, guest, of course, of Legislator Hahn's.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Tim, mark me present.

MR. LAUBE:
I got it already.

LEG. HAHN:
Good morning. Can everyone hear me?

(Affirmative Response).

Great. I would like to welcome Rabbi Aaron Benson, who is from the North Shore Jewish Center as its spiritual leader. And prior to that, Rabbi Benson graduated from the University of Illinois. He was ordained by the Ziegler School of Rabbinic Studies at the American Jewish University. And so I would very much like to welcome Rabbi Benson. Thank you for being here.

RABBI BENSON:

Thank you to Legislator Hahn and to all of you for having me this morning. Let us join together in prayerful reflection.

We say (Stated in Hebrew), the Divine source of blessings, and one of those winks of the Divine eye, a coincidence that isn't at all. We find two holidays coincide this year, our Jewish holiday of Hanukah and our American holiday of Thanksgiving. Joining them together in that manner sheds light on a message and lesson from which we can all learn. Our quintessential American holiday of gratitude encourages us to consider the many riches and freedoms we enjoy as Americans. And the holiday of Hanukah, with its message of the few fighting against the many to preserve their rights and freedoms, reminds us of those who celebrated the first Thanksgiving, those and so many others who founded and fought for our country to provide us the blessings for which we may be thankful at this season. We will always give thanks for the many blessings we enjoy, and when we see injustice, when we see need, when we have it in our power to help those who defend and guard our blessings and freedoms, may we ever be willing to light a fire in the darkness, to illuminate and inspire, to comfort and guide all those who struggle in the night searching for the dawn. May we never believe that we are powerless to light that light, no matter the odds. May we always find the strength to spread the light of freedom and its blessings to all who crave it. Amen.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Rabbi, and that was very inspiring. May we also please stand for a moment of silence for U.S. Army Sergeant John Mariana, age 33, from Coram, who served four tours in Iraq and Afghanistan, who passed away suddenly just before Thanksgiving.

And also to Harold McCormick, a retired Suffolk County Detective, who passed away recently. He is the father of Russ McCormick, from the Suffolk County Detective's Association, who passed away.

As always, let us also remember all those men and women who put themselves in harm's way every day to protect our freedoms, both home and abroad.

(Moment of Silence)

P.O. HORSLEY:

All righty. Good morning again, and welcome to our General Meeting in Riverhead, the beautiful Riverhead, the County Center.

And we are now going to be moving into proclamations, and our first proclomator is Legislator Schneiderman, who will present a proclamation to the Lady Whalers Field Hockey Team.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer, and good morning. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to introduce to you New York State's Class C Field Hockey Champions for the year from Sag Harbor Pierson High School, the Lady Whalers. Come on up.

*(*Applause*)*

Now these girls are missing class this morning, but I thought it was important to bring them here so that you, the Legislative body, can meet the best field hockey team, Class C field hockey team in New York State.

*(*Applause*)*

Now, these girls are really a shining example of what you can achieve with hard work and, indeed, teamwork, and they have made their coach and coaches very proud, their high school, Pierson High School, very proud, Sag Harbor Village proud, and, of course, Suffolk County very proud.

Now, field hockey is a game I only know a little bit about, but my daughter joined the Southampton field hockey team this year and they lost in the All-County up in Dowling, the Class C Champions, to Pierson. And I said to my daughter after the game, I said, "So what happened?" She said, "Dad, they were a better team." And, indeed, they were the very best team in New York State. So what a great victory.

And I'm going to turn things over for a second, yes, to Coach, to Coach Shannon Judge, at least to introduce the team, and if you want to say a word or any of the teammates want to say a word. And they're also joined by the Superintendent, who's here, and a bunch of other folks from Pierson High School are here as well.

So this is the winning Coach, this is Shannon Judge, who's been coaching for seven years. And, of course, this is Pierson's first Field Hockey State Championship. The basketball team won back in the '70s, so it's really the school's second State Championship. So Judge -- I mean, Coach Judge. Judge Coach? Coach Judge.

*(*Laughter*)*

COACH JUDGE:

Thank you very much for having us here today. We're very happy. This is my -- this is the Assistant Coach, Melissa Edwards. She's a local Riverhead person. A lot of people here know her.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Would you like to introduce the players?

COACH JUDGE:

Yes. All right. First, I have the senior captain, Katherine Matthers; second, senior captain, Emme Luck; freshman, Calista Cafiero; senior, Emma Romeo; goal-keeper and gymnast, Samantha Duchemin; senior captain, India Hemby; seventh-grader, Hollie Schleicher -- insane -- seventh grade; sophomore, Cassie Spencer; senior captain, Kasey Gilbride; junior defensive player, Rachael Miller; sophomore, Erica Selyukova; seventh-grader -- I'm sorry. Sophomore, Kerrie Vila; sophomore/junior Phiona Vall, and then our best Sports Information Director, Elizabeth Marchiesella.

Again, thank you for having us here today. These girls are amazing, not just on the field, but in the classroom as well, having, I believe, a 94 average, which is pretty solid, I think. Every accolade they get, they absolutely deserve it. So thank you, girls, for what you've given the coaching staff and the community of Sag Harbor. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I have with me a proclamation on behalf of myself, as their Legislator, and all of Suffolk County. It talks a little bit about the season and the great win up in Syracuse against the Syracuse team. I think it was the Lady Lakers; is that the name of the Team? Yes?

COACH JUDGE:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Something like that.

COACH JUDGE:

Lady Lakers, yeah.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right, they beat them. They don't remember the team they beat. There were so many teams that you guys beat, everybody. So I brought with me a proclamation congratulating you on this, really, a great effort, a great season, and bringing honor to the County and to your community. Congratulations once again. I have copies, additional proclamations for each one of you, and I'll present this to your coach. Thank you so much.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

Congratulations to all. That's terrific. May I just add on a note for my fellow Legislators that Babylon Village won the Long Island Football Championship, League IV, for the second time in a row, which is a first for Suffolk County. And I'm very proud of them, so I wanted to mention them.

Let me introduce to you Legislator Krupski, who will be presenting several proclamations. And I understand, Legislator, that the Mattituck Girls Volleyball team is first on deck.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

They are. Coach Massa, would you bring the team up? The Mattituck Tucker Girls Volleyball Team. So Coach Massa should be very proud, and he can introduce the girls when I'm done here. They started the season with two wins and four losses, but turned it around in the second half with four wins and two losses. They were the number one seed in the County playoffs and beat Babylon three-to-nothing in the Suffolk County finals.

*(*Laughter*)*

The team competed for the Long Island Championship against Carle Place. They were down two games to one and came back to win it in five games.

The Mattituck Girls Volleyball Team has been the County champs for the third time in the past four years, and they had a fourth place finish in the State Tournament. And the Coach should have -- should be very proud. My daughter was coached by Frank Massa a few years ago. The first time they won the County's, and also the first time they went to the States. And so he's done a great job and now this is becoming a Mattituck Volleyball tradition, I think, to go to the States. So, Frank, if you'd like to introduce the team.

COACH MASSA:

Thank you, Mr. Krupski, for having us here today. I'd like to read off the list of all the girls that are on the team. And some of them couldn't make it today because of prior commitments and tests, and a lot of my girls have to get out of here after this to take their tests.

If you're here, just put your hand up, and then we'll just clap for the rest. Junior, Caralee Stevens; junior, Cortney Benediktsson; junior, Colby Prokop; junior Lisa Angell; junior, Constantina Leodis; junior, Lizzie Wilcenski; senior, Tricia Dorfmiester; senior captain, Shannon Dwyer; sophomore, Carly Doorhy; junior, Emilie Reimer; senior captain, Laurel Bertolas; senior captain, Nicole L'Hommedieu; senior, Kayla Healy; senior, Casey Rugnetta; senior, Lauren Waters; senior, Jessica Makucewicz; senior, Pam Batist, and junior, Julia Orlando.

*(*Applause*)*

LEG. KRUPSKI:

All right. So I'll give the Coach the proclamation, and we have proclamations for the girls, which we'll give you that you can give out on the way home. Congratulations, girls.

COACH MASSA:

Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator, just let me just note, congratulations to the girls, but we may come from small schools, but we are -- we are both humble, but tough.

*(*Laughter*)*

There you go. Carolyn Carrera, the National Finalist in the Wendy's Heisman Award. I understand you're giving a proclamation.

*(*Applause*)*

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And I'm going to read. This is a long list of accomplishments, that I'm going to read them all, because it's very impressive.

Carolyn Carrera is the New York State female winner of the Wendy's National Heisman Award competition. Earlier this Fall, Carolyn received the distinction of being chosen as News 12 Scholar Athlete of the Week. An outstanding three-sport athlete is varsity goalie on the soccer team, guard on the basketball team, All Division middle on the lacrosse team. She has received a scholarship to play both lacrosse and soccer at Hofstra University this Fall. Carolyn carries a 98.75 unweighted, 2040 on the SATs, and is ranked third in her class of 362 students. She is an Honor Roll student, a member of the National Honor Society, the Latin Honor Society, Mentathletes and Math Club.

As president of the Class of 2014, Carolyn has been actively engaged in raising funds to help a former classmate and friend, Michael Hubbard, return to the Riverhead area after a debilitating accident.

Carolyn also works two jobs at the Riverhead Rec. Department and at Michael Angelo's Pizza. In addition, she has been active in her church as an accomplished pianist and a percussionist.

Carolyn plans to play both lacrosse and soccer for Hofstra University and major in Engineering or Pre-Med, or, at the rate you're going, both.

*(*Laughter*)*

The winner of the Wendy's National Heisman Award Competition will be announced on December 13th, and a television special about the competition will air on December 15th on ESPN II.

Carolyn's profile can be read online at wendysheisman.com, and she's here with her dad, Mario. This is really -- this is really impressive, and congratulations.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

Congratulations, Carolyn. I understand you have several more. The Riverhead Central High School -- District Elementary School is on line, up next.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Okay. This is for the staff, teachers and students at the Riverhead Central School District Elementary School.

Project Fit is a public charity whose mission is to create and donate innovative fitness and education programs to schools across the nation. Riverhead Central School District Elementary School has been chosen as the official pilot and flagship model for this program in New York State. Project Fit has partnered locally with Peconic Bay Medical Center and Suffolk County Lions Diabetes Education Foundation, and those organizations raised and donated the funds to implement the program at all five elementary schools in Riverhead Central School District.

So congratulations. This is the only school in New York State to be chosen for this. You should be very proud.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Congratulations. I understand next on line is Taylor Burgess, a high school student who will represent Riverhead at the New York State School Music Association.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Taylor's a Riverhead High School senior who has participated in school chorus since third grade. She is a soprano, a truly gifted singer with a beautiful voice, who has spent countless hours practicing and performing. She has participated in pre-college classical training, attending the New York State School of the Arts School of Choral Studies Program, is a member of the Metropolitan Youth Orchestra, which will be performing at Carnegie Hall next spring. Taylor was also this year's Riverhead Idol winner.

Taylor was chosen to participate in this year's All Suffolk County Festival, sponsored by the New York State Council of Administrators for Music Education and the Suffolk County Music Educators Association. Taylor plans to continue her classical training at Fredonia, and plans to become an opera Singer.

We are recognizing Taylor today because she was chosen to represent Riverhead at the New York State School Music Associations All State Mixed Choir, and will perform at the NYSSMA Winter Conference. She is here with her parents, Joseph and Patricia, and her music teacher -- is he here? Well, her music teacher is Mr. Sean O'Hara.

Congratulations, and keep up the good work. It's a lot of hard work to get this far, and I know you'll be very successful at Fredonia. Congratulations.

MS. BURGESS:

Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right, Legislator Krupski. Congratulations, to Taylor. We have a -- I understand the Riverhead Lady Waves are here, our fastpitch softball team.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Come on up, Ladies.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

In the house.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

The Riverhead Lady Waves, it's a U10 fastball -- fastpitch team, softball team. They placed first in the National Junior Baseball League this past fall. The League consists of teams from both Nassau and Suffolk, and is an entry point for young ladies into the competitive world of fastpitch softball.

The Lady Waves finished their season with a record of nine wins and three defeats. The team began practicing for the fall season in August, giving up normal summer activities to devote time to learn the skills necessary to compete at a high level.

In addition, the team placed second in the Little League World Series Fastpitch Softball District Championship this summer. They have displayed determination, dedication and teamwork to reach their goals.

This is a special group of players who have consistently picked each other up and not once placed blame on an error on the field. Their belief and trust in each other led to more than one victory coming in their last at-bats.

Riverhead Fastpitch Softball is growing in recognition throughout Long Island for its competitive play, from the recent high school varsity team's playoff appearance to Riverhead Little League's World Series District Championship in both the U12 and U8-11 age groups; in 2013, runner up finishes in the U12 and U10 age brackets. The future for this program and our female athletes is, indeed, very bright.

And I'll let the coach introduce the team.

COACH WICKLUND:

Thank you very much. We have Katie Moore, catcher. We have Kacie Dilworth. She's going to be -- she's shortstop. Kendal, Kendal plays everywhere, excellent. Katie is our -- one of our -- she's a lefty pitcher. You always need one of those. Reilly Hubbard, she plays outfield. Skylar, she plays outfield and pitcher. Casey Dunbar is a pitcher, and outfield, shortstop, second, first, pretty much everywhere. And Crysten, she's another one of our catchers. You can never have enough catching.

So thank you very much, everybody, for having us here.

*(*Applause*)*

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Congratulations, Coach. Here's the proclamation, and we have proclamations for the girls, also.

And, girls, keep up the hard work. My daughter played fastpitch and it's a lot of work, but it's a lot of fun, so keep at it.

COACH WICKLUND:

Thank you. Thank you very much.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

Congratulations, girls. Legislator, I was -- I looked at the crowd before and I was worried that we had a controversial agenda, and I'm pleased to see that it's just your honorees that are here.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

There's no controversy in the agenda.

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

Congratulations to all. All righty. Legislator Browning, I understand you're up next, and you have a proclamation for Stefanie Stypulkowski and Alexander Stokes of Center Moriches.

LEG. BROWNING:

Actually, yeah, Stefanie is a constituent of Al's. So, mom and dad, do you want to come up? And, yeah, funny enough, related to Stefanie Stypulkowski. Could you be surprised about that? But we are here today to recognize them. And also Anne Thorsen? Okay. She's a senior representative for Community Engagement with the American Cancer Society.

Stefanie and Alexandra are 11 years old, correct?

MS. STYPULKOWSKI:

Yes.

MS. STOKES:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

And from the Center Moriches area, and they're founders of the Coalition of Kids Against Cancer. What began as a hobby making keychains, they developed an idea to raise money for research to address the prominent issue of cancer on Long Island.

Alexandra and Stefanie have been lifelong friends and were born just hours apart in Saint Charles Hospital. They started making pink and white braided breast cancer awareness key rings or keychains this previous summer and selling them at Davis Park. Each keychain takes about 20 minutes to make, and both of them logged dozens of hours throughout the summer making these keychains. Before they knew it, with the help of family and friends, they made over 600 breast cancer awareness keychains.

Alexandra and Stefanie started calling themselves the Coalition of Kids Against Cancer, and they now have a mailbox at the UPS Store and are in the process of starting a website. They intend to increase the number of participants, and grows aggressively, as their homework and other obligations will allow. Together, these two young ladies have raised \$1,000 for cancer research over the past summer, which they have donated to the American Cancer Society, and I know that they will continue to do more.

And I should now mention her parents are here. Alexandra's dad is Tom Stokes, who I'm sure many of you are familiar with Tom. But, anyway, I know that Anne Thorsen has something to say. But do you want to say something first, Al?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No, that's fine. Thank you.

LEG. BROWNING:

Oh, come on.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I'll wait.

LEG. BROWNING:

You have to say nice things about your cousins, you know.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

We're both very proud of them and impressed. This is, you know, the youth of our future and they set a very good example.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes, they are. And from the American Cancer Society, do you have a few words to say?

MS. THORSEN:

Hi. I'm just amazed and so proud of these young ladies, and it really -- every dollar you raise makes a difference, because you never know which dollar will be responsible for finding the cure against cancer. So, please know we are so grateful for your hard work and that all that you do for future generations. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

LEG. BROWNING:

And, again, girls, keep up the good work, and thank you for your commitment to help people with cancer. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

Congratulations to Stefanie and Alexandra.

LEG. BROWNING:

And one last thing. The girls actually took the time to make sure that each and every one of us gets a keychain, so we'll be passing out the keychains for you.

Oh, okay. And the girls are -- they have the check here today to give to the American Cancer Society, so thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Sounds like a picture.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes, it does.

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Again, congratulations to all. It's my understanding that our Suffolk County Clerk, Judith Pascale, will present a proclamation to the Legislature, and I can't wait to see what we're getting a proclamation for.

LEG. STERN:

Having the best Clerk.

MS. PASCALE:

Thank you. It's not a proclamation. Actually, on November 1st of 1683, the Dongan Laws, as passed by the Colonial Assembly, established Suffolk County. And Suffolk County celebrated this past November 1st our birthday.

So this is what we were able to recreate through the efforts of the New York State County Clerks Association, along with the other nine counties in the state that also celebrated their birthday at the same time. And I'm just going to -- if you read it, I'm going to leave it with you for a while in your -- if you get a little break, you can take a look at it. It's very hard to decipher, but this is an actual replica of the book in which the Dongan Laws, creating Suffolk County, was written.

And the translation, and very briefly, "Having taken into consideration the necessity of dividing the province into respective counties for the better governing and settling courts in the same. Be it enacted by the Governor Council and Representatives, and by the authority of the same, that the said province be divided into twelve counties as follows:

The County of Suffolk, to contain the several Towns of Huntington, Smithfield, Brookhaven, Southampton, Southold, East Hampton to Montauk Point, Shelter Island, the Isle of Wight, Fishers Island, and Plum Island, with several out farms, settlements and plantations adjacent.

In addition to Suffolk County, the act also created the Counties of Albany, Dutchess, Kings, New York, Orange, Queens, Richmond, Ulster and Westchester. The Counties of Cornwall and Dukes were also created, but were later transferred to Massachusetts.

So I wanted to share this with you. We were able to get this replica, along with the other nine counties that also celebrate their birthday with us. So on November 1st of this year, Suffolk County celebrated its 330th birthday. So happy birthday, Suffolk.

*(*Applause*)*

We're going to take a quick photo so you're all part of the birthday.

P.O. HORSLEY:

You are.

*(*Photograph Was Taken*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Are we ready to go? Okay. If you'll please go to the agenda, Item Number 7, **Public Hearing**, 10 a.m., **Southwest Sewer District Assessment Roll**. I'm going to ask Counsel to just brief us on why this is in our agenda and the vote that we have to take on it.

