

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

SPECIAL MEETING

THIRTEENTH DAY

November 6, 2013

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

Verbatim Transcript Prepared By

**Lucia Braaten and Alison Mahoney, Court Reporters
Kim Castiglione, Legislative Secretary**

Special Meeting 11/6/13

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

(*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:06 P.M.*)

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Good afternoon, everybody, and welcome to the meeting of November 6th, our budget meeting. And, Mr. Clerk, would you please call the roll?

MR. LAUBE:

Good afternoon.

(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:

Here.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Here.

LEG. KENNEDY:

(Not Present)

LEG. NOWICK:

Here.

LEG. GREGORY:

Here.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. STERN:

Here.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Here.

LEG. SPENCER:

Here.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Here.

MR. LAUBE:

Thirteen.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thirteen. Who's missing? Where is everybody. Jay is here?

MR. NOLAN:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay.

MR. LAUBE:

Jay is here; 14. *(Not Present: Legislators Schneiderman, Muratore, Montano and Kennedy/Vacant Seat - District #8)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

We were worried about you, Jay. All righty. We will, of course -- may we all rise for the Pledge of Allegiance, led by Legislator Al Krupski, the newly-elected -- re-elected.

(*Salutation*)

P.O. HORSLEY:

The invocation will be given by my guest, Reverend Joanne Bond, Pastor of the Cross of Christ Lutheran Church in Babylon.

The Reverend Dr. Joanne Bond received her B.S. in Business Management and Communications from Adelphi University in Garden City. She earned a Master of Divinity from New York Theological Seminary in New York City, and a Doctor of Ministry from the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia. Pastor Bond currently serves at Cross of Christ Lutheran Church in Babylon, and resides in Babylon as well.

And may I just add that the Reverend leads a group called the Clergy Cluster in Babylon Village, who feed those people, and is one of those food pantries that we support as a Legislature, which I am so proud of, and that we do across the County. And she is one of the leaders of those food pantries in my neck of the woods. And I couldn't be more proud to invite the Pastor up here to lead us in congregation. Thank you.

REVEREND BOND:

Here we are, one day after Election Day, three weeks before the national holiday of Thanksgiving, a few days before Veterans Day, days which bring many different sentiments.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

Last Sunday many congregations celebrated All Saints Sunday, a day to remember all of the saints, especially those who have gone on before us in this past year. Saints are often thought to be those canonized whom churches are often named after, but saints are also the living among us, very special people. Webster defines a saint as one who is extraordinarily charitable, patient, self-denying. Saints are sometimes defined as people of God, holy people, those who mirror a life of grace and faith; people set apart from the nations; individuals who stand out for their work for others. I dare say we have many saints gathered here this day whose life work is to serve others in charitable offering for others.

I looked up the patron saint of attorneys, civil servants, court clerks, lawyers, politicians and public servants. His name is Thomas More. Described as a man for all seasons, More was a literary scholar, eminent lawyer, gentleman, father of four children and Chancellor of England. An intensely spiritual man, he would not support the King's divorce from Catherine of Aragon in order to marry Anne Boleyn, nor would he acknowledge Henry as Supreme Head of the Church in England, breaking with Rome and denying the Pope as Head; beheaded on Tower Hill, London, July 6th in the year 1535. He steadfastly refused to approve Henry VIII's divorce and remarriage and establishment of the Church of England.

Four hundred years later, in 1935, Thomas More was canonized a Saint of God. It is believed few saints are more relevant in our time. In fact, in the Year 2000, Pope John Paul II named him Patron Saint of Political Leaders. The supreme diplomat and counselor, he did not compromise his own moral values in order to please the king, knowing that true allegiance to authority is not blind acceptance of everything that authority wants. Saint Thomas More's Saint Day in the Roman Catholic Church is June 22nd.

I'd like to share an excerpt from a prayer written by Saint Thomas More one week before his death. He wrote, "Give me, good Lord, a humble, lowly, quiet, peaceable, patient, charitable, kind, tender mind in all my works, and all my words, and all my thoughts, to have a taste of your holy blessed spirit."

Let us pray. We thank you, dear Lord, for all the saints who have gone on before us, those we love, those we miss. Especially this day, we remember with reverence and affection former Presiding Officer and Legislator, William Lindsay. We thank you, dear Lord, for all attorneys, civil servants, court clerks, politicians and public servants, and for our Legislators of the Suffolk County Legislature. Bless those who will be departing from their roles in this time of transition. We thank you, Lord, for all these living saints among us. Bless them, Lord, and help them to know how much they are appreciated for the fine work they do, faithfully serving the people of their communities. And we also ask a special blessing for our veterans who have served our nation. Bless this Legislature. In your holy name we pray. Amen.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Pastor Bond. And I certainly hope that in emulating the right Thomas More, that we never have to lose our heads.

*(*Laughter*)*

But we certainly -- we certainly thank you for coming down here today, and we appreciate it. And have a good time at the Lutheran retreat.

REVEREND BOND:

Thank you.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

P.O. HORSLEY:

Right. All righty. May we also now stand, and remain standing, to let us remember all those men and women who put themselves in harm's way every day to protect our country, and have a moment of silence.

*(*Moment of Silence*)*

All righty. I just wanted to just make a quick note that I will be leaving in January, but I wanted to take a moment to take this opportunity to congratulate the newly elected and reelected Legislators at the horseshoe today, and I wish you the best for 2014.

All right. We are going to now move to hopefully adopt a budget. And the Public Portion is set for one hour, and I have a number of cards. At the conclusion of these cards, I'll ask if there will be anybody else that would like to speak, and then we can close out that Public Portion, but it is technically set for one hour. Of course, speakers are limited to three minutes. And we will move to the -- the first person that I have that would like to speak to the Legislature today is John Rooney, involving the North Fork Environmental Council Drinking Water Protection Fund.