MR. NOLAN:

Normally, we do the assessment roll at our -- the Public Hearing right at the last meeting, unfortunately, wasn't properly advertised, so we're doing it this morning. And as soon as we close

the Public Hearing on the assessment roll, we're going to vote on the Resolution 1986, which affirms the assessment roll. That's in the tax warrants packet. That's the only tax warrant resolution we're going to do this morning, we're going to do the rest later, but that's why we're proceeding this way this morning. So we should begin the Public Hearing on the assessment roll.

P.O. HORSLEY:

I do not have any cards on the Southwest Sewer District Assessment Roll. Would anyone like to be heard on the Southwest Assessment Roll? Would anyone like to be heard on the Southwest Assessment Roll? Seeing none, I'll make a motion to close the Public Hearing on the Southwest Sewer Assessment Roll. Legislator Cilmi, you want to second that?

LEG. CILMI:

Sure.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second that motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Fourteen. (Vote Amended to 15 yes, 2 not present: Legislators Muratore and Montano/Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Now, we're going to go to the manila folder, and the first one up, you'll see ***Introductory Resolution 1986 - Affirming, confirming, and adopting the Assessment Roll for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest and directing the levy of assessments and charges within the Towns of Babylon, Islip and Huntington for the Southwest Sewer District in the County of Suffolk for Fiscal Year 2014 (P.O. Horsley)***. I'll make the motion to approve this resolution, seconded by Legislator Muratore. All those -- anything on the motion? We're all good?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

It doesn't have to age an hour?

MR. NOLAN:

No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Muratore and Montano/Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

Resolution 1986 has been approved.

All right. Now we're moving back to the agenda, which we are moving to ***Public Portion***. I have several cards. And, of course, our speakers are limited to three minutes. And our first speaker is Ashley Alexander, and on deck is Paul Llobell.

MS. ALEXANDER:

Hello, everyone. I'm Ashley Alexander, and I'm representing Project Bus Stop. Project Bus Stop is an organization created and run by the Youth Group at the First Universalist Church in Southold. Our goal is to have bus shelters built to shelter the human needs, waiting for the bus. We have several locations, including -- one is across the street from Waldbaum's in Mattituck, which is the eastbound side, two across from 7-Eleven, Greenport, on the westbound side, and then across from King Kullen, Cutchogue, eastbound, across from the Greenport Brewery, Peconic, eastbound, in front of King Kullen, Cutchogue, on the westbound side, and also behind Empire Gas Station, Southold, on the eastbound side.

We affirm that we will be tireless in our endeavors, and shall continue to raise awareness throughout the community, as we have been for the past year. Our efforts include a petition, which will be presented at a future date, a Facebook page, which has garnered significant interest, though all likes are really appreciated, and a photography campaign in which we have taken over 100 pictures of men, women and children waiting for the bus without a shelter.

If there is any doubt for a need of these structures, we have included a picture of a handmade bench built by a local man who is not strong enough to stand while waiting for a bus.

We understand that you are currently working under -- on a 2014 budget, and we would very much like the opportunity to address the Public Works and Transportation Committee in the near future.

Thank you very much for consideration, and we look forward to seeing you again. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Ashley.

*(*Applause*)*

The second speaker will be Paul Llobell, and on deck is Mario Mattera.

MR. LLOBELL:

Good afternoon, or good morning, I should say, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'm here to speak in opposition to I.R. 1877, the modification of the Pet Offender Registry.

As you know, you know, you know a lot of what I spoke about earlier. You know, the SPCA has been serving Suffolk County for in excess of 29 years, and we currently operate the Bite Registry for the County of Suffolk. We've been doing that for 16 years, never had a complaint, never had an issue, never had a problem. This is not about indemnification, as it seems to be in the back of everybody's mind. There's no indemnification issues here whatsoever.

The law makes it a separate misdemeanor not to register and reregister the way it's written today. The Suffolk P.D., the District Attorney's Office has never followed up on any arrest or any prosecution of any of these individuals convicted of animal abuser crimes who didn't register in the last three years. There's been no follow-up, whatsoever.

The Suffolk County SPCA is best situated to maintain this registry and to follow up. We are a law enforcement agency, authorized by the State of New York to enforce separate crimes against animals, and failure to register and reregister, as this law was written.

This amendment makes no sense. I can't comprehend in my mind why this amendment would even be brought forward to you folks. It doesn't make -- it doesn't have anything to do with indemnification, doesn't have anything to do with anything that I can clearly see. I think this is

typical of a not-thoroughly-thought-out process. And if it does get off the ground, and when it does get off the ground, it's surely destined for failure, and it's going to lay heavy responsibilities and liabilities on the County of Suffolk.

No reflection on Parents for Megan's Law, but we can't even keep track of the sex offenders in this County, as was evidenced by the Newsday article just recently. And I think it's incumbent upon each and every one of you to think this process through before voting on it.

It seems to be more of a personal issue with somebody than doing the right thing for the County, and the animals, and the people of the County of Suffolk. With that being said, I'm urging all of you to either vote against it or to abstain from voting. Thank you very much.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Llobell. Mario Mattera, and on deck is Dan Farrell.

MR. MATTERA:

Good morning, Presiding Officer and all Legislators. First of all, I just hope everybody had a great Thanksgiving, because I know I did, and I ate too much. And all the weight I lost when I was running for a campaign I gained back already. But today I just want to thank you very much for letting me speak about Resolution 1910, the backflow testing.

My name is Mario Mattera. I am one of the Consumer Affairs Board Members for the plumbing and sprinkler licensing and complaints. I'm very, very broad when I got -- it was unanimous when this Board around the horseshoe voted me in. And I take my job very, very seriously, and when complaints come forward, which I know you -- everybody around this horseshoe, when complaints come forward, you know, you need to respond.

Approximately two years ago, this -- complaints were coming in like crazy about the backflow testers, and it was all from licensed plumbers. This has nothing to do with union, nonunion. This has something to do with the 968 license holders that pay \$400 every two years, plus insurances, to perform work in Suffolk County. Legislator Cooper sponsored this bill at that time. It's a great bill.

The licensed plumber is responsible for any plumbing work that is being performed on any job in Suffolk County. You need to have a license to install backflow RPZs. You need to be a licensed plumber for these devices. Just to show you something, this is a two-inch backflow. Okay?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Move to the mic.

MR. LAUBE:

You have to use the microphone.

MR. MATTERA:

Oh. This is a two-inch backflow. Okay? It goes from three-quarter inch all the way up to 12-inch on Long Island that's tested. The 12-inch one, I could not actually come here today with it, because I would have to bring a truck and trailer, and then I would have to make sure we would have a nice little field day again like last time, and that's what we did. When Presiding Officer, may he rest in peace, I miss very dearly, said, "Please, let's have a little field day." We all went outside in Hauppauge, we went outside, we looked at my -- back of my truck and actually had a lesson from my instructors what it -- what this device does.

This device protects the health of the nation, helps the consumer, and make sure that, in other words, when the water is going in, that there's no contaminants going back into the system. Okay? Everybody home pretty much has a three-quarter to a one-inch, and that's for the contaminants from -- obviously, from our fertilizers and everything like that, are not going back in.

Anybody that touches this device needs to be a licensed plumber. All eight Board members, it was unanimous, even for me to come here again today. And I'm not sitting here and saying that everybody -- everybody that's a licensed plumber has to actually touch this device. I'll tell you the truth, I talk too much.

But just to give a quick scenario, to be a doctor, you need to go to school. You need to go and get your degree to perform medicine, but guess what, the instructor, the professor cannot perform. What about the paralegal that works for the lawyer? Goes in, the paralegal wants to be a lawyer, yes. Pass the Bar and then you become a lawyer.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Mario, you're going to have to start wrapping it up.

MR. MATTERA:

Okay. I am here again to please kill this bill. I am here as, you know, a Board member with Consumer Affairs. Please, we need to kill this bill. We need to move forward. The licensed plumbers, the 968 licensed plumbers that are out there, small mom-and-pom shops, from big shops have to have a plumbing license to do this.

And just quick, I just want to congratulate everybody that won their election. And I have to say this today. Wayne, thank you very much for doing a great job all these years.

Lynne Nowick, I got to tell you something, you are going to be well missed around this horseshoe. For me, I wish it wasn't -- you guys didn't have term limits, because I'm going to tell you, I am going to miss you dearly. Thank you for being always a friend.

And I want everybody to have a merry Christmas and happy new year, happy Hanukah. And thank you very much. Kill this bill today, and I am staying here.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you, Mario.

MR. MATTERA:

Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Kyra Dorn is on deck -- I mean, is up, and Dan Farrell is next.

MS. DORN:

Hi. Good morning. My name is Kyra Dorn. I am here to speak today in support of Legislator D'Amaro's bill, I.R. 1877, which is a Local Law to strengthen the Animal Abuse Offenders Registry. I am, myself, an animal welfare advocate, as well as the co-president and co-founder of a local organization who services dogs in need on Long Island.

I think this bill explicitly is important, because it strengthens, you know, the registry, which it self-protects animals from being sold or given to abusers, which is actually a common problem on Long Island.

This bill that created the registry -- the bill that actually initially created the registry became law three years ago. However, the registry has lay dormant for three years, since its inception. This is -- the registry itself is the first of its kind in the entire country, which is something we should all be really proud of. And it's a great start, and, you know, it's something that we should take hold of in setting an example for the rest of, you know, the States. However, nothing has been done for three years.

I am in support of it. Like I said, it clarifies the process by which the information is transmitted. It goes from the DA's Office to the convicted abuser, who then gives -- who then has five days to register at the Suffolk County Police Department local precinct. And then, at that point, it's relayed to the group in charge of the registry. This bill clarifies the process. As well, this bill, it doesn't exclude the SPCA. It actually -- what it does is includes other groups who are also competent and experienced organizations who might have interest in running the registry, it includes them as well.

So I think this bill, you know, it doesn't do any harm. In fact, it gives clarification, and it strengthens the registry to open it up to other organizations who are interested in acting, interested in seeing this up and running, and who appreciate the importance of this registry. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Ms. Dorn. Dan Farrell, and on deck is Mary Anne Gladysz.

MR. FARRELL:

Good morning. How is everybody today? I'm feeling much better. I missed your last meeting, I had the flu.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Is that why you feel better? Oh.

MR. FARRELL:

That's why I feel better. I had the flu and I missed the meeting, but I wanted to thank each and every one of you for your unanimous support on the collective bargaining agreement. I deeply appreciate that. But I'm here today to oppose I.R. 2063, the residency requirement to hire outside of Nassau and Suffolk County, because, as you know, we have plenty of people looking for work. I have plenty of my members who were laid off looking for work, and I think there are plenty educated and trained people right here in Suffolk County that can fill these positions. I don't think there's a need to go outside of Suffolk County and even into Nassau County for that matter. But to extend this to outside there I think is -- doesn't make any sense. So I urge you to oppose this resolution.

I'd also like you to either table or oppose I.R. 2037, the hiring of part-time ECOs, Spanish-speaking, for the simple fact that I know we've taken great strides, and I appreciate all the help we've gotten with them, because we have gotten a lot of positions to them, but I don't think part-time is the answer. Part-time is like putting a Band-aid on the situation. And, as you know, it takes nine months to a year for the people to get trained to do their job.

And, like I said, I appreciate all the help we've been getting when getting positions filled there, but, again, part-time I don't think is the answer. And I have not had any -- I have not had any conversations with the Administration on this issue, so I urge you, if you can, to please table this so that I can have further conversations with them to try and work something out, because, like I said, part-time I don't think cuts it, I'd rather have full-time employees there. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Dan. All right. Mary Anne Gladysz.

MS. GLADYSZ:

Good morning. My name is Mary Anne Gladysz. I am a resident in Rocky Point on Prince Road, and I'm here to talk about the Rails-to-Trails Program. For all but three of my 42 years, I hate to date myself, but I've lived along the LILCO or LIPA right-of-way, previously in Sound Beach, currently in Rocky Point.

I've placed several calls to Legislator Anker's office, and, unfortunately, I've gotten some information, but once my name was known as being against the Rails-to-Trails, it was, "Well, there's a meeting tomorrow night, go to the meeting for information."

In July 2012, there was a meeting at the Rocky Point VFW Hall. At this meeting, the majority of residence in attendance that live along the proposed trail were opposed to it for a multitude of reasons. Many of them were also agitated that we had only heard of this meeting through word of mouth, there was no notification. Upon questioning the lack of notification, we were informed that 400 letters were sent out, some of which went to residents, and that did not live along the LIPA trail.

I lost my place. Okay. On Prince and King Road alone, there are approximately 110 roads -- I'm sorry, 110 homes that abut the trail, and in the 12 miles of trail that is being proposed, I think there's going to be quite a bit more than the 400 letters that were sent out.

I have a little blurb here from the meeting in July of 2012 that was listed in the Miller Place/Rocky Point Patch, which is online, and it says, "Suffolk County Legislator Sarah Anka (phonetic) -- Anker" -- excuse me -- "addressed her community and reassured all that every effort to further inform all would take place, and that nothing was being rushed, as far as she was concerned, without full community input of all impacted by the project, should it proceed. Added, the community was told that the decision needs to consider costs, what can and cannot be afforded, community concerns and safety. To date, I have not heard, being a resident on the trail, signing up that meeting, that night, I have not heard anything of a further meeting until my recent calls, and I was told that there is one tomorrow night. Unfortunately, I have a wake and I cannot attend the meeting.

Another part, in December of 2012, also from the Miller Place/Rocky Point Patch, it says, "The Legislator of the Sixth District took time with Patch to speak about this project." The question is, "After the first meeting, you were on the fence about the project. Has your opinion changed either way?" The answer, "I'm still getting input from the community. What's most important is what my constituents feel.

A lot of those people that were at the meeting were from other areas. They're bikers, hikers and joggers, and I think that's great, but I need to focus on what my constituents want, and there were a lot" -- excuse me -- "there were a lot there that are hesitant about bringing this near their homes. This is understandable, especially in Rocky Point, where you have less of a right-of-way."

For the most part, they're saying there's a 100-foot, not easements, but 100-foot wide. Where I live it's about 50-foot wide.

Another question was, where -- I'm sorry. "What are the major hurdles moving forward?" The answer, "Of course, the cost. Right now, it's over one million dollars per mile. That's a lot of money for a bike path. We're talking about" -- excuse me -- "millions of dollars that the County doesn't have.

I just have two small paragraphs and I'll finish up.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Sure. Please, wrap it up.

MS. GLADYSZ:

We have existing trails and parks that we have already paid for. Why do we need more? Why do we need to disrupt the everyday lives of thousands of people that live along LIPA or another -- for another trail? You're asking them to give up their privacy, security, and, in many cases, their property. On top of that, you're asking us to pay for it as well, and by "us," I mean taxpayers. You must admit, and I stress the words "must admit," that if you do not live along LIPA, you do not know what we already deal with on a daily basis, people that should not be there.

The entire project, I think, is being pushed through very sneaky, very underhanded and in a backdoor manner. You claim to care, Legislator Anker, about your constituents, but you do not contact --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Ms. Gladysz, you really have to wrap it up.

MS. GLADYSZ:

Okay. Sorry. I'm hereby asking that, or I'm here to ask that any forward movement on the Rails-to-Trails project in Port Jefferson to Wading River be halted immediately.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay.

MS. GLADYSZ:

We are not being notified as promised, we don't know what's going on, and everything's being pushed through.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much.

MS. GLADYSZ:

Thank you. Have a great day.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All righty. Okay. The next -- I do not have any more cards. Would anyone else like to be heard on the Public Hearing? Would anyone else like to be heard on the Public Hearing? Would anyone else like to be heard on the Public Hearing? Seeing none, I'll make a motion to close the Public Hearing, second by -- Public Portion, second by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, Public Portion has been --

MS. ORTIZ:

Twelve. (Not Present: Legislators Browning, Muratore, Montano, Kennedy and Gregory/Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

-- has been closed. All right. Yeah. Will all Legislators please come to the horseshoe? We're about ready to proceed with the agenda.

All right. I'll make a motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Seconded by Legislator Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, the Consent Calendar has been approved.

MR. LAUBE:

Twelve. (Not Present: Legislators Browning, Muratore, Montano, Kennedy and Gregory/Vacancy: District 8)

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. And we will now move to the Resolutions Tabled to September -- December 3rd, 2013, which is Page 7. Everyone follow me on this, page 7? We're good? All right.

Okay. I think we're ready to go. The first resolution tabled to December 3rd is ***1307-A Charter Law adopting and incorporating a 2% Property Tax Cap into the County budget process (Cilmi)***.

LEG. CILMI:

Motion to table.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion to table by Legislator Cilmi. Do I have a second on the motion?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Barraga makes a second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been tabled. ***1347 - Directing the Department of --***

MR. LAUBE:

Sixteen.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

MS. ORTIZ:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Kennedy and Gregory/Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

Directing the Department of Public Works to conduct a traffic study on a portion of County Road 86 (Spencer). Legislator Spencer?

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion to table.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Make a motion and second, motion to table; second by Legislator Calarco. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been tabled.

MR. LAUBE:

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. *1465 - A Charter Law to strengthen farmland and open space preservation in Suffolk County (Krupski)*. Legislator Krupski?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Motion to approve.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Makes a motion to approve.

LEG. HAHN:

Motion to table.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. A motion to table by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Seconds the motion to?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Approve.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Approve, okay. Legislator Schneiderman makes a motion -- seconds the motion to approve. Legislator Anker makes the second on the approval.

LEG. ANKER:

No.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Table, rather. Yeah, right. I'm sorry. Okay. We have a motion to approve and we have a motion to table. Anything on the motion, motions? I know the tabling takes precedence. Let's do a roll call vote on this.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. HAHN:

No.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

I'm sorry, to table. Yes to table.

P.O. HORSLEY:

This is tabling, tabling, everybody.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes to table.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

(Not Present)

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No.

MR. LAUBE:

Thirteen.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Horsley, yes.

MR. LAUBE:

I'm sorry. Legislator Horsley.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes to table.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes, he's almost out the door. All right.

*(*Laughter*)*

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

Legislator Calarco, what do you want to do?

LEG. CALARCO:

I'm going to make a motion to table.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Makes a motion to table; second by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been tabled.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

1753 - A Resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the establishment of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 4 - Smithtown Galleria (County Executive). Where is Mr. Kennedy? Why don't we just pass over this one for now?

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).

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to approve.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Makes the motion to approve, Legislator Schneiderman. Second on the motion?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator Krupski. We have a motion to approve. Are there any other motions? We all good? Anything on the motion? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been approved.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Same motion, same second on 1864A, the pending bond resolution. Roll call vote.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yay.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

(Not Present)

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. Okay. *1964 - Appropriating funds in connection with the construction of a the recharge basin at the North Fork Preserve, Town of Riverhead (CP 7143)(Krupski).*

Legislator Krupski?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

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. On the motion, all good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. *1964A is also moot. 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)(County Executive).*

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Makes the motion; Legislator Schneiderman makes the motion, second by Legislator Krupski.