MR. ROONEY:

Hello. My name is John Rooney from Southold. I'm on the Board of the North Fork Environmental Council. And I'm here to very strongly oppose any movement of funds that are intended for water protection to plug any holes. I've heard the term, "The ship is sinking," I've heard the term, "We've got to plug a hole." This is the kind of shortsighted thinking that is leading this country down the primrose path. It's what's going on in Washington and elsewhere. We cannot, simply because we've had some hard economic times, which slowly seem to be getting better, but we cannot use that as an excuse to affect the long-term health of our population. I'm 71. God knows how long I'll be around, but I have a son, and a daughter-in-law and three grandchildren who also live in Suffolk County and these water protection funds are for them.

This is Suffolk County. This is -- we have a heritage of stopping phosphates, remember back in the '70s, of preserving farmland or preserving the Pine Barrens. This is Suffolk County, progressive on the environment and on health. Remember that. Do not do this. It would be absolutely wrong and shortsighted. I expect better from our County. Thank you very much.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Rooney. All righty. The next speaker is Howard Meinke, who wants to talk about the -- talk, from the Clean Water Coalition, and on deck is Bob DeLuca.

MR. MEINKE:

Hello. Yeah, my name is Howard Meinke, and thank you for letting me get up and speak. This is a very important issue, in my book, because when I look around me, I can clearly go back and talk about how the Peconic Bay and the creeks were, and none of you people are in the position to argue with me.

Now, I first came to Broadwaters Creek at Nassau Point in 1936, and I remember then wading in the creeks, the blowfish would nibble on your feet, toadfish would squirt around and hide at the base of the dock pilings. The scallops in afternoon, when the water was quiet and the sun was setting, the little bug scallops would jump along and break the surface. We had oysters and scallops, and there were eels crawling around our feet, and it was fantastic.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

Now, at that same time forward, there were oyster boats docked in New Suffolk, two or three oyster boats that planted poles all over Peconic Bay and shuffled the oysters around as they grew. They're not there anymore either.

Now, there was also -- I ran the New Suffolk shipyard for quite a spell, and in the shipyard we had a lot of boats that took party fishermen out. They caught shrimp and they anchored along off Jessup's Neck and they would catch the run of weakfish. They don't do that anymore.

In Greenport there was a raft of boats that went out and caught menhaden. It was a big enough deal they had an aircraft that flew overhead and told them where the schools were working in Gardiner's Bay. There are no more bunker boats, there are no more menhaden. The processing plant and promised land is gone. So all those things I've been talking about that I remember are not here anymore, and that's a pretty steep downslope in the creeks and the bays. Now, we've got to do something about that.

This is no time to steal funds from water preservation, because Dr. Chris Gobler says that -- or Professor Gobler from Stony Brook University says that the pollution is on the increase. We last year and this year again have the rust tide. We just last year closed Mattituck Creek from paralytic shellfish poisoning. The things are going downhill, and what could well be the next event would be the red tide, which would then cause dead fish to come up on the beach because the terrible stink, and it would make the waters unsafe for swimming. So, if we have an intelligent outlook and we want to look a little bit past the urgency of tomorrow, we will keep the funds in clean water protection and do what we have to do to support reducing the pollution. And that's the right thing to do, and I hope that we will look at it correctly and do that, because a buck in your pocket today at the expense of tomorrow is no way to run the Legislature. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Meinke.

*(*Applause*)*

Bob DeLuca, and on deck is William Toedter.

MR. DE LUCA:

Good afternoon, Legislator Horsley and Members of the Legislature. And on behalf of Group for the East End, I want to congratulate all of you for the races hard fought and won, and for your continued efforts to serve the people of Suffolk County. And I appreciate the opportunity to speak today.

Unfortunately, I'm speaking in staunch opposition to the proposal to what we see is a raid on the Drinking Water Protection Fund, the 32.8 million dollar transfer of that fund to debt service and other obligations, as opposed to the intended use of that fund, which we think is clearly articulated in the law to be for septic upgrades, sewage expansion and actually the installation of denitrifying septic systems for residential and commercial use. Any overage that was in 404 Fund is supposed to go to that purpose. And the great irony, of course, is that in the last couple of months, when these are the headlines in Newsday about the pollution of our waters, that this particular fund is to be savaged for other purposes is completely unconscionable to us, and we can't imagine how you thought this was a better idea than other things that may have come before you.

I understand what the County government is up against with respect to its budget. I have to run an organization that is some 25 to 30% lighter than it was in 2008. I understand the decisions are painful, but I understand also that the credibility of this body, like the credibility of my organization, rests in the public's trust in what it says it's going to do.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

You all have heard from the public about what this fund is to be used for. You already get over 20 million dollars a year in tax stabilization from this fund. There's another eight million dollars a year that you're getting to fund 80 salaries, the 477 Fund. And the Water Quality Protection Program is essentially out of business because we're covering those salaries, and now we want 32 million dollars this year? We want money for the next two years? And there is a soft promise of making paying it back, which, honestly, I wish I could say differently, I don't see it happening. People will be gone, priorities will change, and when the bill comes due on that 30 million, or 60 million, or whatever it is, it's going to be very hard to get it to come back. We've seen it happen over and over again.

I've been at this for like 30 years and I am pleading with you guys to rethink whatever logic you apply to thinking that this was a good idea. If you want to change the purpose and the allocation of this fund, go back to the voters, put it back on the ballot, let people decide. Maybe they've changed their mind, but, you know what, they told you what they wanted to see this money used for and this is completely in the opposite direction of that at a time when the need has never been greater. I really appreciate the opportunity to speak before you, and I would urge you to vote against this particular amendment. And if it requires voting against all of them, I would encourage you to do that, and think about it, and see if you can't find another way. We all have to deal with tough budget decisions. Please don't break the public trust as part of that process. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. DeLuca. All right William Toedter, and Richard Amper on deck.

MR. TOEDTER:

Hi. My name is Bill Toedter. I'm the President of the North Fork Environmental Council, here to speak on the same issues that the previous people have been speaking on, and that is the raiding of the funds on the Drinking Water Protection Program.

I think what's lost here and what's not getting through to many people is that this program has already helped to preserve some of the quality in our drinking water, and the cost that you put in today to further protect that is far less than any funds that you'd need to put in down the road for remediation of our drinking water supplies, and the remediation of our bays, and our inlets and creeks; that this is a misplaced opportunity to make a stopgap funding decision, rather than looking at the intent of what these funds were for and what the people have spoken in the referendum.

They have asked for these funds are to be specifically used for the protection of our drinking water. And this is at a time where I think it may be lost upon you about the great cooperation among all the environmental groups that you see here today, in addition to the Nature Conservancy, to the Citizens Campaign for the Environment, Pine Barrens Society or the Group for the East End looking and promoting education and awareness about these problems and solutions and problem-solving. And when you look at all of those groups, plus all the civic associations that are concerned about our water, I think you know where the people's hearts and minds and pocketbooks are on this, and we really ask you to think twice. And, as Bob DeLuca said, to change your idea and concept about how these funds to be used in the short term and not do this. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much.

*(*Applause*)*

Richard Amper, and on deck is Cesar Malaga.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

MR. AMPER:

You're not solving the budget problems, and now you're going to the heart of the contract between the citizens of Suffolk County and their government.

Taxpayers are paying two-and-a-half times the average in taxes. And still, when you ask them will they give you more, will they give you more money than 45 of the 50 states in this union if you will devote it in solemn contract with the voters and taxpayers and spend it on water protection, not just buying land -- we've got a major water crisis that is being addressed at every layer of government with the exception of Suffolk County, sewage causing problems with surface water and drinking water that has to be addressed.

The raiding of this money, the use of this money for any other purpose, when the public said, "Despite what we're paying in taxes, we will give you a billion dollars more if it will be devoted exclusively to water protection." It's the most basic element of our natural world and essential to public health and safety, and that's what your principal job is in government, more important even than balancing the budget. If we break faith with those people, they will never give us any more money for even these important things. This is a matter of conscience, it's a matter of law. It's a matter of personal responsibility, and I ask every one of you to say, "Stop." Maybe we can go to the State, maybe we can do any number of things, but we cannot break the law or the commitment we made to the public to use this exclusively, a dedicated fund that can only be used for this purpose, and to reassure the public we will build into that referendum the explicit provision that if it is altered in any way, it will have to go back to the public and they can approve it.

If the public decides they don't want to protect water anymore and they want to balance the budget with you, let them decide, but you have to vote no, legally and morally, and in terms -- you all ran to the people and you were elected, or reelected, or you're retiring after many years of public service. Please do not betray the high office that you serve and the responsibility, and, more importantly, the public trust that allowed the people of this County to put up that kind of money, however stressed they are with the economy, as long as it was only used for water protection. Find another way.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Richard. Cesar Malaga, and on deck is Romarie McCue.

MR. MALAGA:

My name is Cesar Malaga from West Babylon. You know, when we talk about, you know, destroying our environment, I hope you -- all of you can understand what I'm talking about. I know many times I've mentioned here in this Legislature, which I've been attending over 30 years, I never got a question concerning the budget. In 2006, 2007 and 2008, I told this Legislature that we were going to face a very critical economic situation where many people would lose their jobs, will be a lot of pressure, but the County did nothing about decreasing costs. They keep increasing, increasing. Like today, I see that you -- we are in a very tight economic situation and you are increasing salaries by one million for the employees of Suffolk County. That's ridiculous. We are facing a crisis.

And the other thing that I have mentioned many times is that you might not like Steve Levy, but he knew what money was, he knew the value of money. But many of you here, it appears to me, you know, the things -- increase taxes, shift from here, shift from there. You do not know the value of money. Steve Levy stopped the increase of, you know, union leaders. The unions give you money for your campaign, and as soon as you get elected, you give them whatever they want, but that's not right. Where do you get the money? Money does not grow on trees.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

Like the Police Department, I mentioned many times, they are overpaid. They make too much money, and we do not have as much crime in Suffolk County as there is in other parts of the country. So we have to do something. We have to stop this continuously "give me, give me, give me. Okay, here it is, here it is. Give me, you know, for my campaign 100,000, 50,000, whatever," and you give them everything they want.

We have to stop. We have to think of who we are. We are -- you represent the people of Suffolk County. You do not work for your party, like during this campaign, that was yesterday. Everything is, you know, "Hey, vote Democratic, Democratic." Like in my area, they call it the "Schaffer Team". There's no more Democratic Party; Schaffer Team. And we have to start bringing democracy back. There is not democracy in this.

We had gone to Albany trying to change the election laws, because if you go out there for -- to get elected, the Board of Elections does not allow you, and the Board of Elections works for the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. It shouldn't be. It should not be funded by the people of Suffolk County, it should be funded by the Democratic Party and Republican Party, not from the County taxpayers, because they are destroying the -- and, as a matter of fact, I would suggest that you limit 80% of the Board of Elections. And you saw in my article several times and they --

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

MR. MALAGA:

In Newsday, and also I mentioned here, your salaries are tremendous. I mean, why should you make more than Suffolk -- Nassau and Westchester? You make over double. You have your offices with a big sign there, County Legislature, and no one goes there. And whenever you want to go to the office, you have to ring a bell to get inside.