On the motion, everyone's good?

LEG. MONTANO:

No. Just give me an explanation on this.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Sure. Who would like to do that?

LEG. MONTANO:

I'll ask Counsel.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Mr. Vaughn? Do you want Counsel or you want --

LEG. MONTANO:

It doesn't matter.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Mr. Vaughn.

MR. VAUGHN:

Actually, Mr. Presiding Officer, Commissioner Anderson is in the parking lot and going to be walking into the building momentarily, and he would be the best person to provide an explanation on this.

LEG. MONTANO:

Jay, do you know?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's on several C and G facilities.

MR. VAUGHN:

Yes, this is for a C and G facility in the County. But, as I said, Commissioner Anderson --

LEG. MONTANO:

I can't hear you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Can't hear you, Tom, you have to talk a little bit louder.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is this the third one we're building?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I think it's primarily federally funded.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

It will be open -- it will be open also to the public in Yaphank.

LEG. MONTANO:

Where is it at?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yaphank.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm going to give you some details in a second, but --

LEG. MONTANO:

Yaphank?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

(Nodded).

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I think it's primarily federally funded, if not all federally funded.

LEG. CILMI:

According to my notes, if I may through the Chair, it's 80% federally funded.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you.

LEG. CILMI:

Our appropriation is \$700,000 on it. The total cost is 5.2 million.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

The location is --

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

-- Yaphank.

LEG. MONTANO:

All right. That explains it sufficiently.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Is that good enough?

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah.

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. Same motion, same second on the pending bond issue.
Roll call vote.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

(Not Present)

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

Very good. Okay. We're going to be moving over to Page 8. I don't see Mr. Kennedy as yet, so we'll still hold that one off to later. Okay. Page 8, Introductory Resolutions.

LEG. NOWICK:

Here he is.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Sorry about that, Mr. Presiding Officer.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Mr. Kennedy, anything for you. ***1753 - A Resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the establishment of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 4 – Smithtown Galleria.***

LEG. KENNEDY:

Motion to table one more cycle. We're going to wrap it up at the next meeting.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. We're on 1753. Everyone with us?

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Mr. Kennedy makes a motion to second -- to table.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS FOR DECEMBER 3, 2013

BUDGET & FINANCE

P.O. HORSLEY:

Excellent. All right. We're moving to Budget and Finance, which is the following page, starting at the top. ***1949 - Adopting a Charter Law to increase Budget Transparency (Calarco)***.
Legislator Calarco?

LEG. CALARCO:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Makes a motion to approve.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator Hahn. Anyone on the motion? We're all good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been approved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

Congratulations. ***2001 - Refunding Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, Adopted December 3, 2013, authorizing the refunding of certain outstanding Serial Bonds of said County, stating the plan of refunding, appropriating an amount not to exceed \$430,000,000 for such purpose, authorizing the issuance of not to exceed \$430,000,000 refunding Bonds to finance said appropriation, and making certain other determinations relative thereto (County Executive)***. Do we have a motion?

LEG. GREGORY:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Gregory makes the motion. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator Calarco. All good on the motion? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it's been approved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. ***2050 - To Amend Resolution No. 7-2013, designating depositories pursuant to Section 212 of the County Law (Presiding Officer)***. Legislator Gregory makes the motion to approve. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator D'Amaro makes the second, seconds the motion. On the motion, everyone good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been approved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

2055 - Authorizing the County Comptroller and the County Treasurer to transfer funds to cover unanticipated expenses in the 2013 Adopted Mandated Budget from the 2013 Adopted Discretionary Budget (County Executive). How are we going on this? Legislator Gregory, we're good?

LEG. GREGORY:

(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Makes the motion. Legislator D'Amaro, you want to do the second on that?

LEG. D'AMARO:

No.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Well, someone else like to make the second?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator Barraga. All those in -- on the motion, everyone good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

2056 - Authorizing the County Comptroller and the County Treasurer to transfer funds to cover unanticipated expenses in the 2013 Adopted Mandated Budget (County Executive).

LEG. MURATORE:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. NOWICK:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. ***2057 - Authorizing the County Comptroller and the County Treasurer to transfer funds to cover unanticipated expenses in the 2013 Adopted Discretionary Budget (County Executive).*** Same motion, same second all right? We have same motion, same second. Everybody all right with this? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & ENERGY

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. ***2021.*** We're on Economic Development and Energy. ***Appointing Donna McKenna to the Suffolk County Motion Picture/Television Film Commission (County Executive).***

LEG. NOWICK:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator Nowick.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. *2062 - Extending the life of Downtown Revitalization and Downtown Beautification Grant Program (Projects) (County Executive)*. Is there a motion?

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator Hahn, was that?

LEG. HAHN:

No.

P.O. HORSLEY:

No? I'm sorry. Legislator Browning makes the motion, I'll second the motion.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

On the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

On the motion. Who was that Legislator Krupski? Okay on the motion.

LEG. HAHN:

And me.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I have a question for the -- maybe Mr. Vaughn could answer. I did get a list of the projects. Where is this money coming from?

MR. VAUGHN:

The money is coming from projects that were already approved and bonded for, and actually Budget is going to provide a deeper explanation than that.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Connie's going to answer the follow-up.

MS. CORSO:

I think I have this simple now. If you look at that resolution, it has various point numbers. Each one of those point numbers was approved for, say, \$500,000. So right now, because you approved the point number -- when the spending starts, it's 2009. So far, we spent \$445,000. There's \$55 left over. Because the period of probable usefulness is going to end, five years, the Department won't be able to spend the additional 55,000 on the projects unless we extend the PPU to 15 years, but it's that simple.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Krupski, do you want to follow up on that or --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Legislator Hahn.

LEG. MONTANO:

I just can't hear.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Oh, you can't hear?

LEG. HAHN:

Sorry. Can you hear? Okay.

P.O. HORSLEY:

We want to make -- Connie, we want to make sure you speak up. Apparently, we're having a problem --

LEG. MONTANO:

I'm having difficulty hearing you. Go ahead.

MS. CORSO:

Sorry.

LEG. HAHN:

So my question is, but aren't these the downtown revitalization grants? They're not each 500,000.

MS. CORSO:

Can I have the resolution?

MR. VAUGHN:

Yes.

MS. CORSO:

I don't have the resolution in front of me. Each of those resolutions has an allocation, each one of those projects. Is Carolyn here? So say for the -- say for the first one, 6413 -- 6412.315, Downtown Revitalization Grant Round 7. The resolution was passed in 2007, but with a bond, the period of probable usefulness doesn't start until the day you spend the first penny. So after the -- I guess, during this project, after they got their permits, and everything going on, the first penny was spent 5/15/09, and then the clock ticks on the bond. This is a five-year bond, so 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012; 2013 would be the last year that you could spend a penny on this bond and be able to finish that particular project that is in progress.

So what happens is we talked to bond counsel, and because these projects have a useful life that's more than five years, that's more like 15 years. If we -- all we're doing here is extending the life of the bond from five years to 15 years so we could finish the project, so finish whatever is in all of these point numbers that you've previously approved. Otherwise, this money technically would just -- it would sit in cash and every year, when we do the capital closeout, it would close the fund balance. It's just giving the -- an opportunity to spend this money, or else it's gone.

LEG. HAHN:

Right. But are we extending how long we have to pay back the bond; is that what we're doing?

MS. CORSO:

No.

LEG. HAHN:

No. Okay. This has nothing to do with that?

MS. CORSO:

No. It's just it's extending the life of the project, because each capital project that you guys, you know, approve, they have all different periods of probable usefulness. So some are five years, some are 10 years, some are 15, 20, 40 when it comes to sewer, so it's -- all it's doing is extending the life of the actual project, what's being, you know, developed.

LEG. HAHN:

So the question I had in committee was whether or not this extended the amount of time we're bonding for, and they weren't able to answer that question.

MS. CORSO:

And I heard you in committee, and I went back and I --

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. And so --

MS. CORSO:

-- figured I'd try to come up with a simpler explanation for you, so you -- I mean, I needed to understand it. I think we were getting very technical when we were trying to explain it.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. Thank you.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Wayne.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Thank you, Legislator Hahn. Legislator Calarco.

LEG. CALARCO:

Connie, I just -- I think maybe to help clarify this, so what we're saying is say like in one of the rounds, in the oldest round that we have there, you have a number of different projects that were approved, and we did an authorizing resolution for all 10 or 15 projects at one time. So maybe in Patchogue they got the project done within the first year of that five-year bond, but maybe over in the Babylon area, they -- for whatever reason, the project got stalled and they haven't actually finished or completed the project yet. This is going to allow that particular portion of that grant to go forward, correct?

MS. CORSO:

Yes, it is.

LEG. CALARCO:

Do you know how many of those specific projects we're trying to extend the life for? I mean, are we talking one or two in each year? Are we talking a larger majority in each year?

MS. CORSO:

I can only tell you, in this particular --

LEG. CALARCO:

Oh. So, in other words, we're not extending, you know, four million dollars worth of spending,

really, we're just covering, you know, 50,000 here and 20,000 there for those couple of stragglers that haven't quite gotten their job, their project completed.

MS. CORSO:

Right, correct. And this is -- a lot of them, like -- well, their PPU would -- the next one was 2017, the next one was 2016, there was another one that was 2014. So we figured we'd just handle them all in one fell swoop.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yeah, we're just doing it as one big catchall resolution.

MS. CORSO:

Right.

LEG. CALARCO:

But you're covering a couple of projects in each grant round.

MS. CORSO:

Yeah, in each grant, right.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. Thank you.

MS. CORSO:

You're welcome.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator. Legislator Montano?

LEG. MONTANO:

I think you answered, in fact, I'm sure you answered. But just to reiterate, this does not change any of the funding for any of the projects that were approved back then?

MS. CORSO:

Correct.

LEG. MONTANO:

Correct, okay.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay? Very good. We have one more. Legislator Kennedy?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Connie, it's actually to the complementary bill, 2062A, the bond. If there's no additional funds that we're generating off this, why are we looking at a bond that accompanies?

MS. CORSO:

We have to change -- because everything in the bond has to be technically changed. Right now, say for the first one that I was talking about, there's -- the bond has already been issued --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Right.

MS. CORSO:

-- and there's 55,000 in cash sitting there. But you're extending the period of probable usefulness, so you could still use it for that particular project, or else what would happen is we would just -- in the capital closeout, that cash would just close to fund balance and you don't --

LEG. KENNEDY:

So, towards everybody else's question, I guess I'll ask you one more time, just so that I make sure I understand, there's no effort to go ahead and seek any additional funding, all you're doing is basically truing up the underlying support doc to allow for this money to issue in the first place and to accommodate the period of time?

MS. CORSO:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay, good. Thanks.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Thank you, Legislator Kennedy. Anyone else? We're all good? Okay. We have a motion to approve and seconded. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. Same motion, same second on the corresponding bond issue.

MR. LAUBE:

That was 15.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Roll call vote.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

(Not Present)

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

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

EDUCATION AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. Okay. Moving to Education and Information Technology. ***2051 - Appoint member of the Suffolk County Community College Board of Trustees, Arthur Cliff (Presiding Officer).***

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Where did that come from? Legislator D'Amaro makes the motion.

LEG. MURATORE:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator Muratore. Anything on the motion? All those in favor? Opposed?

So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

Congratulations to Mr. Cliff. ***2066 - Rescinding Adopted Resolution No. 532-2013 amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the acquisition of a Suffolk County New Microsoft Enterprise Agreement (CP 1815)(County Executive).***

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion to approve.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion to approve by Legislator D'Amaro. Is there a second on the motion? Anybody? Anybody?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

(Raised hand).

LEG. CALARCO:

Second. Second by Legislator Calarco. Okay. We have a motion and a second. Anyone on the motion? Anyone discuss this? We're all good. Okay. We have a motion to approve, and all those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it's been approved.

MR. LAUBE:

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

ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING & AGRICULTURE

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Moving to Environment, Planning and Agriculture.

1941 - Authorizing the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (effective December 1, 2007) - open space component - for the Eastport Senior Living, LLC property - Toppings Farm - Town of Brookhaven - (SCTM Nos. 0200-593.00-02.00-006.001, 0200-593.00-02.00-006.003 and 0200-593.00-02.00-006.005)(Barraga).

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So moved.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Barraga makes the -- Barraga. Legislator Krupski makes the motion, seconded by Legislator Hahn. Everybody good on the motion? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Cosponsor, please, Tim.

MR. LAUBE:

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

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Krupski, I can tell the difference. I was reading Barraga while I was saying that. He was on that -- on the agenda.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I didn't want to offend my colleague, that's all.

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. I'm glad we straightened that out. ***1942 - Authorizing the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (effective December 1, 2007) - open space component - for the Westhampton II Old Country Senior Housing, LLC property - Toppings Farm Town of Brookhaven - (SCTM Nos. 0200-593.00-02.00-006.002 and 0200-593.00-02.00-006.004) (Barraga).***

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So moved.

P.O. HORSLEY:

So moved by Legislator Krupski, and seconded by Legislator Hahn. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Cosponsor, please, Tim.

MR. LAUBE:

Got it.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Good? ***1990 - 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 – Manor Lane 1 – Town of Riverhead (SCTM No. 0600-022.00-01.00-005.001) (Krupski).***

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So moved.

P.O. HORSLEY:

So moved by Legislator Krupski.

LEG. HAHN:

(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator Hahn. On the motion, everyone's good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. **1991 - 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 - Manor Lane 2 - Town of Riverhead (SCTM No. 0600-022.00-02.00-012.000) (Krupski).** Same motion, same second all right on that? On the motion, everyone good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. **2006 - Authorizing a new Intermunicipal Agreement in connection with Phase II Stormwater Abatement to Lake Agawam within the Village of Southampton (CP 8240.118 and CP 8240.327) (County Executive).**

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Schneiderman makes the motion, second by Legislator Krupski. On the motion, everyone good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. **2007 - Authorizing a new Intermunicipal Agreement in connection with installation of stormwater runoff filters within the Village of Babylon (CP 8240.116 and CP 8240.320) (County Executive).** I'll make a motion to approve, seconded by Legislator Gregory. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. Cosponsor on that, too. Thank you.

2017 - Reappointing George Proios as a member of the Suffolk County Soil and Water Conservation District (Krupski).

LEG. MURATORE:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Muratore makes the motion.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. ***2053 - Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and appropriating PAYGO funds in connection with the New Suffolk County ¼% Drinking Water Protection Program for Environmental Protection for land acquisitions (CP 8714.211)(County Executive).***

Anybody?

LEG. HAHN:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator Hahn, second by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8).

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

2065-13 - Appointing Ralph Scordino as a member of the Long Island Regional Planning Council (County Executive). I'll make that motion. Seconded by Legislator Gregory. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Moving along, **Government Operations, Personnel, Housing & Consumer Protection:**

1910-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law authorizing an exemption in County's Backflow Testing Law (Schneiderman).

LEG. HAHN:

Motion to table.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion to table by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator Muratore. We have a motion to table. Anything on the motion?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

On the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I would just like to explain what the bill does, because there was some testimony and I'm not sure it gave a real accurate picture.

So New York State, years back, started requiring that a lot of commercial places, even residential, large residential, have backflow devices that prevent water from the facility from coming back into the system. They also set up a procedure to certify people to test. So it would be a yearly testing requirement, New York State developed a test and people were licensed by New York State to teach that test. And anyone inspecting had to have this licence, whether it was a plumber or some individuals who became backflow testers and they actually set up businesses to do that. A few years ago, in 2011, we, Suffolk County, upped the requirement a little bit and said anyone who's testing a backflow device has to affiliate with a master plumber, and for the most part I think that has gone well.

This is a narrow exemption for the people who actually teach the plumbers and the other individuals who inspect backflow devices. Every once in a while they're asked, typically by a plumber in a difficult situation with a device, to check that device. There are three people in Suffolk County who are certified by New York State to teach the plumbers and to teach the individuals for them; this would allow them, at the request of a master plumber, to inspect without having to affiliate.

Now, I know there's some concern. I just wanted to make sure that people understand, there's really only three people who are affected by this, it's an extremely narrow exemption. The individual who's been teaching this class for some 30 years had spoke at the committee level, isn't here today, so maybe tabling it and allowing that individual to come and make his case. It doesn't matter, but I just wanted you to understand what the law actually did.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator Schneiderman. Anyone else on this? Everyone's good? We have a motion to table IR 1910. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

2034-13 - Approving the appointment of a relative of a County Legislator to a position in the Suffolk County Department of Labor, Licensing and Consumer Affairs (County Executive).

LEG. GREGORY:

(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Gregory makes the motion. Legislator D'Amaro seconds it. On the motion, everybody good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. For the purpose of the Clerk, I am recusing on this one.

MR. LAUBE:

Sixteen (Recused: P.O. Horsley - Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

2035-13 - To approve the lease of two (2) new fifteen (15) passenger vans in the Suffolk County Department of Labor, Licensing and Consumer Affairs (County Executive).

LEG. CALARCO:

Motion to approve.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion to approve by Legislator Calarco. Seconded by Legislator Muratore. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

2036-13 - To approve the purchase of a vehicle currently leased by the Suffolk County Department of Labor, Licensing and Consumer Affairs. (County Executive). Do we have a motion on this? Motion by Legislator Muratore to approve. Second by Legislator Browning.

LEG. SPENCER:

On the motion?

P.O. HORSLEY:

On the motion, Legislator Spencer.

LEG. SPENCER:

Just briefly, and I don't know if there's someone here from the department who could -- we just mentioned this yesterday that on the one motion we are leasing and the other motion we're purchasing. Now, my understanding from our discussions was that we're kind of doing a buyout on that, I guess, lease to save us money, but we're leasing to begin with to save us money. I'm just trying to just see --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Unravel the confusion.

LEG. SPENCER:

Unravel, right. So -- so if it's a new vehicle, we -- it's beneficial for us to lease, but once we've gone through that lease it's better for us to purchase that vehicle; is that what we're saying? Why don't we just purchase it up front?

MR. VAUGHN:

The reason that we typically don't purchase it upfront, Legislator, is actually that most of the time that we're leasing it's because the Federal government's paying for it, so it's -- they are the ones who are saying *We will provide you funding to go do a lease, we won't provide you funding to do a purchase*. So that's typically why we lease on the front end. And then as we get to the back end, it would be beneficial to us to buy a vehicle rather than return the vehicle because of the cost of a new vehicle.

LEG. SPENCER:

So if that funding dries up, I guess the explanation we were just given, we can walk away or we can return that vehicle.

MR. VAUGHN:

That is the understanding that I have been told by --

LEG. SPENCER:

But I guess if we're in the middle of a lease, you can't just -- you still have to pay out the lease, you can't just leave right in the middle of a lease. I guess it's saving us money rather than purchasing. Because there is some fees that are associated with leasing, I understand individuals, that it's not the best idea to lease --

MR. VAUGHN:

No, I think.