So, gentlemen, if we are in the situation, decrease your salaries, unless we have to go to the Board, you know, for next year, have -- you know, as an amendment in which we can decrease your salaries and eliminate your perks and your offices. Thank you for listening.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much. Romarie McCue, and on deck is Andrea Spilka. Hello.

MS. MC CUE:

Hello, and good afternoon to everyone. And I'd just like to congratulate the newly appointed and the reelected.

This my first time speaking in front of the Legislators, so I'm a little bit nervous, and I usually don't talk about a topic I'm not quite comfortable with and that I really believe in.

My name is Roe McCue and I'm the Director at The Retreat. And for over 25 years, The Retreat has been a community-based not-for-profit agency that provides domestic violence services and support for victims. Over the past few months you have been individually addressed by our Executive Director, collectively by our Shelter Director, Minerva Perez, and are aware of what Suffolk County's experiencing in terms of domestic violence. And we are extremely encouraged by your message, the support from your staff and your offices regarding the need of essential services.

It is important that you realize that domestic violence is a public safety issue that impacts both women and children in Suffolk County. I'm a resident of Copiague, and last week there was a murder-suicide in Amityville with Virginia Vasquez, and now four children is an orphan; lost both their mother and their father.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

We've -- for the past three years we've experienced a 96% increase to our calls. And it really is a public safety concern and it's really the catalyst behind the development, and maintenance and the important partnership with the Suffolk County Police Department, and we're really working collaboratively to keep our women and children safe.

The Retreat feels and acknowledges the impact of the nation's economic downturn. We understand that Suffolk County's been hard hit by the economic crisis and it's a really tough budget year. And we want to thank you for working diligently to bring in a balanced budget and for working to ensure that the critical domestic violence services are not destructed or cut. And as a woman and an immigrant of this country and a mother, I'm often asked like what's so great about this country, and this is so not scripted anymore, but I always answer -- and also a victim of family violence -- that we wish we had services like this back in our country, or folks that are sitting behind me who's fighting for the people who don't have a voice, and for you who's giving us a voice up in Washington, and help fight for the services that we really struggle to keep.

So, in closing, I just want to remind you of The Retreat's mission, to provide safety, shelter and support for victims of domestic abuse, and break the cycle of family violence. For the thousands of women and children who pass through our doors, we really thank you. It really is a place where the violence ends and hope begins. Thank you for your time.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Ms. McCue.

*(*Applause*)*

Andrea Spilka, and on deck is Jane Fasullo. Hi.

MS. SPILKA:

Hi. Good afternoon. I'm Andrea Spilka. I'm the President of the Southampton Town Civic Coalition, so -- and I am here as well to ask you not to raid the Clean Water Fund.

I represent civics in western Southampton Town, but I think I speak for the civics in our entire East End who say this is a mistake. And, frankly, I think you're taking the easy way out on this issue. At a time when improving our water quality should be one of your highest priorities, and at a time when we get headlines like brown tide back in South Shore bays, shellfishing ban is ordered after illness reported, and environmental chemicals, a pregnancy risk report, taking money away once again from the funds that we voted for and expect you to use to improve our water quality, there's really -- it's not just a health hazard and a health problem, but it's an economic problem. I think let's not forget the billions of dollars that are brought in from both commercial and recreational fishing. It's an important part of our economy. It's an important part of the daily lives of people throughout the area.

You're really taking from what you consider a usable piggy bank to fund what should be something that's done through other kinds of means. And, look, I don't take anything away from what you guys have to do to balance the budget. I understand it's a terribly difficult time. But when I read in the newspaper that you thought it was too risky to go to the State and use the money for restructuring your debt, frankly, this is more dangerous. It's more dangerous for our health, it's more dangerous for the confidence that people have in government, that when we vote for something, that's what it's going to be used for. And it's certainly, I think in the long run, more dangerous for the budget.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

One of the things I keep seeing is all the money that goes through the IDAs for economic development. You're giving tax reliefs. You're letting people pay fewer taxes; that's less revenue for us. But, at the same time, you're slamming people who already live here, who already work here in the fishing industry. I think, frankly, it's a mistake.

I personally think, in honor of Sir Thomas More, who was quoted today so eloquently, you really need to keep your covenant with the voters, and I think you need to do the right thing and I'm hoping you will. Thank you very much.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Ms. Spilka. Jane Fasullo, and on deck is Alex Gutierrez.

MS. FASULLO:

Yes. Good afternoon, and congratulations, everyone. I was pleased to see many of the election results, but I'm here speaking for myself as a citizen. I do want to note that a number of you might have already recognized me as a representative of the Sierra Club, but I'm not speaking for the Sierra Club today, although I do have a lot of contacts there.

I'm concerned as a citizen because I have lived here in Suffolk County for all but four of the years of my life. And even during those four years, I spent time out in the areas on the East End for my summers. I voted time and time again for the money to be put aside for water protection. I did so with the belief that when the clauses stated very clearly that that referendum could not be changed except by a vote of the people, that that would hold. My trust is gone. It's not only at the local level in government, it even goes higher, because we've been lied to even by others at higher levels.

I'm totally discouraged by the fact that you would feel it's okay to override the vote of the people. And I'm going to put this very, very simply, because I have someplace else to go, I have to actually go clean up a stream in Wyandanch, but I'm going to ask you to use your own conscience on this. If your voters had known before the election yesterday that you were going to take money from the Drinking Water Protection Fund to use for general purposes, would you have been reelected or elected? Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Ms. Fasullo. Alex Gutierrez and Gregory Noone on deck.