LEG. SPENCER:

-- and then purchase at the end, that's not good personal financial management. Either you lease and you continue to lease or you purchase upfront, but to lease and to buy out, you're just really paying to use that vehicle and you're paying for the money factor on it. And then a lot of times the residual value that's left over, unless I'm missing -- Robert? I don't know if you could -- I guess we're saying that we're writing off the cost of that because we're getting the money from the Federal government.

MR. VAUGHN:

My understanding is that when we're doing a lease, it's because of the funding source that's available and the funding source dictates that you lease not buy. And then as some of those vehicles come up towards the end, because some of them are in better condition than the vehicles that we have, we sometimes do look to purchase those vehicles at the end of a lease to go into use as our fleet. Once the Federal funding has expired --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Tom, could you speak up just a little bit?

MR. VAUGHN:

Sorry about that. So once the Federal funding has expired and we're no longer doing the lease, then in certain cases it is advantageous for us to then go ahead and purchase a vehicle, one that we have been using for a while, because it's in better condition than let's say a vehicle that we are getting ready to retire. So that's when -- so you're paying -- it's basically like using two different pots of money to pay for the vehicles, and that's what it comes down to. Many often -- very often we are bound by whatever regulations the Federal government is telling us.

LEG. SPENCER:

Okay, I won't belabor it. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Anyone else on this, 2036? Okay, we have a motion to approve. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

2037 --

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

2037-13 - Amending the Temporary Classification and Salary Plan to add the Emergency Complaint Operator and Emergency Complaint Operator (Spanish Speaking) Titles (County Executive).

LEG. MURATORE:

Table.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Who said that? Legislator Muratore wants to table this.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator Kennedy. On the motion, everybody good? Legislator -- Mr. Vaughn.

MR. VAUGHN:

We would ask that the Legislature please consider adopting this. Back in, I believe, June or so you adopted the ECAT, the third RESOLVED clause of the ECAT bill, it specifically asked us to create these titles. We're simply creating the titles to be in compliance with the resolution that was already adopted by this Legislature.

LEG. HAHN:

Just describe what ECAT stands for, because --

MR. VAUGHN:

I'm sorry. It goes back to the Emergency Action Team over at the Police Department. The bill -- the third RESOLVED clause of that bill specifically stated that there needed to be these temporary titles created, we're simply complying with the will of the Legislature by putting this bill forward.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Legislator Browning?

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah. I mean, I know we have had many conversations about this and we've said the need for it. But again, like any bargaining unit within the County, to do anything, I would have thought that you would have had a conversation with AME and had some kind of {amaway} done, because this does impact their membership, and it's my understanding there's been absolutely no conversation with AME. So I'm going to support a tabling motion and request that the Administration have a conversation with the union to make sure that they understand what you're doing.

LEG. NOWICK:

That seems fair

MR. VAUGHN:

I would just say that --

LEG. HAHN:

Wayne?

MR. VAUGHN:

-- you know, we weren't the ones who drafted the bills and we weren't the one who adopted it, so if there was a conversation that should have been had with AME, I would contend that perhaps it should have been done at an earlier point in time than now. We're simply complying with what the bill that was adopted and sign off by everybody says to do; the third RESOLVED clause specifically says *create these titles*.

LEG. D'AMARO:

What does it say? Can you read it?

MR. VAUGHN:

Yeah, certainly.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Kate, are you done?

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay.

LEG. HAHN:

Am I on the list?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Hahn. I'm sorry, Legislator Kennedy. I'm sorry.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. And it's my understanding that AME President Farrell spoke in opposition to this bill this morning. And Mr. Vaughn, what I would say is, is I think that you might have mischaracterized what the prior bill was.

MR. VAUGHN:

I don't think that I did, sir. The third RESOLVED clause says that --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Wait, let me finish and then you can tell me what the clause says.

The language talks about a temporary type of a pool; that doesn't, by and of itself mean that you will have individuals that are part-time, non-benefitted employees. The two are not synonymous. A temporary employee may be one who comes on and comes on, oh, maybe for a year's period of time or even less. It does not mean an individual that's coming in getting wage only; if that was the way we were going to go ahead and embrace this, I guess we'd be like Wal-Mart.

If there's language that needs to be modified, we'll do that. But I am not going to support some effort to go ahead and undermine the collective bargaining process.

MR. VAUGHN:

I don't think that anybody is looking to undermine the collective bargaining process. The third RESOLVED clause specifically says that, "*The Suffolk County Police Department shall request that the County Executive establish a new title and salary line for temporary emergency dispatchers.*" It specifically says to do that (*laughter*).

LEG. KENNEDY:

Tom, I understand what you're saying, and what I'll do is I'll file a bill today to go ahead and amend that. Because I did not intend, nor do intend, to support facilitating part-time, wage-only employees when, in fact, the collective bargaining process speaks specifically to full-time benefitted employees. Quite frankly, that's probably a violation of the Tailor Law. I don't want to get into it right now, but I disagree with the position you're representing on behalf of the County Executive.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Thank you very much, Legislator Kennedy. Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

I was going to try to open the original resolution.

LEG. MONTANO:

You can't open the item, right?

MR. VAUGHN:

Legislator?

LEG. HAHN:

Now I already lost the number; 651, it's Resolution 651? Okay. I'm going to pull it up here.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Do you want me to move on?

LEG. HAHN:

No, no. I am a little disappointed. I mean, yes, we passed a resolution telling you to adopt titles. But in the implementation of the resolutions, you know, I think there's a legitimate expectation that you're going to work with the body who -- Tom, and I know you spent many months sort of kind of fighting up there with the 911 operator representative, and it just -- it just would make sense that in the implementation of this and how this is going to play out, we get some buy-in from their bargaining unit. And, you know, I understand how you're -- I very much appreciate, Tom, all of your efforts to make this happen. This has been a very frustrating process, how long it takes to train these individuals. And I really want to see this in place in time for the next blizzard or major snow storm that we have, so I would hate to delay this significantly. If we do table this here today, I hope that -- if that winds up happening, I hope you will agree to meet with that unit as soon as possible so that you can just be on the same page. I don't know that we're going to solve the part-time/full-time issue, but I hope that there'll be -- there'll be some agreement. We have one more meeting, you know, I'd like to just see us try to have a discussion about how to make this happen before we pass this. But thank you so much, Tom, for all your efforts. I know, you know, you've been working hard to make this happen for us and I do very much appreciate that.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Legislator D'Amaro?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, thank you. All right, so I'm looking at a copy of the resolution that we passed and it seems, if I remember the whole debate we had at the time, these are 911 Call Center Operators needed some help and assistance relief during especially busy times. And one of the WHEREAS clauses even references that, *"They are responding during severe weather events and busy summer weekends and holidays and would be extremely useful to reduce the stress on the current call center operators who are overworked."* So the whole intent here was to provide some relief.

It also says that, *"The Police Department is directed to reach out to recent 911 Call Center retirees that still reside in the County to offer temporary, per diem employment,"* per diem employment, they be trained. And then the third RESOLVED clause says that you need to establish a new title and salary line for temporary Emergency Dispatchers; it does not say part-time, but it does say temporary, and I'm not sure if you can reconcile the two of those.

So is it possible to go back to our retirees, ask them if they'll help out in the busiest of times or during times of emergency and do it in such a way, under our salary plan, that they are receiving more than just a wage; is that possible? Because it would seem to me that there's a legitimate point to be made that, you know, just providing a strict per diem employment as opposed to some type of benefit package in addition to that may not be the right way to go.

I don't really know if it's possible to do. I think the intent here was to hire per diem just on an as-needed basis; you come in for the day, you get paid for the day on an agreed-to wage. I think that was the intent, but that seems to be evolving. So before I vote on this, I'd like to know whether or not there is any way to accommodate hiring temporary Emergency Dispatchers in a way that's beyond the per diem that's referenced in this bill.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator D'Amaro. Legislator Anker?

LEG. ANKER:

Are we waiting for an answer?

LEG. D'AMARO:

I was hoping for one.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Oh, I'm sorry. That was an answer.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, I was just wondering if Mr. Vaughn or if anyone could --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Did you have an answer? I didn't mean to cut you off. Thank you, Legislator Anker, for straightening me out.

MS. CORSO:

I'm going to try and answer you, Lou.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thanks.

MS. CORSO:

I can tell you this, that my office has been working with the Department of Civil Service to

implement the bill. So just so you know, there has been some effort and research into what the hourly rate would be. However, going with Legislator D'Amaro's question, we do have opportunities to hire back the retirees. They have to be within the parameters of their retirement, and if you would like us to do that, I think the bill has to be changed.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So there are certain conditions for the particular retirees that we have to address as well.

MS. CORSO:

Right. They --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Because they're retired.

MS. CORSO:

Right, they're retired. So --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MS. CORSO:

We have to make sure that they don't jeopardize their retirement.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. We don't want to jeopardize their retirement, and we also want to hire them on an acceptable basis to all of us as well.

MS. CORSO:

Exactly.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So perhaps --

MS. CORSO:

So like how would you -- you know, it would have to be like you're really technically on-call. So like if somebody calls in --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MS. CORSO:

-- or it's busy and we have an event, you would have to be on-call.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Which would be more than in my mind a per diem who could say, *No, I'm not available today.*

MS. CORSO:

Right. But if we had a pool of per diem, which was I think the intent --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MS. CORSO:

We could go through the list and say --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, I think we need to --

MS. CORSO:

So we could --

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- tweak this, because we -- I think we want more than just a pool. I mean, if we're having a real emergency in the County and we need to rely on this pool of individuals, retirees who are specifically trained, I think we need to get beyond -- you know, if we have ten people on the list and nine of them can't make it, I don't see how that helps.

MS. CORSO:

But I think it would be the same -- it would be kind of the same with the retirees, but, I mean, we're -- you know, whatever you decide to do. But there is -- all I'm telling you is there is a mechanism to accomplish what you're looking for.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So there is a way to do that. Who was the original sponsor of this bill?

LEG. HAHN:

(Raised hand).

LEG. D'AMARO:

Kara, you were? So, I don't know, would you be willing to look into that or work on that?

LEG. HAHN:

I was the original sponsor of the resolution that passed, the one that's before us today is a County Executive sponsored resolution?

MS. CORSO:

Yeah, because when you --

LEG. HAHN:

Yes, yes.

MS. CORSO:

You have to add, you have to specifically add the title to the Salary & Classification Plan.

LEG. HAHN:

Correct. So my question is do we have to change my original resolution or do we have to change what you laid on the table and we're voting on today?

MS. CORSO:

If you don't want the title in the Temporary Salary & Classification plan -- I mean, I don't think it hurts to put it in, it's up to you. It doesn't hurt us if we adopt this and put it in. It doesn't preclude us from doing what Legislator D'Amaro wants us to do either.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, I mean --

MS. CORSO:

But it does -- it does --

LEG. HAHN:

But could we change it --

MS. CORSO:

Like if something happened tomorrow, at least we'd have something to deal with, to use. So there's no harm in adopting this resolution, it doesn't mean we have to use it. It just actually establishes the title and the rate; if you're not happy with the title and the rate, then don't pass it.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Legislator D'Amaro, are you --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, I just wanted to respond to Legislator Hahn --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Sure.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- that you may have to change your bill, because the RESOLVED clause references temporary per diem employment. So what I would recommend is that you have the discussion up front, come up with the proper salary, classification and salary category and put that in the bill. Just amend your bill and do it all in one, if that's possible to do, do it all in one bill and maybe we can do it by CN next time.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay?

LEG. HAHN:

But we'd have to lay something on the table today.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No, not if --

LEG. HAHN:

Right?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator D'Amaro's talking about a CN coming from the County Exec.

LEG. HAHN:

For next meeting.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Right, for the next one.

LEG. HAHN:

Well, I just need to know that they're willing to do that. We can't -- no, it would have to be -- yeah, we'd have to have -- if we were to do the Late Starter today --

LEG. MONTANO:

Otherwise you wind up with -- you have to ask for a C of N.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Counsel, do you want to add anything on this, weigh in on this?

MR. NOLAN:

No. Like they said, I mean, you can go one of two ways. You could -- you're going to have to -- if you want to go in a different way than the original resolution, then we've got to change the original resolution which means you'd have to get it laid on as a Late Starter or get a CN for the next meeting.

LEG. BROWNING:

(Inaudible).

MR. NOLAN:

The one that's before us?

LEG. BROWNING:

(Inaudible).

MR. NOLAN:

We could, but it's inconsistent with -- it sounds like it would be inconsistent with the earlier resolution. I think we've got to get those two resolution to be consistent. We can take it up at the lunch break, too.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay. And again, it sounds like there's issues between part-time and per diem. I really would like to hear from Dan Farrell. Dan, would you mind coming up here and, you know, giving us a little bit more information?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Through the Chair.

LEG. KENNEDY:

He's out the door already *(laughter)*.

P.O. HORSLEY:

No one cares. Just call whoever you want *(laughter)*.

MR. FARRELL:

Well, thank you. As I spoke on this earlier, we haven't met to discuss this. I would like to sit and meet with them. I'd be happy to sit and meet with them to discuss this because, as we all know Superstorm Sandy -- Superstorm -- Superstorm Sandy, that's a tough one to say. You know, it really devastated us. And, you know, while I think the concept of having a pool of people, and if they're retirees even, you're going to pay them per diem to come out in a 2-foot of snow storm? I don't think that's going to happen. I honestly really don't think. I mean, if you had a pool of 20, 30 retirees. How many of those retirees are really going to be able to get out in that snow or that Superstorm, whatever it may be.

So I'd be more than happy to try and work this out but, you know, from my perspective, it's more a matter of we need more people and we need more full-time people. That's the way I see it.

LEG. HAHN:

And they're being trained. They're --

MR. FARRELL:

We have some that we've hired and are being trained and are getting up to speed, yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay?

LEG. HAHN:

But there's no question that even -- as we pass this, there are times when even when we're trained and we have, you know, a really good level, we still might need a few extra in those super emergency situations. That's what this is meant to be. And the pay scale has to be enough to entice someone to want to come in in those scenarios.

MR. FARRELL:

Exactly it; that's going to be your problem.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay? Legislator Anker, are you finished?

LEG. ANKER:

Well, again, I just think, it's important that we get the full picture, you know, to include our union representative, our Legislature, our County representative before we move forward with this. So I will vote to table. I'm hoping we can amend this today and try to resolve it today. But, you know, thank you for your input.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator.

MR. FARRELL:

Thank you. And I appreciate your support on tabling it. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Farrell. Legislator Montano?

LEG. MONTANO:

No, I'll pass. I was going to ask Dan to come up, but that's already been done. Thanks.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Everyone wants Dan. Okay, Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Dan? Mr. Farrell, just one other second. I apologize, I was out of the room when you spoke before in Public Portion, but let me just make clear. You're opposed to this bill, 2037?

MR. FARRELL:

Yeah, as it currently is, yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Good. Thank you.

MR. FARRELL:

Okay.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. All right, anybody else; we're all good? Okay, I think we have a motion to table; is that correct? Do we have a motion to approve also? Just table, right?

MR. LAUBE:

No, you just have a motion to table.

P.O. HORSLEY:

That's what I thought. Okay, I have a motion to table on the floor. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it's been tabled.

MR. LAUBE:

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

2038-13 - Authorizing the County Executive to execute an Agreement with the Suffolk County Police Benevolent Association, Inc., Parks Police Unit covering terms and conditions of employment for the period October 30, 2013 through December 31, 2018 (County Executive).

LEG. CALARCO:

Motion.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Muratore makes the motion, second by Legislator Calarco. Motion to approve. Is there anyone on the motion? Legislator Cilmi, you want to --

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah, just a question.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Sure, go ahead.

LEG. CILMI:

Just a question for Counsel, if I may, Mr. Presiding Officer?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Uh-huh.

LEG. CILMI:

Wasn't there something about needing authorization from New York State for this, or am I --

LEG. CALARCO:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

Am I missing --

LEG. BROWNING:

No.

MR. NOLAN:

That I think is a separate issue having to do with the Park Police merging into the --

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

MR. NOLAN:

-- Suffolk County Police Department. This is them just getting the same benefits, I guess, as the PBA.

LEG. CILMI:

Good. All right, thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay? We have a motion to approve. Anyone else, everyone good?
All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right, page ten, ***2059-13 - Adopting a Salary Plan for employees excluded from Bargaining Units (Presiding Officer).***

LEG. CALARCO:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator Calarco. Second on the motion, anybody?

LEG. MONTANO:

Second *(Raised hand)*.

P.O. HORSLEY:

I'm sorry, who said that? Legislator Montano seconds the motion. Everybody good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

Health:

1601-13 - To appoint member to the Early Intervention Task Force (Salvatore Caravella, M.D.)(Spencer). Dr. Spencer?

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion to table, please.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion's to table. There's a second by Legislator Calarco. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

It's tabled.

2052-13 - Declaring January as "Carbon Monoxide Poisoning Awareness Month" in Suffolk County (Presiding Officer). I'll make the motion.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

LEG. SPENCER:

Cosponsor.

MR. LAUBE:

Sixteen.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Cosponsor.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Others? Don't like this carbon monoxide.

LEG. SPENCER:

Cosponsor.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay? We've got more.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Human Services:

1963-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to update the Suffolk County Advisory Board on Child Protection (Gregory). Legislator Gregory makes the motion.

Seconded by Legislator Stern. All those in favor?

LEG. HAHN:

I just have one quick question.

P.O. HORSLEY:

On the motion, I'm sorry. On the motion, Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

This doesn't in any way preclude individuals -- like these are public meetings, correct? So it doesn't preclude anyone who isn't on the committee from attending in any way.

LEG. GREGORY:

(Shook head no.)

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Anybody else; we're all good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

We're moving to **Parks & Recreation:**

1992-13 - Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with rewiring of historic buildings at Suffolk County Vanderbilt Museum (CP 7445) (Spencer).

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion.

LEG. NOWICK:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator Spencer. Second by Legislator Nowick. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. Same motion, same second on the corresponding Bond Resolution ***(1992A, Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$75,000 Bonds to finance the cost of rewiring historic buildings at the Suffolk County Vanderbilt Museum (CP 7445.315),*** roll call vote.

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

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

All right, we're moving to **Public Safety:**

1698-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to enhance and improve Suffolk County's E-911 Service (Schneiderman).

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Make's a motion to approve. Legislator Schneiderman makes the motion to approve, seconded by Legislator Kennedy. Anyone on the motion? We're all good? All right, if I just could ask the question; this basically codifies what was provided in the budget?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. Besides, it's very similar. You know, we had passed a similar bill that Kennedy -- Legislator Kennedy had sponsored and there's a couple of minor --

P.O. HORSLEY:

I cosponsored.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

A couple of minor differences. One is that this provides a little bit more revenue, all the revenues from the 20% from the various voiceover IP's, land lines, cell phones, etcetera, to the PSAPs. The PSAPs, under this version, get to decide how to spend that 20%, you know, they have that ability to decide how to divide it. And then it also expands the uses beyond equipment to personnel training, etcetera. And I want to thank the County Executive for his cooperation on this, the PSAPs, FRES, Legislator Kennedy. It's been a long time in the making, but I think it's a good bill. And as you said, it codifies what currently is contained in the County Executive's 2014 budget, in our adopted budget.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Very good. And it's good to see us all working hand-in-glove together.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Mr. Presiding Officer, what it also does --

P.O. HORSLEY:

-- to help our firematic services.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, and it implements most of the recommendations that came from Comptroller Sawicki for the audit that we requested, including the quarterly distribution.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yep.

LEG. KENNEDY:

A reinstatement of the Memorandum of Understanding with each of the PSAPS, and it really cleans up and puts some regularity into the whole process on both sides. So it's a good bill, a good collaboration all the way around.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Man, we're good. Okay. All right, all those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Cosponsor, Tim.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Me, too. All right; we're good?

1877-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to strengthen the Animal Abuse Offenders Registry (D'Amaro). Legislator D'Amaro?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Muratore seconds the motion. On the motion, everybody good? Legislator Kennedy, you want to say something?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yeah, I do have one question on the motion, as a matter of fact, Mr. Chair. This is something, I guess, I'll pose to the sponsor. There was an awful lot of discussion in Public Safety about why, I guess, it's taking so long to actually go ahead and implement this or put the pet registry into effect, and I had offered to reach out to the District Attorney because there seemed to be some request from the SPCA. Now, I know your office has been involved and apparently a lot of folks have been involved in trying to streamline and get it into place. But I'm also told by the DA's Office that since Legislator Cooper's bill was first put into place, to date we only have six individuals that have actually been convicted of this, and the District Attorney's Office is apparently ready to make the notifications available to the SPCA. So I guess I come back to a question as to why move or why kind of migrate away from the agency that's been the primary enforcement on this?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Sure, John. I'd be happy to answer that. It's been three years since the bill was first signed into law by the County Executive. I spoke to the District Attorney's Office, Ed Heilig, as well.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

There has always been a willingness on the part of the DA to get this up and running. And what, in fact, happened here was I believe the SPCA had other issues with the County and decided that if they're not going to get their way, they're going to stomp their feet, jump up and down and tell the County *We're not doing anything*, despite the fact that they were written into this law.

Now, with that said, what I am trying to do is just level the playing field here. The SPCA is not being excluded from running the registry, they can apply to the Police Department with any other applicant, they'll be screened and then a decision will be made.

LEG. KENNEDY:

There have been underlying issues, both you and I are very much aware of it, when it comes to the broader discussion about indemnification.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

LEG. KENNEDY:

However, an agency shouldn't use one responsibility in order to be a wedge, if you will, to advance a separate issue. Mr. Chair, again, I apologize that I was out, I was dealing with the County Clerk on some matter. Mr. Lobell must have spoken during the public portion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

He did.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Could I ask him to come up and just give whatever the SPCA's perspective is with this before we hold a vote?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Sure.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay, good.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I think that's fair. Is he here? Yeah, there he is, yes.
Mr. Llobell.

MR. LLOBELL:

Thank you. Hi, John.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Again, through the Chair. Paul, you know, the sponsor has indicated, and I think, quite frankly, all of us are aware that here we are in 2013, 2010 is when former Legislator Cooper had the bill passed in the first instance. And like the sponsor, I did speak with Ed Heilig as well, he did indicate that, in fact, it seemed that from the District Attorney's Office, there is some type of a process that's been discussed to give you folks the notification you need so that there's no element of ambiguity or question, whatever you would wind up posting, you can demonstrate reliance on the part of the prosecuting agency. Why are we here at this point, Paul?

MR. LLOBELL:

That befuddles all logical thinking, I'm not sure why we're here. I've spoken to Ed Heilig, Ed Heilig would prefer us to be the agency, the law enforcement agency that handles this offender registry. We're the only one, really, that's qualified to do it.

There is no indemnification issue. There is a process issue that was spoken about, and it's a very simple process; we want to get the information from one source to go to one source. And again, you know, if the County gives us bad information and we post it on a registry and somebody comes after us, well, that's going to fall in the County's lap. Obviously, if the County gives us good information and we put bad information into the registry, it's going to fall on our lap; we're big boys, we understand that. This has nothing to do with the prior indemnification issues. We've even -- the Chief has even said, and I testified to this in the committee, the \$50 fee, we're ready to waive that. You know, there's only been, you know, five or six people that would be appropriate to put into the registry at this point. So it's not a money issue, it's a qualification issue.

You know, we've been around 29 years. We've been handling the dog bite registry for the County of Suffolk, which maybe many of you don't even know about, for the past 16 years without one question, problem, hitch. Now we're talking about opening it up to any animal rights group or any -- it could be PETA for God's sakes, you know, it's a terrorist organization (*laughter*).

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, I -- let me go back, through the Chair, again, if I will, and then I'm going to yield. The only thing I'd say to you then, Paul, is I found my conversation with the DA's Office, you know, fairly illuminating, they covered everything you just stated, everything Legislator D'Amaro stated. If we have six individuals that have been found guilty, and you folks clearly are the preeminent agency comprised of volunteers who have been dealing with this function, why can't I go on this laptop today and see those six individuals? What's stopping you from doing that now?

MR. LLOBELL:

We have to get the information; they haven't supplied it to us.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, you know, I guess the only other thing that I could say is I had the conversation with Ed, I know where your office is. If we get out of here on time tonight or I do it tomorrow, the two of us can go walk over and see Tom. I don't know what more needs to be done to fulfill that.

MR. LLOBELL:

There's nothing. The website is finished, it was done a couple of years ago. You know, we spent a few thousand dollars setting it up, I don't know what the dollar amount was. It's ready to go. We get the information from the DA's Office and they tell us who to post and we're going to have it up there, it's over and done.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

MR. LLOBELL:

There's no questions whatsoever. We're ready, willing and able. And for the life of me, I can't figure out, other than some personal issues with somebody, why this amendment would even be brought forth and wasting your time with it. I can't see it.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. I'm going to yield. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Paul.

MR. LLOBELL:

Thank you very much.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator Kennedy. Legislator Browning?

LEG. BROWNING:

I'll pass. No, I'm good.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Browning passes. Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

Sir, would you stay up there?

MR. LLOBELL:

Sure.

LEG. MONTANO:

I just want to get some clarification, I'm not really clear on this. This talks about a contract with the Suffolk County Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Do you currently have a contract in place for this particular --

MR. LLOBELL:

For the registry?

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes.

MR. LLOBELL:

No. They haven't given us one.

LEG. MONTANO:

How much money are we talking about here?

MR. LLOBELL:

Zero dollars, zero cost to the County of Suffolk. We're doing it at no cost, no charge, zip, nada, nothing.

LEG. MONTANO:

So you would be willing -- are you saying you would be willing to contract to do this for free?

MR. LLOBELL:

Absolutely.

LEG. MONTANO:

Have you negotiated or discussed a contract with the Administration?

MR. LLOBELL:

I believe -- I personally haven't. I believe there were some early on discussions.

LEG. MONTANO:

You said early on; this bill's been around -- I think this was a Cooper bill. This bill's been around for, what, three years now?

MR. LLOBELL:

This bill's been around for a long time. It was discussed with Sarah Simpson three or four times. George Nolan has some information regarding it. I think the problem is coming because everybody has got this indemnification question hanging over their head from the prior indemnification issues that we had early on.

LEG. MONTANO:

This particular -- we didn't approve the indemnification; am I correct on that?

MR. LLOBELL:

No.

LEG. MONTANO:

We did not.

MR. LLOBELL:

You did at one time and then --

LEG. MONTANO:

Right, okay.

MR. LLOBELL:

-- it changed.

LEG. MONTANO:

There is no indemnification.

MR. LLOBELL:

Right, we have no indemnification and we don't have -- vice versa.

LEG. MONTANO:

Right, but that's not the issue before us.

MR. LLOBELL:

That has zero, nothing to do with this pet offender registry. There's no indemnification issues.

LEG. MONTANO:

All right. So getting back to my question, if there was supposed to be a contract for this, should it not have been done earlier than where we're at now?

MR. LLOBELL:

I would think we should have a contract sent to us or tell us it's ready, we'll come over and sign it. It's quite simple.

LEG. MONTANO:

Right. But then the contract that you're talking about would involve no expense to the County to maintain this registry?

MR. LLOBELL:

Correct.

LEG. MONTANO:

So I'm not sure I'm getting the issue then.

MR. LLOBELL:

I'm not sure I have it either.

LEG. MONTANO:

Maybe Counsel, do you -- he said you might know something about this. Are you going to share that with us?

MR. NOLAN:

No, I don't have any first-hand knowledge. I just know there have been multiple meetings involving a lot of parties over the years and it's -- all I know is it's three years later, we don't have the registry up.

MR. LLOBELL:

Well, over the three or four years, I believe there's only been three or four meetings.

LEG. MONTANO:

And who are those meetings with?

MR. LLOBELL:

Sarah Simpson, from what my notes tell me, and --

LEG. MONTANO:

Sarah who? Oh, Sarah.

MR. LLOBELL:

-- you know, that's really it. There's been a couple of phone calls going back and forth, but --

LEG. MONTANO:

Hi, Sarah. I thought you were talking about someone from the County Exec's Office. I didn't realize you were talking about our Sarah.

MR. LLOBELL:

It's been log-jammed. I mean, lay the contract out to us, get it to us, let's get it signed and let's get on with business here.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay.

MR. LLOBELL:

We're wasting valuable time.

LEG. MONTANO:

I see Mr. Vaughn back there, he looks like he's going to explode.

*(*Laughter*)*

You know I like you, Tom.

P.O. HORSLEY:

That would be challenging.

LEG. MONTANO:

Why don't you -- would you bear with me and let him come forward? I think he has something to say, and I'm just curious as to what he has to say.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Tom, I'd hate to see you explode, so through the Chair.

LEG. MONTANO:

You know that was in gest, Tom.

MR. VAUGHN:

Absolutely, sir.

LEG. MONTANO:

Go ahead. What is it that -- you looked like you had something to say. Do you have anything to say?

MR. VAUGHN:

Yes, I do.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Excuse me, just on a procedural thing. Mr. Chair, I believe, if Mr. Vaughn's going to testify, maybe he should but at the podium by himself.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah, I have no problems with that. You're absolutely correct.

P.O. HORSLEY:

I can understand that. That's --

LEG. MONTANO:

You're absolutely right.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Llobell.

MR. LLOBELL:

No problem.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Mr. Vaughn, all by yourself, before you explode.

MR. VAUGHN:

Thank you very much. Quite frankly, I don't agree with the representations that have been made by the SPCA today.

LEG. MONTANO:

Could you speak a little louder, Tom?

MR. VAUGHN:

Quite frankly, I do not agree with the representations that have been made by the SPCA today.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. So what's going on here?

MR. VAUGHN:

Here is our --

LEG. MONTANO:

In a nutshell.

MR. VAUGHN:

Here is my contention. First of all, this issue of indemnification and who should be indemnified and how they should be indemnified, as you know, has gone around and around for a very long time. Last year one of the very first issues that I dealt with was trying to get this issue resolved. And we had a piece of legislation that was laid on the table to address the issue of indemnification specifically pertaining to the animal abuse registry. The reason that that bill was never adopted was because the bill was never amended to add a contract to it which we sent repeatedly to the SPCA and was not signed. We are here now trying to resolve this issue. We -- I don't know who Mr. Llobell has met with, but I can tell you that I have sat in meetings with the SPCA personally no less than four times, at least four times. I know that Dennis Cohen and Dennis Brown have sat in those same meetings with me, no less than four times.

LEG. MONTANO:

All right. So, just so I'm clear, what you're saying is that a contract was prepared and was offered to the SPCA?

MR. VAUGHN:

And rejected, yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

And rejected?

MR. VAUGHN:

Correct.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay.

MR. VAUGHN:

And I am saying that we think -- to further -- to finish that statement, with all due respect, sir, I think that we should adopt this bill as it's drafted right now.

LEG. MONTANO:

Oh, I'm sure you do; it's your bill, right?

P.O. HORSLEY:

No, it's not. It's Mr. D'Amaro's.

LEG. MONTANO:

Oh, Mister -- Legislator D'Amaro's bill. That's in complete contradiction to the gentleman that just spoke. I don't want to play back and forth, but what's going on here?

MR. VAUGHN:

Legislator, I -- I can only give you my version of it and I can --

LEG. MONTANO:

Well, let me ask you this.

MR. VAUGHN:

Sure.

LEG. MONTANO:

Is that contract still outstanding? I mean, if they were willing to sign the contract today, would that solve the problem for you?

MR. VAUGHN:

No, I don't think that it solves the problem for us.

LEG. MONTANO:

Why not?

MR. VAUGHN:

Because I agree with Legislator D'Amaro that this issue has been outstanding for far too long. I don't think that it's -- there were two separate issues that were attempted to be comingled. I think that there's nothing in Legislator D'Amaro's bill right now, which is the issue that's before us, that precludes the SPCA from handling this going forward, but I don't think that -- just as I don't think that the issue of indemnification falls --

LEG. MONTANO:

Right. No, we're done with indemnification, we're done with the fact that you've offered a contract and for whatever reason it wasn't signed.

MR. VAUGHN:

Exactly.

LEG. MONTANO:

My question is that if there's a contract out there right now that was tendered to them and they're willing to sign it, you -- you indicate to me that you're not willing to cosign it; is that accurate?

MR. VAUGHN:

I'm not willing to agree to that at this moment in time. And I don't --

LEG. MONTANO:

Well, I don't mean you, I mean the County Executive.

MR. VAUGHN:

Me representing the County Executive; the Executive's Office is --

LEG. MONTANO:

So he doesn't want to contract with the SPCA is what you're saying.

MR. VAUGHN:

No, I'm saying what he doesn't want to do is make a decision right here at 11:45 on this matter when this has been out for a very long time. And the issue -- just as the two indemnification issues have nothing to do -- should not have been comingled, I don't believe that the problems in getting a contract signed with the SPCA has anything to do with the bill that's before us today. I think that that's a completely separate issue. I think that this bill strengthens the language that is in the law and I think that this bill does not preclude us from going forward with the SPCA. And the issues

between the SPCA and the County should be resolved, but I'm not agreeing to sign a contract that was rejected months ago by the SPCA today, on the floor.

LEG. MONTANO:

All right. Tom, thank you. I'm going to -- I hate to belabor this. Mr. Llobell?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Oh. Tom, you can sit down, and thank you.

LEG. MONTANO:

Through the Chair, of course.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Of course.

LEG. MONTANO:

I just want to get some clarification. Do you -- were you offered a contract or not? Do you have a written contract in your possession, not in your pocket but, I mean, at the SPCA?

MR. LLOBELL:

No, we don't.

LEG. MONTANO:

Have you ever seen a contract, or anyone in your organization, have they seen a contract?

MR. LLOBELL:

Me personally, no. Maybe our attorney may have seen or spoken about a contract. I'd like to give you guys a copy of an e-mail, if you want it, that was sent to me by our attorney. You know, I don't know if that's going to help --

LEG. MONTANO:

Say that again?

MR. LLOBELL:

I have an e-mail that was sent to me by our attorney which should be circulated around; if you guys want to see it, I don't mind sharing it with you.

LEG. MONTANO:

Well, I'd like to see it. You want to -- is it short? Maybe you can --

MR. LLOBELL:

Well, it's not really short.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah, why don't we -- we can make copies of it and have it distributed.

MR. LLOBELL:

He's a little long-winded, nothing's short with him, unfortunately.

LEG. MONTANO:

Well, he gets paid by the hour.

MR. LLOBELL:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

What, in essence, does the e-mail say, before we get to read it. What is your interpretation of the e-mail?

MR. LLOBELL:

Why don't I read it to you guys? Do you have a few minutes? This will take a couple of minutes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Well, we have all day. Go ahead.

MR. LLOBELL:

Okay, great.

P.O. HORSLEY:

So glad to hear it (*laughter*).

MR. LLOBELL:

Okay.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah, I think we can circulate it.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah, why don't we circulate it.

P.O. HORSLEY:

We'd be glad to make copies and we'll circulate it to the Legislature.

MR. LLOBELL:

Okay.

LEG. MONTANO:

All right. But basically, just to end this, you guys are at odds. Supposedly a contract was tendered to you. Supposedly you have not seen a contract or you have not -- you can't represent that anyone has seen a physical contract for your signature; am I correct?

MR. LLOBELL:

Correct. Bring on a contract, let's get it signed.

LEG. MONTANO:

All right, let me read the e-mail. Thank you.

MR. LLOBELL:

Okay.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay? Thank you very much, Legislator.

MR. LLOBELL:

Thank you very much.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator -- thank you, Mr. Llobell. Legislator Schneiderman?

MR. LLOBELL:

Thank you.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yeah, I'm trying to figure out what went wrong since we passed this bill in 2010, and clearly since then there's at least six individuals who should have been on this list. You know, I'm looking at the 2010 law and there's a bunch of things in there. The onus was on the offender to actually notify the registry, which was kept by the SPCA, which I don't know whether they did or whether the SPCA actually got anybody noticing. Let me just finish, Lou, and then I would like you to follow through on this. There was supposed to be a \$50 administrative fee that the offenders paid each year, that was supposed to cover some of the cost of administering the registry. The Commissioner of the Police Department, Suffolk County PD was supposed to put together the rules for implementing, I don't know if that was done.

It sounds like a lot of balls were dropped here. I'm not sure -- there's a thousand dollar potential penalty and incarceration for individuals who don't register. So something obviously went wrong since 2010, I'm not sure where to place the blame. Now, certainly there's liability here. If the SPCA -- and they've spent some money on doing this, it sounded like a thousand or several thousand dollars putting this website together with no individuals on it. But if they would put somebody on there that shouldn't be on this list, then certainly they could get in trouble, they could be held liable for defamation of character on some level for putting the wrong person on. So there needs to be some coordination with law enforcement, the DA's Office seems to be the right entity there.

I don't love, Legislator D'Amaro, the fact that we have designated an entity in the law, because what if the entity isn't doing their job like the SPCA? We ought to have the ability to pick an entity that will do the job, but I'm also concerned, A, about liability and, two, about the SPCA having spent some funds already on this. Legis -- Mr. Vaughn, did you want to respond to that?