MR. GUTIERREZ:

Good afternoon, and congratulations to all of you. My name is Alexander Gutierrez. I'm a former high school teacher, retired high school teacher, as some of you know me, and as maybe several of you have had me in class, or have had several of you in a class. And I was also the Head of the Hispanic Advisory Board of Suffolk County; some of you may know me as that. Today I'm here as a firefighter. Okay? And I'm here in reference to the Fire Department.

Our contract has been extended for six months until June 30th. Okay? The reason I'm here is because Budget Amendment Number 5 will fund a location for the entire year. We definitely need and are asking for your support for the entire year, and that's the reason I'm here. I want to thank you very much for hearing me out.

*(*Applause*)*

Special Meeting 11/6/13

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Gutierrez. Gregory Noone, and on deck is Nanci Dallaire.

MR. NOONE:

Good afternoon and congratulations to all. Trathnona mhaith, in the Irish language. I'm here today to publicly state my gratitude for your many years of support on behalf of the almost 4,000 Suffolk County residents who are living with HIV and AIDS.

Although the entire annual budget of Thursday's Child is less than \$300,000, I've been watching a lot of business news stations on T.V. lately. For some reason or another, the psychology of the 1% fascinates me. However, my point in speaking to you today is to tell you of your ROI, your return on investment in Thursday's Child and in our services.

This past Monday evening, we held our Client Advisory Board Meeting, which lasted an hour longer than planned. Seven clients came. They represent the wonderful demographic diversity of backgrounds who populate our County.

But one person's story I want to tell you about today, in my humble opinion, his story personifies the incalculable value of your ROI in us. A 49-year-old male of Puerto Rican ancestry from the Central Islip area, this gentleman came to us due to a recommendation from our medical partners in our HIV-POSITIVE Early Intervention Service. He had tested positive for HIV just about a year ago. Also, within the past year, he suffered from a divorce, lost his job, and was shunned by several of his family members.

Let me counter you our dollar investment over the past five months. Twice we helped keep his phone on, \$100. We helped him complete and obtain Food Stamp/SNAP benefits because he lost his job. Due to inappropriate housing, he could not obtain medical insurance, because Social Services requires a proper home address, which he did not have. We were able to keep his federally funded AIDS Drug Assistance Plan going in order for him to access lifesaving medical care. Due to homelessness, his food kept running out. We provided a grand total of \$200 in grocery store vouchers. We provided approximately \$50 in personal hygiene supplies to maintain his dignity. We paid \$75 to help him renew his driver's license in order to return to respectable work and stay off welfare. Because we helped -- before we helped him find safe, but temporary, housing with our partner agencies, I even met him on Suffolk Ave in Brentwood to talk to him, talk him down from his overwhelming crises.

At our meeting this past Monday, this man brought us all to tears with his thankfulness for our support in his time of need. He told us that over the past year, he was going to, quote, "eat a gun" at three different times were it not for Thursday's Child being there for him.

So while today I thank you for your support, I want to tell the whole County of a pretty good return on its investment in us. The return on a \$425 investment and some of our time is a man's life saved. I think this is a pretty good value and Thursday's Child is a pretty good value.

Thank you for keeping our doors open to serve our neighbors in need.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Greg. We appreciate you coming down here today.

*(*Applause*)*

Nanci Dallaire, and Louise Harrison on deck.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

MS. DALLAIRE:

Thank you. I've always considered it a privilege to vote, and I will, of course, continue to exercise that right, but I'm here to express my disappointment with yesterday's ballot.

Too many officials ran unopposed, and I question what good is my vote when I have no choice? Over the years I have made many requests of my elected representatives. Unfortunately, there were many that were unable to deliver or provide me with answers. Why would I choose to reelect them? Because there was no choice. They were the only ones on the ballot. They were the only ones being endorsed by the Republican, Conservative and Independent Parties. I was not sure there would be a Treasurer's Office to vote on. Will that position last as long as the term? I not only fear the uncertain future of that office, I fear the future of this County, and without choices, I cannot see it getting any better.

I certainly do not believe that seven casinos will cure New York's problems. And with an estimated 2.6 million gamblers, I was not surprised Proposal 1 passed. And although I may agree that we need that estimated revenue that those casinos will eventually produce, I also believe we need answers. I have felt more -- I would have felt more comfortable amending the Constitution if all my questions could be answered. Where exactly will those seven casinos be located? Where will those jobs be now? When will we expect lower taxes? And who will ensure that our schools will receive their fair share? What is the cost? We know that there is always a price to pay.

I do not see a casino proposed for Long Island, and not to sound selfish, but how is Suffolk going to benefit? I've read that there is an estimated fiscal impact that would be 430 million dollars annually, including 238 million dollars in school aid and tax relief. Would Suffolk County share in that kind of income annually? Maybe we could have afforded the John J. Foley Skilled Nursing Facility, but that's something we will never know. Sadly, John J. Foley now has a better chance of becoming a casino than ever returning to the not-for-profit that it was intended to be. And I believe that it's a sad state when the Governor himself not only encourages, but endorses such a proposal. But I will hold my elected representatives responsible to deliver and fulfill every promise that that proposal intends.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Nanci. Louise Harrison, and on deck is Bobby Blassingame.

MS. HARRISON:

Good afternoon, Presiding Officer Lin -- sorry, Horsley, and members of the Legislature. My name is Louise Harrison. I live in Peconic in the Town of Southold. For 30 years I lived in the Hamlet of Setauket.