MR. VAUGHN:

Well, quite simply, sir, we didn't -- we never had a problem in terms of the indemnification for the information that we provided to them, we never had a problem with that. We were always in support of providing that limited indemnification, so if we had been given bad information, we would be held responsible. We did not have an issue going forward. That was the genesis of the bill that was out there 12 months ago.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let me hear from Legislator D'Amaro, too.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Sure, Jay. The County proceed -- after this bill became law, the County proceeded in good faith, there were some negotiations, a contract was given to the SPCA, the indemnification was included in that should the County do something wrong, we would want to protect any contract agency from that liability. What happened was that the SPCA decided that *we're not signing this contract unless they use* -- they wanted to use it as a wedge to get the County to give them indemnification on many other issues that we've talked about here in the Legislature.

As far as procedure goes that you raised, this bill clarifies and sets forth a procedure. When I spoke to the DA's Office, Mr. Heilig, he told me that the procedures were discussed with the SPCA. The delay of this bill has nothing to do with the procedures not being clarified, it has nothing to do with

the ability of the SPCA to do it, but it has everything to do with the fact that it was held up by the SPCA because they wanted to get the County to give them broader indemnification provisions.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator D'Amaro, are we eliminating the requirement in your version that the onus is on the offender?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Now the onus is on the District Attorney to notify --

LEG. D'AMARO:

That's correct.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

-- the designated entity.

LEG. D'AMARO:

The District Attorney, at sentencing, will notify the offender who is then going to go, within five days, to the Police station to register. The Police will then work with the contract agency. By the way, that makes sense because the Police Department is also going to screen and oversee the agency and contract with the agency.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Now, Legislator D'Amaro --

LEG. D'AMARO:

And I agree with your point that it's not good practice, legislative practice to name a specific agency in a bill like this exactly for this reason. Whether you believe what you're hearing or what you want to believe is really irrelevant at this point. What's really relevant here is we need the proper procedure in place where the County can select from anyone who wants to apply to run this registry, select what's best -- in the best interest of the County and then go ahead and contract with that organization. That's what we're trying to do.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Well, perhaps the SPCA is the best organization to do this. If they are willing to go with just a limited indemnification in regard to the Animal Abuse Registry, you know, perhaps this can move forward. You know, there may be other qualif --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, this doesn't preclude that from happening, that's exactly my point. But perhaps if the SPCA finds some other issue where it doesn't want to sign the contract, it doesn't put us right back here debating this bill all over again. You know, you need to put -- you need to clarify that the County's going to contract with the best qualified agency. If that turns out to be the SPCA, that's fine, I admire the work they do. I know their ability. I don't necessarily think their comments here today are appropriate, but the organization as a whole does wonderful work in Suffolk County.

This bill just sets forth procedure, it lets the Suffolk County Police Department consider any organization that wants to run the animal registry history, and the history you can't deny. The fact of the matter is the SPCA had this opportunity, it sat dormant for three years, and I would say to you today that but for my bill, we still wouldn't be addressing this animal registry.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I don't have your bill right in front of me. And yes, when you're writing legislation it's probably good not to define an entity, but often you put certain criteria in such as a County-wide organization or an organization that's been operational for a number of years. Does your bill put any of those criteria in place or just say any animal --

LEG. D'AMARO:

No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Because I'm concerned about that.

LEG. D'AMARO:

We thought about doing that --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

There are a lot of people out there who are very passionate about animal rights and are concerned about animal abuse, but may not be the best organization to do this. So, Legislator D'Amaro, I would feel more comfortable if your bill had some criteria in it so that we knew we had a large organization that had a reputation.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, a large reputation, I mean, these are the things that the Police Department is going to be looking at. And I specifically avoided putting criteria into the bill because I felt that it was best to let everyone apply, whoever thinks they're qualified, and then let the Police Department determine who's best suited to run. We're talking about running a website here, that's what we're talking about. I mean, we're talking about you get a slip of paper with a name on it and it gets posted on the website, that's it. You know, to start putting forth criteria --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, if we are, in fact, complying that organization and they are reckless in their behavior, they put names there that don't belong --

LEG. D'AMARO:

But that can happen with the best of organizations.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

-- then we're liable. And our fiduciary responsibility would be to --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Legislator Schneiderman, I'm asking about running a website.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Hang on a second. Counsel has --

LEG. D'AMARO:

We're not talking about going out to someone's home, you know, on a call, we're talking about running a website and getting a slip of paper from the Police Department.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

All I'm saying is I would be more comfortable if it had more specifics.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Guys? Guys? One second, Counsel wants to interject on that motion.

MR. NOLAN:

I was just saying, if we contract with somebody, we're not indemnifying them against the world. If they go and do something crazy, we're not going to indemnify them for that. We're going to indemnify them if we give them bad information and they post that.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Okay, Mr. D'Amaro, you're good?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes, I believe so.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay, very good.

LEG. D'AMARO:

If anyone has any more questions --

P.O. HORSLEY:

I don't think -- that's the entire list that I have at the moment. Anyone else want to be heard on this issue? Anyone like to be heard on this issue? What motion do I have in front of me? It's been a while.

MR. LAUBE:

You have a motion to approve.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion to approve. We have a motion to approve. Do you want a roll call, you're good; guys? I'll just call the vote. All those in favor? Opposed?

"Opposed" said in unison

P.O. HORSLEY:

We need a roll call.

MR. LAUBE:

Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Well, that answers that question. Okay, roll call vote, Mr. Clerk.

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

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Absolutely.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

No.

LEG. MONTANO:

No.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

(Not Present).

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

Twelve ****AMENDED VOTE:** Eleven (Opposed: Legislators Kennedy, Barraga, Cilmi, Montano & Browning - Not Present: Legislator Anker - Vacant Seat: District #8).

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All righty, the motion passes.

2005-13 - Approving a temporary increase in the fleet of the Suffolk County Department of Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services (County Executive). Anybody on this?

LEG. CALARCO:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Seconded by Legislator Muratore. On the motion, everybody good?
All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

2009-13 - Amending Resolution No. 500-2011 to modify appropriated funds in the HazMat 2009 Grant (County Executive).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Mister -- well, let's make a motion first. Mr. Vaughn, hang on a second. Legislator Browning makes the motion to approve.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Seconded by Legislator Muratore. On the motion, Mr. Vaughn.

MR. VAUGHN:

Actually, we actually amended this bill after the amended copy deadline, so we were going to ask that it be tabled, please.

LEG. CALARCO:

Table it.

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion to table.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion to table by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator Cilmi. Okay, we have a motion to table and a motion to approve. Anyone on the motion?

LEG. BROWNING:

I'll withdraw my motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay, Legislator Browning withdraws the motion to table. Is that seconded by the seconder?

LEG. BROWNING:

No, no, no.

P.O. HORSLEY:

To approve; I'm sorry, to approve. Is the second on the motion to approve okay with that?

LEG. MURATORE:

(Shook head yes).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Good. Okay, just a motion to table is on the floor. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been tabled.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

2011-13 - Authorizing the transfer of Phone Debit Card Funds from the Sheriff's Office Prisoners' Commissary Account to the Inter-Department Operation and Service Fund (County Executive).

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator Browning. Is there second on the motion?

LEG. SPENCER:

Second.

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 #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

2012-13 - Approving the reappointment of Rabbi Steven A. Moss as Chair of the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission (County Executive).

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion.

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion -- I'm sorry, who said the motion?

LEG. BROWNING:

I did.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay, I'll make it Legislator Browning, and the second was Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. I've got several reappointments here to the Human Rights Commission.

LEG. BROWNING:

Same motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

If you don't mind making the same motion, same second.

2013-13 - Approving the reappointment of Mark J. Epstein, Esq. To the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission (County Executive). Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

2014-13 - Approving the reappointment of Dr. Yu-Wan Yang to the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission (County Executive). I have same motion, same second. All those in favor?

Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

2015-13 - Approving the reappointment of Augustus G. Mantia, MD, to the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission (County Executive). Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right, we've got another one yet. ***2016-13 - Approving the reappointment of Rajeshwar Prasad to the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission (County Executive).*** Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

2039-13 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funding in the amount of \$60,000 from the United States Department of the Treasury, Internal Revenue Service, for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the IRS STEPP (Suffolk-Treasury Enhanced Prosecution Program) with 80.08% Support (County Executive).

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

2040-13 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funding in the amount of \$17,203 from the United States Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration, for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the DEA Long Island Task Force with 77.01% support. (County Executive).

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Same motion, same second on that all right? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

2041-13 - 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 FBI Joint Terrorism Task Force with 77.01% support (County Executive). Legislator Browning, you wanted this one?

LEG. BROWNING:

Sure, I'll make a motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Makes the motion. Seconded by Legislator Spencer. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

2042-13 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funding in the amount of \$30,000 from the Department of Homeland Security, United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the ICE El Dorado Task Force with 77.01% support (County Executive). Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

2044-13 - Accepting and appropriating grant funding in the amount of \$225,225 from the State of New York Governor's Traffic Safety Committee passed through the STOP-DWI Foundation for the Suffolk County STOP-DWI Program to fund DWI Enforcement Related High Visibility Road Check Patrols with 82.77% support (County Executive). Legislator Muratore, you want to make this one?

LEG. MURATORE:

Sure.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Makes the motion. Second by Legislator Browning. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

2045-13 - Authorizing execution of a Law Enforcement Officer Reimbursement Sub-Recipient Agreement with the Town of Islip For MacArthur Airport (County Executive).

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Browning makes the -- let Legislator Cilmi make the motion. Legislator Browning makes the second on the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Public Works & Transportation:

1909-13 - Approving extension of license for the South Ferry, Incorporated (Presiding Officer Horsley).

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

1994-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with application and removal of lane markings (CP 5037)(County Executive).

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Schneiderman makes the motion. Second on the motion, Legislator Stern. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

Same motion, same second on the pending Bond Resolution, ***1994A (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$375,000 Bonds to finance the cost of the application and removal of lane markings (CP 5037.326).*** Roll call vote.

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

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right, thank you very much.

1995-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with traffic signal improvements (CP 5054) (County Executive). Same motion, same second all right on that? All those in favor?

Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

On the corresponding Bond Resolution, same motion, same second; roll call vote.

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

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

(Not Present).

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

Sixteen.

LEG. MONTANO:

No, I'm here.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right.

1996-13 - Authorizing execution of agreement by the Administrative Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 6 - Kings Park and Flynn Subdivision (SM-1594) (County Executive).

LEG. NOWICK:

Motion.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator Nowick. Seconded by Legislator Kennedy. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

1997-13 - Authorizing execution of agreement by the Administrative Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest and Tutor Time at Melville (HU-1654) (County Executive). Mr. D'Amaro, you want that one?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

1998-13 - Approving the Vector Control Plan of the Department of Public Works Division of Vector Control pursuant to Section C8-4(B)(2) of the Suffolk County Charter (County Executive).

LEG. KENNEDY:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Makes a motion by Legislator Kennedy. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second on the motion by Legislator Krupski.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

On the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

On the motion, Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

This went through Public Works Committee, it was discharged without a recommendation. I had some concerns, as I voiced here in the past, about a particular larvicide called Methoprene which is now restricted in.

MS. CORSO:

Maine and Rhode Island. We continue to use it.

This particular Vector Control Plan is not really unlike last year's Vector Control Plan, it's very minor in terms of how it's changed. Whether we at some point will start putting additional restrictions on Methoprene, we'll see as the evidence gets presented. There is a study being done by the University of.

MS. CORSO:

That will be finished soon. The concern is that placing Methoprene in estuaries because it affects arthropods and their ability to go from the larval stage to adult stage by interfering with the endocrine system, that the same thing happens with crustaceans; lobsters, crabs, etcetera.

There seems to be an increasing movement to restrict Methoprene. My concern with this Vector Control Plan is that it gives a little bit too much leniency to the department in terms of using Methoprene on the early stages of larva when our own GEIS recommended against using Methoprene, aerial spraying in estuaries of Stage I and Stage II larva, so I'm planning on abstaining from this.

There is a time concern here in terms of getting the plan approved. Should this get accepted, I do plan on bringing as much information to this body as I can next year on Methoprene to make an educated decision. This always can be amended during the year should more information and

studies show that Methoprene is a concern. I will say we started using Methoprene in 1995, there were four million pounds of lobster in the Long Island Sound at that point. Now that lobster population is virtually non-existent in the sound, I think it's down to about a hundred thousand pounds, about 10% of what it used to be. Other areas that have stopped using Methoprene are starting to see their lobster population rebound. That is not to say that Methoprene absolutely is the problem that's causing the lobster die-off, but it's certainly worth taking a very careful and fuller look at it and I will leave it at that. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Schneiderman. Is there anyone else on this? Legislator Krupski, you want to talk about it?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I've -- after Legislator Schneiderman brought this issue up, I did have some conversations with Dominick Ninivaggi who runs Vector Control for Suffolk County. And this is serious business and we should be using science and not emotion, and not -- and not, you know, conjecture on what affected the lobster population or what didn't, and these decisions should all be based on science. I'm confident that Public Works and Vector Control are doing that thoroughly and that's why I would support this.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Anybody else? We're all good? May I just throw in, I hope that next year, when Mr. Schneiderman looks at this issue, that we also take a look at the Aisan Tiger Mosquito and how we can control them, because the west end is just devastated by these daytime mosquitos, it is just ruining the quality of life in our backyards.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

And now Babylon has Dengue Fever, right? (*Laughter*). That's the new one, right?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Dengue Fever, yes. And who knows, it could be those tigers.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can I just add that we are conducting a literature review. Amy Yuchatz from Cornell Cooperative Extension is working with Planning to look at the most recent studies. I don't know when that will be finished, but this is an issue that will come up again next year and hopefully we'll have the most up-to-date research on it.

P.O. HORSLEY:

And I look forward to hearing about how that all came about and worked out.

Okay, we have a motion to approve on 1998. I don't have any other motions. All those in favor? Opposed?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Abstention.

P.O. HORSLEY:

So moved.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

One abstention.

MR. LAUBE:

Sixteen (Abstained: Legislator Schneiderman - Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

All righty. Next page, 12, **1999-13 - Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with beach erosion and coastline protection (CP 5380) (County Executive).**

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. I'll make the second on the motion. 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 issue which is **1999A (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York authorizing the issuance of \$100,000 Bonds to finance the cost of engineering, in connection with beach erosion and coastline protection (CP 5380.112),** roll call vote.

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

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Cosponsor, please.

MR. LAUBE:

Got it.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

2000-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with intersection improvements on CR 94, Nugent Drive, Towns of Riverhead and Southampton (CP 5557) (County Executive).

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Krupski makes the motion. Second by Legislator Schneiderman. 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 ***(2000A, Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$100,000 Bonds to finance the cost of engineering, in connection with intersection improvements on CR 94 Nugent***

Drive, Towns of Riverhead and Southampton (CP 5557.111), roll call vote.

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

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

2019-13 - Accepting a \$4,000,000 Empire State Development Grant and amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with engineering, planning, and design of Ronkonkoma Hub Sewer Project (CP 8156) (County Executive).

LEG. MURATORE:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator Muratore. Do I have a second on the motion?

LEG. KENNEDY:

(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:

By Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

On the motion, Mr. Chair?

P.O. HORSLEY:

On the motion.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Just a quick question for Commissioner Anderson. What is the plant being sized at this point, Gil?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The current plan has the plant being sized at 500,000 gallons per day with the potential to expand to 200 -- another 250,000 gallons per day to 750,000 gallons per day, but eventually to go up to another 250,000 to a million gallons. So at the end of the day --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. And what are we going to -- do we have a determination yet as far as what we're doing with effluent, or is that going to be part of the -- are we still in the design process to take a look at the alternatives?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We're still in the design process, but right now the effluent would be recharged into the ground.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Below grade?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Below grade.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. And we have sufficient acreage?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okey doke. All right, thanks.

P.O. HORSLEY:

It's all good. I'm very proud to hear this talk. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Thanks, Mr. Presiding Officer. Commissioner, what happens next year? What role does the Town of Islip play in this process? Where are we at now with the Hub and how does this funding fit into that picture?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, this funding helps and basically pays for the design of the treatment facility. We have 400,000 reserved currently for Ronkonkoma Hub, the project north of the tracks. On the south end of the tracks there's another additional hundred thousand available for the Town of Islip and we've been -- we're starting to work with Islip. We've talked to them in the past trying to find out exactly what Islip would be interested in doing and how -- you know, if they want more, this is the time to know exactly what they want to do with that \$100,000 -- sorry, 100,000 gallons per day.

LEG. CILMI:

So this involves some public input?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You're welcome.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah. Commissioner, on this. Now, several -- I guess it was two years ago today we -- right around now, we approved the bonding for the Hub's plant itself; where is that? Does that expire? That vote that we took was the \$20 million. Do you want to refresh my memory on that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, actually, originally the -- when the 22 or \$23 million was put into the Capital Program --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Twenty-three, yeah, right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

-- it was put in as Sanitary Bonds. And because this is not a district yet and won't be for some time, we couldn't use that funding which would have been this -- we would have actually appropriated this year for construction.

In turn, last year's Capital Program, the funding was put into 2015 as General Bonds. So it will be ready when we need it, which is 2015. I believe last year we offset a hundred thousand to help start the consultant in the design phase and what -- an oversight on my part is we didn't go through the process of formally accepting the funding from ESDC. So this keeps us moving, keeps us -- you know, keeps the project moving forward in a timely manner. We're working with TriTech to make sure, you know, we're essentially ahead of them. And like I said to Legislator Cilmi, we're looking forward to conversations with the Town of Islip to see what they want to do, you know, with their capacity.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Whether it's McArthur Airport or the industrial --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The industrial park to the south.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

There's a lot of options.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Wow. So it sounds like we've got a plan and we're actually progressing towards this 2015 date in which we can really have serious conversations about a sewer plant in that locality.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

P.O. HORSLEY:

That's good news. There's also -- my understanding is there's the possibility that some monies could be taken from the Stabilization Fund. That's a possibility that that would be a project that would be considered in the future as well?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Once -- yeah. I mean, there's a bunch of things being looked at still, you know, not the least of which would be the possibility of, you know, even connecting to Sewer District 3 at some point. You know, we have a lot of capacity in Sewer District 3. So, you know, that's still kind of out there for other areas as well as this area. But we're moving forward right now with the treatment plant and that's our goal.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Well, it's a worthy goal and I love to hear you just explain this. I just wanted to keep everybody informed that this is actually something that's going to happen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You're welcome.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. So 2019, do we have a motion on this?

MR. LAUBE:

Yes, you do.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. We have a motion and a second to approve. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. And we also have the corresponding Bond Resolution, ***(2019A, Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$1,275,000 Bonds to finance the cost of engineering, planning, and design of Ronkonkoma Hub Sewer Project (CP 8156.110).*** Same motion, same second; roll call vote.

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

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

All right, ***2033-13 - Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with decommissioning and demolition of County Facilities (CP 1665)(Browning).***

LEG. HAHN:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator Browning. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. MURATORE:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Muratore makes the second. On the motion, everybody good? 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 ***(2033A, Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$80,000 Bonds to finance the cost of decommissioning and demolition of county facilities (CP 1665.311).*** Roll call vote.

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

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Very good.

2049-13 - Authorizing an Intermunicipal Agreement with the Town of Babylon to facilitate the relocation, reconfiguration, and reconstruction of CR 3, Wellwood Avenue at its intersections with Conklin Street and Long Island Avenue, Town of Babylon (CP 5510) (County Executive).

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

That is an ambitious project.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It is. Long overdue.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Long overdue, there you go.

2058-13 - Naming the North County Complex in honor of William J. Lindsay (Spencer).

Legislator Spencer, you want to make that motion?

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

And I think we'll all --

"Cosponsor" said in unison by various Legislators

Yeah, okay. Legislator Hahn, you can second it, and we'll all cosponsor. Very good.

I just want -- so we're all cosponsors. I just wanted to also note that I have designated two committee Chair that is going to be putting forth the committee that will figure out what we're going to do as the commemoration and the date and those such things, and that will be headed by long-time Chief of Staff Terry Pearsall and Kevin Harvey from the IBEW. And they'll be setting up the committee and I hope that anyone that wants to be part of the committee --

LEG. HAHN:

(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:

-- joins. I'm looking forward to a very, very fitting memorial for our former Presiding Officer.

LEG. NOWICK:

When will it be?

P.O. HORSLEY:

I don't know, that's to be decided, too. When will it be? The question is -- you know, some people discussed maybe March 17th; wouldn't that be cool? We're good.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can we do a unanimous motion and a second?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Would anyone have any objection to that? A unanimous -- it's recommended by Legislator Schneiderman that we have a unanimous motion and second.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

By everybody. Do you have any objection to that?

LEG. SPENCER:

No objection.

P.O. HORSLEY:

No objection. The second, Ms. Hahn, you're good?

LEG. HAHN:

Oh, yes, I'm fine.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Okay, we'll withdraw, I guess, the motion and the second and we'll have us all as motioners of this 2058. Okay, we're good? All those in favor? Opposed. So moved, it's been approved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Good work, guys.

Ways & Means:

1888-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to improve the County's property redemption process (Gregory). Legislator Gregory?

LEG. GREGORY:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Makes 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:

1989-13 - Approving payment to General Code Publishers for Administrative Code Pages (Presiding Officer Horsley).

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator D'Amaro that was, right?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

And second by Legislator Stern. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

2022-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Willow Ponds on the Sound Homeowners Association, Inc. (SCTM No. 0600-018.00-01.00-012.005)(County Executive).

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So moved.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Krupski makes the motion.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator D'Amaro makes the second. All those in favor? Opposed?
So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

2023-13 - Sale of County owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Willow Ponds on the Sound Homeowners Association, Inc. (SCTM No. 0600-018.00-01.00-012.001)(County Executive). Same motion, same second all right?
All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

2027-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Susan Robinson (SCTM No. 0200-449.00-05.00-001.002)(County Executive).

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

I'm sorry, Legislator D'Amaro makes the motion. Second on the motion?

LEG. STERN:

(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Stern. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

2028-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Padgett Temple-Church of God in Christ (SCTM No. 0900-111.00-02.00-063.002)(County Executive).

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator D'Amaro. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes, Legislator Krupski makes the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Well. Hey, with five minutes to spare, why don't we recess for lunch. Everybody good?

LEG. CALARCO:

Do the warrants. Do the warrants.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Go, go, go.

LEG. CALARCO:

Warrants, go.

MR. NOLAN:

We can't do them. We've got to do them after lunch.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Counsel's advising me that we've got to do them after lunch. I'm not sure why, but -- you want to tell us why?

MR. NOLAN:

We passed a resolution this morning having to do with the assessment roll, we've got to get that signed by the County Executive and then we can do all the business this afternoon.

P.O. HORSLEY:

I knew there was good reason. Okay. Anything else we can do?

MR. LAUBE:

You can do the Procedural Motion, the Mortgage Tax.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes, we can.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Let's --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Do it.

MR. LIPP:

Point of information on the Mortgage Tax?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Sure. Who said that? I'm sorry. Oh, Mr. Lipp.

MR. LIPP:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Dr. Lipp.

MR. LIPP:

Okay. So, some good news. If you look at it compared to the same quarter the previous year, it was up 35.7%, and this is -- we've had increases since the second quarter of 2012, so.

LEG. CILMI:

Wow.

MR. LIPP:

It's always good to have a little good news which doesn't often come.

P.O. HORSLEY:

That's the Mortgage Recording Tax?

MR. LIPP:

Yeah.

LEG. SPENCER:

How much money is that?

MR. LIPP:

Okay. So -- well, the dollars are 16.1 million. And also as a point of information, every Quarter Cent now would add almost \$24 million.

LEG. SPENCER:

So we can spend that money?

*(*Laughter*)*

MR. LIPP:

These are not our dollars. But it reflects on the economy.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Okay, this is in one of the manilla folders.

MR. NOLAN:

The long one.

P.O. HORSLEY:

The long one, okay? Motion ***No. 17-2013, it's a Procedural Motion, Resolution apportioning Mortgage Tax by the County Treasurer (Presiding Officer Horsley)***. I'll take a motion; Legislator Nowick, you want to give that one?

LEG. NOWICK:

(Nodded head yes).

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Anything else I can do?

MR. NOLAN:

Nope.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. All right, we're recessed.

*(*The meeting was recessed at 12:25 P.M. *)*

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

Mr. Clerk, would you like to call the roll?

MR. LAUBE:

I would.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, 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:

(Not Present)

LEG. CILMI:

Here.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Here.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Here.

LEG. NOWICK:

Here.

LEG. GREGORY:

Here.

LEG. STERN:

Here.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Here.

LEG. SPENCER:

Here.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Here.

LEG. HAHN:

Hahn's here.

MR. LAUBE:

Thirteen, 14, 15.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay?

MR. LAUBE:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Muratore and Montano/Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Welcome back, everybody. I hope everyone's lunch was satisfactory.

The Clerk advises that the affidavits of publication are in proper order for the following public hearings; is that correct?

MR. LAUBE:

That is correct.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Excellent. I.R. -- we're starting with ***I.R. 1666 - Proposal to form Suffolk County Sewer District No. 4 - the Smithtown Galleria (County Executive)***.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'm going to make a motion to table one more time, Mr. Chair. There are some last minute items that are being worked out. I am prepared to close it on the 17th and vote the resolution on the 17th.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Thank you very much. But let me just ask, because I do not have any cards on 1666, would anyone like to be heard on 1666? Would anyone like to be heard on 1666? Seeing none, I have the motion from Legislator Kennedy to recess until --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

-- next time.

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

MR. LAUBE:

Fifteen -- 16. (Not Present: Legislator Muratore/Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. The next ***IR is 1690 - 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 1690. Would anyone like to be heard on 1690? Would anyone like to be heard on 1690? Seeing none, Mr. County Exec's, what do you guys want to do?

MR. VAUGHN:

Would you mind recessing this, please?

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. I'll make a motion to recess, seconded by Legislator Spencer. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, 1690 has been recessed.

MR. LAUBE:

Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. Okay. ***I.R. 2032 - A Charter Law to Implement Common Sense Home Rule Reforms (County Executive)***. And I do have several cards on this. The first card that is for an elected official, the Honorable Angie Carpenter. Madam Treasurer.

MS. CARPENTER:

Thank you. I actually wanted to speak on one of the other resolutions, so can I just weave it in, is that all right?

P.O. HORSLEY:

For you, absolutely.

MS. CARPENTER:

I'll remember you said that.

P.O. HORSLEY:

(Laughter).

MS. CARPENTER:

Actually, I had a press conference earlier today basically taking the County Executive to task for his general contempt for good government legislation, legislation that was written by this Legislative body to protect Suffolk County from being hijacked by partisan political hacks.

The County Executive's been pushing three resolutions; one, to allow for double-dipping, which, fortunately, because of growing public outcry, he's backed down and pulled off the agenda. Two is the residency requirements, wanting to throw that out the window. The residency requirements, again, adopted by this body for County employees to reside in Nassau or Suffolk County, and three, the dissolution of any elected official in County government at any point during their term, and I say any, because it could be any of you.

You know, it's hard to control 18 Legislators and this County Executive seems to want to control everything, including the Legislature. It's hard to control 18, but think about if he whittled it down to 15, 13, you know, an odd number. He could play that real well, save some money, cost savings for the taxpayers, and really be able to control the Legislature. But I'm counting on you not to let yourselves be controlled, and to remember that this body, this body is a co-equal branch of government with the Executive Branch, and you collectively have more power than the County Executive if you exert it, but exert it with good judicious care, and not for the sake of exerting power, but the power to protect the people.

I'm really shocked and dismayed by the resolutions that the County Executive, you know, just threw together and trying to push through at today's meeting. Again, it reflects a contempt for good government. The purpose of this is nothing more than an attempt to snuff out the voices of dissent and reward his cronies. Now, with the residency requirements out of the way, he can import people from the City, from California maybe, and put them in positions in this County.

As the County Treasurer, I have a fiduciary responsibility to speak out when I see situations that raise red flags, and the present potential to have a damaging effect on the County's finances, the double-dipping by a County official, even known by law that this existed, they went ahead, and I know it's been pulled off the agenda, but the Legislator-elect is saying that it's legal and is going to look for an opinion from the Ethics Board, but I don't think the Ethics Board has standing to rule on whether or not a law passed by this body is legal. And I am going to be seeking an opinion from the County Attorney, because I don't want to be in conflict with the law. If there's a law on the books that says that two officials should not be receiving a public paycheck, I'm not going to put my signature on a paycheck that conflicts with the law, so I will be seeking that.

The County Executive seems intent on silencing opposition to his fiscal irresponsibility by trying to pass 2032, allowing those in power to do away with any elected official mid-term. These cynical attempts to dilute checks and balances of good government are made all the more disturbing by the findings recently released by the Office of the State Comptroller. And I think there was an article in today's Newsday that clearly shows a pattern, moving money without approval from the Town Board. Does he try to move money without approval of this County Legislature? God, I hope not, but trust me, I'm there watching to make sure it doesn't happen. You need that checks and balances, you need those eyes, you need -- especially with the strain on taxpayers today and the fragility of people's ability to sustain their families.

Clearly, the County Executive doesn't understand what good government and the will of the people means. The fiscal shenanigans that he took place in Babylon I think is what he wants to do here in Suffolk County. I think he thinks that the County coffers would be his personal ATM machine. The pattern's all too clear. Continued failure to follow process, it was in the paper today, it was quoted by someone, and consistently abandoning the rule of law.

I strongly urge this Legislature to vote against these ill-conceived resolutions and work together to really bring common-sense reforms back to Suffolk County. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Ms. Madam Treasurer. All righty. Also, on 2032, I have Kristin McKay.

MS. MC KAY:

Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Kristin McKay. I'm the Director of Public Relations for the Suffolk County Sheriff's Office. The Sheriff could not be here today. He intended to be here; his plane was delayed. I have a statement here that he intended to read on his behalf, and on behalf of the District Attorney, Tom Spota, and Judy Pascale, the County Clerk. So I'm just going to read the statement into the record for you and I'll give you the statement.

We testify today in strong opposition to Introductory Resolution 2032, a proposed Local Law which would amend the County Charter. While the proposed resolution purports to bring the County Charter into conformity with the New York State Constitution and to give the County more flexibility to administer this County's government, the underlying purpose of the amendment is to establish a mechanism for the removal or abolishment of any elected County officer or agency during his or her elective term of office.

While this proposed resolution does not affect the County State Constitutional Offices of the District Attorney, the County Clerk or the Office of the Sheriff, which the New York State Court of Appeals reaffirmed in a recent decision on term limits, it does affect our local elected representatives.

It is reasonable to confer upon the County the ability to establish its own form of government, and make changes that reflect the will of the people, but we do not believe it is within our rights to abolish an elective office mid-term, and after the voters have already spoken by electing that official to a specific term and for a specific purpose. What sense does it make for the voters to vote their conscience in an election, only to have that official's elective office abolished by the County Executive and this Legislative body through a relatively simple process?

It is also possible under this proposed Local Law that a County Executive or a Legislator could be removed from office if one or the other political party had sufficient power and would deem it to be in their best interest to do so. This could be done by abolishing that office, or by curtailing or transferring, and I quote, to another County office or agency any power of an elected County officer. We all know that politics has a way of encroaching into government, and it is, therefore, imperative that when it comes to these very significant matters, that we have the appropriate checks and balances in place to constrain elected officials from taking actions that do not reflect the will of the people.

In closing, we would like to register our strong objection to I.R. 2032 as it currently stands. Any proposed changes to the County Charter to increase the full monopoly of County Home Rule powers should be balanced with similar language which protects the rights of citizens and voters to determine their public representatives and vote for their terms of office. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Ms. McKay. Ms. McKay, just we have one -- we have someone who'd like to ask you -- one of our Legislators would like to ask you a question. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Kristin, thank you for being here. Please give our regards to the Sheriff.

MS. MC KAY:

Thank you.

LEG. CILMI:

I hope he gets home safe. I think I heard you say that it's your belief, or the Sheriff's belief, rather, that I.R. 2032 does not in any way impact the Sheriff's Office, the District Attorney or the Clerk; is that correct? Was that part of the Sheriff's testimony that you read?

MS. MC KAY:

Yes, that is part of his testimony.

LEG. CILMI:

Is that what -- I guess he -- the Sheriff believes that to be true. I wonder if I could ask our Counsel if that is, in fact, true. Does the resolution before us at all relate to the Sheriff's Office, or the DA's Office, or the Clerk's Office?

MR. NOLAN:

The bill in question is not office specific, but I think what the witness is stating is that we had a court decision from the summer where it stated that we could not impose term limits on the District Attorney. And that being the case, it naturally would follow we probably could not abolish the office. Not probably, we cannot abolish the office of District Attorney or the other

Constitutionally-established offices.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So it's your opinion that the abolishment of term limits or the application of term limits is congruent to the abolishment of the office, in the eyes of the law at least?

MR. NOLAN:

If we can't impose term limits on the District Attorney, we certainly can't abolish the office.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Done? Thank you very much, Legislator Cilmi. All right. The next speaker on 2032 is Joan Tram? Travan? I'm sorry. Sorry about that.

MS. TRAVAN:

Joan Travan, First Vice President of AME. We are opposed to I.R. 2032. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much. We're good? All righty. That is all the cards that I have on 2032. Would anyone like to be heard? Would anyone like to be heard? Would anyone like to be heard? Mr. Vaughn, what would you like to do with this?

MR. VAUGHN:

We'd ask that the Legislature please close the Public Hearing.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'll make a motion to recess.

LEG. CILMI:

I'll second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

There's a motion to recess by Legislator Kennedy, second by Legislator Cilmi. I'll make a motion to close. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator Calarco. We have a motion to close and a motion to recess.

LEG. KENNEDY:

On the motion to recess, I believe that a matter of this magnitude and gravity, quite frankly, at the very least warrants the ability to hear additional testimony in the West End. It perhaps may be just the function of the calendar, but the fact that folks, you know, would have to travel 50 or 60 miles out here, even though Riverhead is the County Seat, we should be able to accommodate the input of the public and allow for the opportunity to have this Public Hearing continue over to our western venue.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator Kennedy. Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah, I have a question for Counsel. If we recess the Public Hearing to allow people from the western part of Suffolk to attend our next meeting, which would be our last meeting, how would we, or could we then have a vote on the bill at our last meeting?

MR. NOLAN:

Most likely --

LEG. MONTANO:

And how many votes would be required.

MR. NOLAN:

Most likely, no, you wouldn't be able to, because under our rules and our procedures, we cannot vote a bill -- discharge a bill out of committee until the Public Hearing is closed on that particular bill. So, if we leave this open, if we recess the Public Hearing, the bill cannot be discharged from committee on the next cycle. The only way it could be voted on is if it came on via a Certificate of Necessity, which then would require 12. Otherwise, it would just be a simple 10-vote resolution.

LEG. MONTANO:

What about the aging issue, does that fall into play? I remember that in some instances we closed a Public Hearing, had a committee vote, and then let the bill age for an hour. Does that still apply? Is that a procedural mechanism that can be employed?

MR. NOLAN:

If we close the Public Hearing at the next General Meeting -- we have not done that. We have not had a committee meeting at a General Meeting to discharge a bill that had a Public Hearing on the same date. So I think, practically speaking, the only way you could do it is if you had a Certificate of Necessity. I think that's probably the only practical way to get it before the full body next time.

LEG. MONTANO:

So we're not -- I just want to be clear on this, because I have a recollection that in some cases we've had a Public Hearing the same day and allowed the bill to age for an hour, and then we could vote on it --

MR. NOLAN:

That is what --

LEG. MONTANO:

-- with the requirement of 10 votes.

MR. NOLAN:

Right. That's a different scenario where the County Executive states that it's an emergency to pass a bill the same day. It hasn't -- that happens when the bill has not even been filed yet, and he'll just bring it to us, and then we have the Public Hearing the same day, we post it the same day. We've done it that way, but I'm talking about the scenario where this bill has already been filed. And I'm just saying that if you leave this Public Hearing open, the only way we're going to be able to vote on it on December 17th is through a Certificate of Necessity. That's the only way we're going to be able to do that. And a CN, of course, requires 12 votes.

LEG. HAHN:

Shouldn't we discharge it on the floor, you know, with 12 votes?

LEG. CILMI:

Could you do a discharge petition?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Hang on a sec. Legislator Hahn, did you have a quick question?

LEG. HAHN:

Yes. Procedurally, couldn't we just discharge it on the floor after the public hearing's closed?

LEG. MONTANO:

No.

LEG. HAHN:

No?

MR. NOLAN:

No.

P.O. HORSLEY:

No, I don't think so either.

LEG. MONTANO:

No, but --

LEG. HAHN:

Like with 12 votes? No?

LEG. MONTANO:

If I may.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right, yes. Let's close this argument, then, because I have other speakers.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah. I just want to follow this through, because there may have been some issues preceding your tenure as Counsel. If -- is it possible to have a special meeting -- where is this before, Ways and Means?

MR. NOLAN:

Ways and Means.

LEG. MONTANO:

All right. Is it possible to have a special meeting of Ways and Means after the Public Hearing is closed and people have had an opportunity at the next meeting and then be voted on? Is that a --

MR. NOLAN:

I think that's --

LEG. MONTANO:

Because I recall that we've done that in the past, but not often.

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah. I don't remember doing that. I guess it is possible. A special meeting of the committee has to be on two days notice, so you'd have to do it after you hold the Public Hearing. You'd have to have a committee meeting at some point. You'd break, take a break in the General Meeting to have the committee meeting.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay.

MR. NOLAN:

I guess -- I guess that's technically possible.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay?