I've worked in environmental protection in Suffolk County for 33 years in various roles. For six years, I was with the Office of Ecology in Suffolk County Department of Health Services. Like Bob DeLuca, I was one of the founding members of that office. I've worked for three State agencies in environmental protection, and most recently, I've worked in the Federal Government in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, working on the Long Island Sound Study, bringing over 1.3 million dollars to Suffolk County for land protection from the Federal Government, first time ever.

Now I have a consulting firm called Conservation and Natural Areas Planning, and I represent nonprofits and municipalities in environmental protection.

I hope you are listening very carefully to what the preceding speakers were saying, Mr. Amper, Mr. DeLuca, Mr. Toedter, Ms. Fasullo; well-put, heartfelt words, logical, sensible, realistic and very correct.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

When I started with the Office of Ecology, we had the good fortune to watch the Drinking Water Protection Program come into effect, and it allowed us to do our jobs better. We were able to work with other County agencies to protect thousands and thousands of acres of land, which as, of course, you know protects our drinking water. The Drinking Water Protection Fund never funded my position or any positions of any of my colleagues, it just helped us do our jobs better.

Recently, I spoke to someone who left the Office of Ecology in retirement and I found out that the Office of Ecology only has the Marine Protection Bureau left and the rest of the agency -- the rest of that group is empty, there are no positions there. We're watching our environmental protection programs diminish, but Suffolk County's always been the leader in environmental protection and is known nationwide for this. Can we let our reputation go down like this?

You know what's alarming to me, is hearing the word "raid" be used in such common parlance. It's almost used casually now. Did you hear the previous speaker say, "Please don't raid our Drinking Water Protection Fund"? Raid, that's a military term, isn't it? That's pillaging. You mustn't do this without our permission. This should be up for a public referendum.

When I pay a quarter percent sales tax, I don't like the extra quarter percent, but I feel reassured that it's going for the right purpose. You will be making very, very, very many people, very, very, very upset with their decisions from yesterday if you raid the Drinking Water Protection Fund or any fund that protects our water. Good luck getting business into Suffolk County if there's no water to drink and no water to play in or fish in. Please reverse any decision you thought you were going to make today --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Louise, you're going to have to start to wrap it up.

MS. HARRISON:

-- and do not raid our Drinking Water Protection Fund. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. Bobby Blassingame, and on deck is Dan Farrell.

COMMISSIONER BLASS:

Shalom, shalom. I'm glad that all you got your jobs back. That's good, because that's how Wyandanch is still rising, and it will truly take a Herculean effort. That's how -- we did have shootings in the Hamlet, but still, we're pushing forward. That's how to make sure with the buy-back of guns. I spoke to Pastor Randy on that.

Also, I spoke to my Legislator's office. While it's rising, we still need a community center to be built. We need a proper night life, we need jobs, we need more. We need to -- a lot of things in Wyandanch that a lot of other people have, but we don't have. And as we're still pushing forward, we want to see Wyandanch be the crowning jewel of Suffolk County. She come a long ways and it's been a long road, but we're not finished yet. The road is still ahead of us, and that's why I tell everybody, "Keep traveling this highway, because it's a good highway to travel."

Also, what I was saying about the buy-back of guns, one of the people got shot was my nephew, but that's how -- you know, when they told me he got shot, I was very upset. But we could do better taking as many guns off the street as possible and we need that in Wyandanch. Wyandanch still have a high crime rate, but we could do better, taking as many guns off the street as possible, and we need that in Wyandanch.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

Wyandanch still have a high crime rate, but we could work on those things together.

I need each and every Legislator down here. No matter what district you represent, remember, Wyandanch needs you all, because this is a good road you're taking for her. And, yes, it has met with some bumps, it has met with some push-back, but Wyandanch Rising will be the best thing that happened to this Island. We want to make it so that when they build the buildings, we want Wyandanch to look like the truly crowning jewel of Long Island, as she shines. She have -- how high can we take a building up? They said about five feet -- about five stories. If we can get one taller than five stories, she'll look like an island city.

I know that I speak for Wyandanch as the sixteenth unofficial Mayor. They said, "How did you get that title?" Well, if you knew Mayor Brad, if you knew Mayor Ellison, I stand in the line of great men that may never sit as Legislators ever elected, but we stand in the line of great people believing in one thing, and we're going to push forward to make sure Wyandanch makes it.

Every night you still see people on the street, but that's how -- when I was asking some of the young people, they said, "Well" -- the people that sit up under the tree, they told us, "Yeah, oh, well." They shouldn't sit there. One of the young ladies told me, she said, "Mayor Blassingame," she said, "I'm too old for the youth center and too young for the community center," for the senior citizen center. That means they need a community center, they need somewhere to go, and that's how Wyandanch ain't afraid of a fight to push down a highway if you ever met her, so we're going to get Wyandanch.

All of y'all are doing a great thing down here. And, believe it or not, that's how, when you come to it, we're looking at the building that you're putting up, it is beautiful in our eyes to see it, it warms our heart. They're talking about the watershed in Wyandanch. Anything that you do, we are grateful and we are happy, we are truly happy. I know that it is an uphill battle, it truly is an uphill battle, because I truly have been bugging DuWayne's Office and I know I call bugging. That's how -- because when the Town meets, I promised Rich Schaffer, I don't believe in getting -- what did they say? No newlywed stage. I said, "Get to work in here, I'll be down there." I said, "I'll be showing up in the Town of Babylon," just as sure as I am here.

I trust you that you will move forward. And I'm happy to see that Wayne Horsley, that you are the Presiding Officer. Remember that if Wyandanch don't make, it will just put something in the heart of the children there. But I know you're going to help Wyandanch to make it because I've seen what you're doing.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Bobby, you're going to have to start to wrap it up.