LEG. MONTANO:

So it is technically possible and it can be done. All right.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Then we got an answer. Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I just want to start off by pointing out that we all know that, procedurally, closing a Public Hearing is not indicative of how you may vote on a particular bill. So I would say let's close the Public Hearing today, and the public can come down to the next General Meeting and be heard during the Public Portion at the same -- it's the same -- I think even the same length of time, if I'm not mistaken.

P.O. HORSLEY:

That is true.

LEG. D'AMARO:

The only difference being that the public would be heard in the morning, as opposed to the afternoon. So, certainly, the folks in Hauppauge and in the western section of the County would have an opportunity and would not be shut off from having an opportunity to speak their thoughts with respect to the bill.

However, I do want to point out that I do have some reservations about this legislation, but I am going to vote to close the hearing, because I've consistently said over the years that we should not use this particular vote as a mechanism to try and defeat or delay legislation, and I think that's what's happening here. So I think we should close it and we'll just let it be heard at the next regular meeting scheduled of the Legislature during the Public Portion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And, also, in the Ways and Means Committee as well. We'll be hearing this bill in between the cycle.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Anyone else? Yeah, Legislator Montano wants to respond to Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah, just very briefly. And I don't disagree with what Legislator D'Amaro said, but the difference with testifying at the Public Hearing and testifying in public session is that in the public session, we would not have an opportunity to question any of the speakers, if we so chose. So there is a distinction there, and if it were not for the last meeting of the year, we wouldn't be confronted with this issue.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, if you want me to respond, you know, there will be an opportunity to question at the committee level, which is not, of course, a meeting of the full Legislature, but nonetheless, it is an opportunity. And also, although it may be inconveniencing those who want to speak, if you want to have questions, it's very common for us to call individuals up while we're debating the bill. So that may be another means you want to employ, because we're back against the wall with the end of the year and the last meeting, so it's something to consider.

But I think the important point to make here is that the public will be given an opportunity to speak their mind and to be heard on this particular bill before the full Legislature if we close this Public Hearing today, and I'd rather not get into using the procedural mechanism of recessing just to delay the bill. Usually, we recess it if a sponsor requests a recess, "I'm changing the bill," "I'm working out" -- "I'm talking to a Department Head," whatever it may be, but that's not the case here today. The case today is that we want other folks to be given an opportunity to be heard, and, in fact, they'll have two opportunities to be heard.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Legislator Kennedy?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yeah. I just want to, as the sponsor of the motion to recess. This is not an effort to basically run the calendar, if you will, in order to go ahead and have this resolution expire technically or procedurally. Quite frankly, the County Executive has any opportunity to introduce it whenever he chooses to introduce it. It was his choice to introduce it in the cycle that we have now. So I don't know that I necessarily feel compelled or obligated to go ahead and have to run with what is a situation created actually by his action in the first instance.

If he feels that it was meritorious to bring forward an effort to basically alter or amend the term of any elected official, including mine or any of us that sit around this horseshoe, quite frankly, I would have thought he would bring it forward when there was ample time to debate, vet, and give folks on either end an opportunity to come forward and speak with the give and take, and, who knows, maybe even have yet another hearing.

You know, one of the things that I get, as a matter of fact, a couple of my colleagues had been here with me, is constant complaint that for important matters, citizens would like to see us take comment in the evening. Legislator Gregory, as a matter of fact, joined me for a public meeting.

This is a motion on my part to basically say this is an extremely significant piece of legislation that the Executive elected to put forward in the time frame he decided, but that doesn't necessarily mean we need to be compelled to meet that schedule he elected to set out in the first instance. I think it warrants being kept open.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Wayne.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Do you want, in response --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Just to respond.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Just quickly, and then Legislator Barraga.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I don't feel compelled in any way. The County Executive, by submitting this bill, is following the same procedure that's always been followed, not asking for any special consideration.

Every bill is significant and extremely significant to somebody somewhere, there's no question about that, and I don't think that's a basis to adjourn a Public Hearing or recess a Public Hearing. We're required to have a Public Hearing, we've had that Public Hearing. The public's going to have another opportunity in committee to be heard and to be questioned. They'll be yet another opportunity at the full Legislature meeting to be heard during the Public Portion in the morning, and then later in the afternoon, if anyone's interested and wants to stay and be heard again and called up by a Legislator, that's common practice here as well.

So I don't see the justification for not closing the hearing today. Again, it is not an indication of what we're doing on the merits. And I, myself, have reservations about this particular legislation, but, you know, I don't want to say -- I don't want to leave here thinking that we somehow didn't give the public an opportunity to be heard when we, in fact, did, and we gave the same opportunity that we give on every other piece of legislation that's important to people somewhere all the time.

So, again, I feel comfortable with the fact that everyone has had an opportunity to be heard today. Everyone's going to have an opportunity to be heard at least two more times, plus there'll be a debate on the legislation. And I would say we should not go down the road of recessing Public Hearings if there's not some kind of revision to be made or some other reason, other than the fact that we wanted to give more of an opportunity, because we will be giving that opportunity to be heard.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. You could go back and forth, I think, forever.

LEG. KENNEDY:

The only thing I can say in response is, is I -- all of the things that you've identified, Legislator D'Amaro, are true, but the Public Hearing is what the Public Hearing is. And I have no reason to believe that the County Executive has any desire to go ahead and modify, amend or do anything with this bill, quite frankly. But I will say that, as Legislator Montano pointed out, a Public Hearing is different than a Legislative committee meeting, or, for that matter, voting the bill in the General Meeting, and that is just a function of, once again, who we are and how we do conduct business. So I'm not trying to employ some sense of urgency here regarding the closure today, but I am identifying the fact that this was a choice on the part of the Administration when to introduce this. Presumably, the Administration did so cognizant of the fact that the hearing would be here in Riverhead. You know, again, every meeting we talk about, you know, we're talking about, based -- you know, 10% of the population of Suffolk County here approximate to the East End. You know, we have fabulous recreation, this, that and the other thing, but the lion's share of our constituents are on the West End. I think it's reasonable to go ahead and accommodate them.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, all I can say is, under that theory, we should recess every Public Hearing we have in Riverhead. I mean, this is the procedure, this is what it is.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Hold on, hold on.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Barraga --

LEG. KENNEDY:

This one affects every elected official in Suffolk County. Not every other bill affects every elected official, and for that matter, quite frankly, the fabric of our government.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Legislator, I think the point and counterpoint has been made on this point. Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I think my history is such that when I take a look at a piece of legislation, I take a look at it on the basis of its merits. You know, I don't really take a look at it from a political perspective or an individual perspective in terms of who it's going to affect one way or the other. I really don't care if you recess or you close this bill. I have no intention of supporting it, not now, not later. I mean, I've read enough.

*(*Applause*)*

LEG. BARRAGA:

Don't applaud. I'm not here for the applause. I've read enough about this bill that I'm convinced the only reason it is here, Tom, is that actions will be taken later in other legislation to remove a Countywide elected official that this Administration was not successful in removing previously because of a court decision. That's not the reason to bring this kind of resolution before us.

What I'm asking you to do is go back to the County Executive and, as he did recently with another piece of legislation, withdraw this resolution. This is not the way to go on this issue.

The County Treasurer has now been elected for four years. She should serve her four years. We shouldn't be playing with that. There's no reason to do this resolution. If, in the future, you want to assimilate or consolidate the Treasurer's Office with the Comptroller's Office, put a bill in and make it effective January 1, 2018, four years. The Treasurer gets to serve her term, her staff gets to serve at her pleasure, and everybody knows at the end of four years, the Treasurer's Office now becomes part of the Comptroller's Office. It's a compromise. Nobody walks away completely happy, but the Treasurer gets to serve her term, her staff gets to serve her function, while the County Executive, at the same time, he gets what he wants, but he doesn't get it in the short-term. The assimilation of that office never necessitated millions of dollars in savings. So you wait a little longer to make the 700,000 to a million, you wait after four years.

Bottom line, this resolution shouldn't pass. It's not in the County Executive's best interest, it's not in the Treasurer's best interest, it's not in any elected official's best interest in this County. Withdraw it and put in, if you want to make some sort of a consolidation, that your bill, the basic tenant, take effect January 1 2018, because right now you are losing this argument. The County Treasurer is kicking your butt, plain and simple.

*(*Laughter*)*

It's time to compromise and everybody walks away with a partial victory. Don't pursue this thing, it will not work in your favor. This County Executive was elected to control the budget and control taxes, that's his main thesis here. These are sidebar issues that work in the favor of no one.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator Barraga. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Well, I just want to second my colleague, Legislator Barraga's remarks. But, in addition to that, if we are intent on dealing -- if the County Executive is intent on pushing forward with this ill-conceived bill, then one reason to recess the Public Hearing today is the question I asked earlier, as one of our speakers from the Sheriff's Office indicated, that this bill does not affect in any way the Sheriff, or the Clerk, or the District Attorney. That's not made clear in this resolution. So I think, at the very least, they need to go back to the drawing board and make that clear in the language of the bill, that those offices in particular are not impacted by this bill.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator Cilmi. Okay. Would anyone else -- everyone else good? In the spirit of --

LEG. NOWICK:

I was next.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:

I just want to make something clear, because I heard Legislator Hahn ask a question and Legislator Montano. If this is tabled, we go back to Hauppauge in two weeks, we have a --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Recessed.

LEG. NOWICK:

Excuse me, recessed. We have a Public Hearing. There is no -- we cannot -- we are not going to be voting on it. Then the next vote would take place in December -- excuse me, January?

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah. Anything dies at the end of this term, anything that's pending, is not enacted.

LEG. NOWICK:

So it will die.

MR. NOLAN:

It will die.

LEG. NOWICK:

And there will be no vote in January?

P.O. HORSLEY:

That's correct.

MR. NOLAN:

You'd have to start --

LEG. NOWICK:

I don't want to miss the vote that says, "No, I'm not in favor of it." So, if you tell me it's going to die, okay.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. All right. Well, I'm glad we straightened that out. Let's -- in the spirit of assuring that the public has full opportunity to speak, I have a Legislative official that would like -- came, unfortunately, a couple of minutes late. And I realize it's a little unusual, but I'd like to invite her up for the three minutes for the open portion on this. Councilwoman Trish Bergin. We didn't close it yet.

COUNCILWOMAN BERGIN:

Thank you very much. I really do appreciate the opportunity to speak. I came from the West End, so I was a little bit late, so thank you very much.

This legislation is so dangerous in that if any one of you does not march in lockstep with the County Executive's wishes, any one of you could be gone, and that doesn't necessarily mean just this sitting body. This will continue for generations to come. It is so dangerous.

The other point that I wanted to make is that more than 190,000 Suffolk County residents voted for this woman. They want her here in office. More than 190,000 of your constituents who vote for you, remember, want Angie Carpenter in office, and I think that's very important to note. So thank you very much.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Ms. Bergin, and thank you for coming down for this trip.

COUNCILWOMAN BERGIN:

Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. That's the last card I have, and I think everyone has pretty well spoken on this. Would anyone else like to be heard? Would anyone else like to be heard? Very good.

We have a motion to close and we have a motion to recess. Recess vote takes precedent. Let's have a roll call, recess.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes to recess.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

No.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No.

LEG. STERN:

No.

LEG. GREGORY:

No to recess.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

No.

LEG. ANKER:

No.

LEG. HAHN:

No.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No.

P.O. HORSLEY:

No.

MR. LAUBE:

Seven.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Recess fails. The motion to close, roll call vote.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

No.

LEG. MONTANO:

No.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes -- I'm sorry. What did I -- no, no. Sorry about that.

LEG. BROWNING:

No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

These things -- someone said it's going to die at the end of the year. I've come to realize in a year that nothing ever dies around here. So I'm voting yes, to close the hearing, so we can address this head on and move on from it, because either it's going to pass on its merits, or it's going to fail because it fails the County's taxpayers and County residents.

Yes to close. Let's deal with it.

MR. LAUBE:

Ten. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

The motion passes, it's closed.

All righty. Moving on. ***I.R. 2060 - A Local Law amending Local Law 38-2013 to clarify the fee structure for the Traffic and Parking Violations Bureau (Calarco)***. I do not have any cards on this. Would anyone like to be heard? Would anyone like to be heard? Would anyone like to be heard? Legislator Calarco, what would you like to do?

LEG. CALARCO:

Motion to close.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Makes a motion to close.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Seconded by Legislator Cilmi. On the motion? Everybody all right? All those in favor of closing? Opposed? So moved, it has been closed.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. ***I.R. 2063 - A Charter Law to expand the Suffolk County employment residency requirements (County Executive)***. I have one card from Sean Collins. Sean?

MR. COLLINS:

I had planned on speaking on a resolution that was subsequently rescinded, but I hope you'll give the same credit to me that you gave to our friend, Ms. Angie Carpenter, and continue to speak on this.

I'd also like to just thank Tom Cilmi real fast. We had a great, you know, email exchange recently. And I appreciate you taking the time out to thoroughly explain your position on the matter. And while we don't see completely eye to eye, I respect where you're coming from.

Recently, some members of this body have spent an awful lot of time chasing the press to weigh in on the now rescinded proposal which would have expanded exemptions for Legislators to continue employment with certain public entities. Of course, we should all encourage and facilitate an honest dialogue on such important matters, but it's disrespectful to the publican -- to the public, your constituents, to use this merely as an opportunity to score political points against your newest colleague before she's even taken office.

The voters of the Ninth Legislative District overwhelmingly supported Legislator-elect Martinez in November's election, and I hope going forward members of this body will respect the decision of these voters and cease efforts to undermine her position and credibility. The people who sent you here to -- the people who sent you here to represent them did so because they expect you to address the important issues facing their communities, not to waste time with political squabbles.

Thank you for your time and your service to our County.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much. Okay. I do not have any other cards. Would anyone else like to be heard on 2063? Would anyone else like to be heard on 2063? Mr. Vaughn, what would you like to do with this?

MR. VAUGHN:

We'd respectfully ask the Legislature to please close this Public Hearing.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. I'll make a motion to close. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator Calarco. We have a motion to close. Any others? Are we good? On the motion, everybody all right?

LEG. BROWNING:

To close?

P.O. HORSLEY:

To close, yes. Okay. All those in favor of closure? Opposed?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Opposed.

P.O. HORSLEY:

So moved. All right. Well, say so.

MR. LAUBE:

I just need a hand -- I need a hand count.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Hands up, please, on closure.

LEG. NOWICK:

(Raised hand).

LEG. KENNEDY:

(Raised hand).

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

LEG. MONTANO:

(Raised hand).

LEG. BROWNING:

(Raised hand).

MR. LAUBE:

Twelve. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. The motion is closed. All right. I'll make a motion to set the date for the following Public Hearing, December 17th 2013, 2:30 P.M., at the Rose Caracappa Auditorium, Hauppauge, New York:

I.R. 2068 - A Local Law to strengthen policy against dual public salaries (Cilmi).

Legislator Cilmi, you want to --

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

-- second the motion? All in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been -- the date has been set. Hang on one second.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

This is -- I'm doing another one of my prerogatives as the Chair. Today I would like Mr. Neal Lewis to come up, who, unfortunately -- he came from the East -- from the West End to speak to us about carbon monoxide and I told him he can have a minute or two.

MR. LEWIS:

Thank you for that. Neal Lewis with the Sustainability Institute at Molloy College. I do have a handout that I'll pass around. So, based on your action today, we're going to have an awareness campaign in the month of January to make people aware of certain hazards around their house presented by carbon monoxide.

The simple takeaway, since I'm sort of jumping in here at the end of your meeting, my simple takeaway is there's several tips in the materials we're giving out, and one of them is to encourage people to get a free home energy audit. So we're going to ask all the Legislators, if they could, to consider posting some of this information on your websites, and doing things that you do with your social networking and such. So, please, reach out to me, I'd love to tell you more about this. But I'm thrilled that the County has taken this action, actually, one of the first communities in the United States to do this. And it's an important issue, and maybe we'll save a few lives and we'll help a lot of people to make their homes more energy efficient, so thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Lewis, and it was worth the trip. Thank you.

All right. We have -- in the small manila folder, we have some warrants that we got to deal with. Okay. The first one is 2084. It's not a warrant.

MR. NOLAN:

But it's budget related.

P.O. HORSLEY:

But it's budget related, right. Okay. Small Manila folder, 2084. Everyone got it? Good? Everybody's good? All right. We're on the ball here.

Okay. **Resolution 2084 - Authorizing a chargeback for Out-of-County Tuition (P.O. Horsley)**. Is there a motion on the -- is there a motion? Nobody wants this one. All right. We all know we don't like it. I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. GREGORY:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Gregory. All those in favor? Opposed.

LEG. CILMI:
Opposed.

P.O. HORSLEY:
So moved.

LEG. CILMI:
Opposed.

MR. LAUBE:
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano/Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. It is in the budget, yes. **Introductory Resolution 2085 - Levying unpaid water rents (P.O. Horsley)**. I'll take a motion.

LEG. HAHN:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
I'll make a motion to approve. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. HAHN:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Hahn makes the second. All those in favor? Opposed?
So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano/Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you. **Resolution 2086 - implementing budget, staff, and taxes for the Fiscal 2014 (Discretionary) (P.O. Horsley)**. Okay. We got it?

LEG. NOWICK:
Got it. I got it.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. 2086, are we good?

MR. LAUBE:

No wait. All right.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Are there any motions? I'll make a -- this is the motion.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator D'Amaro; I'll second the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. 2087. What was the last one's number? Oh, 2086. ***2087 - Resolution implementing budget, staff, and taxes for the Fiscal 2014, Mandated (P.O. Horsley).***

LEG. HAHN:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Gregory makes the motion, I'll make the second. All those in favor? Opposed?

LEG. MURATORE:

Opposed.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Muratore is opposed.

MR. LAUBE:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano/Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:

So moved, it has been approved. ***2088 - Authorizing that the Tax Warrants be signed by the Presiding Officer and Clerk of the County Legislature, and that they be annexed to the tax rolls for the collection of taxes (P.O. Horsley).***

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator Spencer.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator D'Amaro. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been approved.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. We apparently have a late-starter --

MR. NOLAN:

A bunch of late-starters.

P.O. HORSLEY:

-- or two. Okay. I'll make a motion to waive the rules and lay on the table the following I.R.'s that are late-starters; second by Legislator Hahn. All right.

2089, Gov Ops; 2090 EPA; 2091, Public Safety; 2092, Gov Ops; 2093, EPA; 2094, Parks; 2095, Parks; 2096, Parks; 2097, Parks; 2098, Public Works; 2099, Public Works; 2100, Education and I.T.; 2101, Gov Ops; 2102, Gov Ops; 2103, Economic Development; 2104, Public Safety; 2105, Health; 2106, Gov Ops.

And we have a motion and a second on the laying on the table. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

Anything else? We are adjourned.

(THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 3:25 P.M.)