MR. BLASSINGAME:

And I've seen the good things that you're doing for it. So I said push it along and don't stop pushing this train forward. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

*(*Applause*)*

All righty. Dan Farrell, and on deck is Marshall Brown.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

MR. FARRELL:

Good afternoon. Congratulations on your re-elections. And to you, Presiding Officer Horsley, I wish you nothing but the best over at the State Parks Department. I know you'll do great things there.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you, Dan, I appreciate it.

MR. FARRELL:

You're welcome. I'm here to speak on I.R. 1966. I understand it's been laid on the table; it's our AME contract. I just wanted to inform you that our membership has ratified this agreement with over 60%. We are in full support of this. I hope we can count on your support for that. But I just would like to extend the invitation that if anybody has any questions or concerns, to feel free to contact me and I'll be happy to discuss the contract with you. So that's about it. Thank you.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Dan. Thank you for coming down and telling us that. Marshal Brown.

MR. BROWN:

Hi. First of all, thank you very much for giving us all the opportunity to speak today. My name is Marshal Brown. I'm Executive Director of Save the Great South Bay, an organization founded August 2012. We have almost a thousand people in our Facebook group, and are part of the Long Island Clean Water Partnership, which was launched September 2013, and which has now over 125 organizations.

My organization and the partnership have both grown explosively because we cherish Long Island and want to see its waters protected and restored. Crucially, we are all looking at the same science, and that science is telling us that if we don't address our water quality issues now and today, all our waters will be lifeless before too long, wiped out by brown tide, rust tide, red tide and blue/green algae, which thrive in nitrogenous waste that is seeping into them from our groundwater.

A Long Island without healthy waters would be a diminished thing, affecting real estate prices and tourism enormously. For that reason alone, the decision to raid a fund dedicated to addressing our sewage issues would be economically disastrous.

When I was growing up in Sayville, the Great South Bay employed 6500 clam diggers. We supplied 50% of all the hard shell clams consumed in this country. Since then, harvests have declined 99%. We have seen similar collapses in finfish populations. Virtually every bay on Long Island has a similar story. The good news is that we have the signs to turn this around. The bad news is we apparently don't have the political will to do so. The science is clear. The main culprit, what is now rapidly killing all our waters are the 400,000 septic tanks scattered throughout the County. It is the nitrogen that is fueling the blooms as it seeps into our groundwater and reaches our bays. It is no exaggeration to say that Long Island's water quality crisis could be the biggest environmental story of 2014. Newsday has been reporting on it extensively, the Wall Street Journal is weighing, it's being reported in the Atlantic Monthly, National Geographic and the Huffington Post.

Now, thanks to our efforts, both Senator Schumer and Senator Gillibrand are eager to help us address our sewage issues. We have the support of a number of State and local officials as well, hopefully enough and soon to stop this raid. Rather than raiding the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund to paper over a budget shortfall, this body should be seeking ways to fund clean tech initiatives, so that we can enjoy the economic and social benefits of a sustainable Long Island.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

The Long Island Clean Water Partnership, along with the hundreds of marine and environmental scientists and public advocates within its membership, have diagnosed a problem and have the solutions. The only question is whether our political leadership is ready to act on the science. To ignore the problem, to undermine it would help complete what is an environmental and economic disaster. I urge you to vote for Long Island's future. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Brown. All right. That completes the cards that I have in front of me. Would anyone else like to speak on the budget? I believe you already spoke; is that correct?

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

I did speak. I had just one thing I wanted to say.

P.O. HORSLEY:

No, I'm sorry, that's not within our rules. Are there any others? Are there any others that would like to speak? Oh, hey. How are you?

MR. STRAUSS:

Much better, thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Good, I'm glad to hear it.

MR. STRAUSS:

I'm so happy to be here today. I'd like to congratulate all the members that won re-election, and to the ones that are leaving, thank you very much for your hard work that you've given Suffolk County and your constituents.

I'd also like to say that on September 11th of 2013, we lost a great father, husband, grandfather, union leader, Legislator, and Presiding Officer, and a real, real, real good friend. And I've seen you people all -- all your statements about Bill and it's really, really appreciated. And thank you and good luck in the next two years, another hard thing.

The budget is very hard, and I still am in favor of raising taxes instead of cutting everything that we cut, and take from one pile to put in another pile, and I know that nobody will ever do that. Have a good day. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. Thank you very much. We appreciate you coming down.

*(*Applause*)*

Would anyone else like to be heard? Would anyone else like to be heard? Would anyone else like to be heard? I'll take a motion to close the Public Hearing.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion by Legislator Barraga.

LEG. D'AMARO:

(Raised hand).

Special Meeting 11/6/13

P.O. HORSLEY:

Seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. The public portion has been closed.

MR. LAUBE:

Ten -- 11. *(Not Present: Legislators Browning, Muratore, Hahn, Kennedy, Gregory and Spencer)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

Can I ask all Legislators to please come to the horseshoe? We're about ready to discuss the budget.

All right. Why don't we start? Dr. Lipp, first of all, you might want to -- I'm going to turn the mic over to you and ask you to go through the processes in which we went through to come up with this document today; also, to discuss with us the changes that were made recently concerning -- the technical changes concerning Cornell Cooperative Extension and how we're going to separate them from the budget due to recusal by one of the members. And just give us an overall idea for what we're -- how we're going about this and what the vote is.

MR. LIPP:

Sure. First of all, there was an amendment today to the second omnibus resolution, Budget Amending Resolution Number 2, you could see on the board -- the screen there. Very simply, all we did is we took out the two pieces related to Cornell Cooperative Extension, and, instead, put them in a separate standalone in order for Legislator Krupski to be able to vote on the Omnibus Budget Amending Resolution Number 2. So those two items were taken out of the omnibus resolution and they will appear under standalone Budget Amending Resolution Number 12. So it's just a minor alteration and you'll be able to see what you're voting on for standalone Resolution Number 12. Okay. So that's for starters.

Second of all, I thought I'd just give you a very brief thumbnail sketch of the highlights of the amendments. In particular, we're talking about Budget Amendments Number 1 and 2. Those are the Omnibus resolutions. The first one is mandated, and the second one is discretionary. The words that go along with both resolutions are the same. The schedules of the line items are different, depending upon if the items are mandated or discretionary.

So, first of all, in terms of the highlights of the resolutions, combining the two, the -- probably the major highlight is the debt restructuring, and the resolutions replace the proposed 32.8 million in debt restructuring with funding from Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund. And what is done there is the debt service in the General Fund is increased by 32.8 million to more properly reflect what the actual debt service will be in 2014.

Second, there was additional five million taken from Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund to fund sewer infrastructure programs. And those are -- you know, for instance, programs that were passed by resolution this year were to help fund sewer upgrades for the Town of Riverhead Sewer District and the Village of Northport.

That being said, you could see here on the board also, this is the breakdown of the Fund 477 quarter cent sales tax. Thirty-two-and-a-half -- 32.15% goes for General Fund tax relief; 31.1% goes for open space; 25% goes for the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund. Those are for the sewers. And, lastly, 11.75% goes for water quality. So what is going on here is the sewer portion, if you will, is what's being accessed. This is just a breakdown illustratively for 2014 based upon 2014 recommended sales tax numbers. So it's not the open space or the water quality portion, it's the sewer portion that's being accessed.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Sewer stabilization portion.

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Right.

MR. LIPP:

Correct. Sorry about that.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah. I think maybe because --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Excuse me. Can we --

MR. LIPP:

I'm sorry. What was the question?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Just quickly, Rob, the request from Legislator Hahn, just to explain what the Sewer Stabilization Fund does, but for the edification of the audience, because there seems to be some confusion --

MR. LIPP:

Okay. So --

P.O. HORSLEY:

-- what it doesn't do.

MR. LIPP:

Okay. So the Sewer Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund gets 25% of the quarter cent, and for illustrative purposes, based upon the 2014 recommended budget, that would equate to 18.8 million. A couple of years ago there was a Local Law passed that said that any monies in excess of 140 million would be split from 2011 through 2013, three-eighths for tax relief and five-eighths for sewer purposes. And what is being proposed in the omnibus is to basically change the allocations there, which would -- and this resolution, by the way, presupposes a Local Law will come forth to actually do that, change an allocation, and would be able to basically not have to rely on that 140 million dollar threshold, if you will. And, in fact, if you look at the board over here, you'll see that the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund, ASRF, for 2014 year-end fund balance, based upon the presupposed numbers prior to the omnibus resolution, the threshold would be at 140 million. That's how it would -- the recommended budget would end it.

What's being -- what's being proposed by the omnibus resolution would be to take 32.8 million from that, which would give a subtotal of 107.2 million left. And then, on top of that, for expanded sewer purposes, what used to be the five-eighths, but that would be altered by the combination of the omnibus resolution, should it pass, and a Local Law that would come forward in the near term, should that pass, what would happen is an additional five million would be taken out of the -- of Fund 404 for a sewer infrastructure program, which is a newly created Fund 406.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

So, at the end of the day, the recommended budget would result in the Sewer Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund having 140 million in it. The adopted budget, should all of these items being presupposed here occur and adopted, would have a remainder of 102.2 million at the end of 2014.

P.O. HORSLEY:

And that would include, as I see Item Number -- was it Three, or Four, rather, where they're going to be putting additional dollars into the grant program for sewers next -- in the 2014 year.

MR. LIPP:

That would be the item highlighted on the Board now.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Right. Thank you.

MR. LIPP:

Okay. So --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Robert. Okay. Do you want to have him finish the presentation, or do you want --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Rob, can you go back to the prior --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Oh, I guess not.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Prior slide there, please.

LEG. SPENCER:

Put me on the list, please.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Well, gang, let me do this. There's going to be -- it looks like there's going to be quite a few questions. Why don't we wait until Robert finishes the presentation, then we'll ask questions. How's that? But, Doc, you're first on the list, how's that, since you asked properly.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Robert why don't you continue your presentation, then we'll answer questions.

MR. LIPP:

Okay.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Ask questions. Go.

MR. LIPP:

Okay. I need to return. Okay. I will go back, though. Okay.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Go ahead, go back.

MR. LIPP:

Okay. So that these -- so I've already gone over the debt restructuring portion and the additional five million that would come out of Fund 404.

Okay. Next, just a simple summary of major highlights. This is not everything. There are a lot of omnicoes and a lot of line items in the omnibus. I don't want to bore you to death with all the details, but basically these are major surpluses, and shortfalls, and priorities that are dealt with in the omnibus. Okay?

So first is surpluses. So we've identified 15.1 million in additional revenues and/or expenditure cuts, and those are made up of 5.3 million in terms of increases in sales tax revenue per the Budget Review Office report. Ditto with five million for increase in traffic ticket fine revenue, and a million dollars gained from the sale of tax-acquired property based upon the most recent auction. And then, lastly, there were two net cuts, after we take out any associated relevant revenue, of a little over three million for Social Service programs that were recommended in Budget Review Office's report, and ditto with 104 million -- I'm sorry, 1.04 million, just over a million, from the Sheriff's Office. In both cases, with DSS and the Sheriff, we didn't just recommend cutting certain expenditures, but, rather, we recognized there were some areas that needed to be beefed up or added, so these are like net cuts. We thought that responsibly there should be certain increases in those areas, in those two departments, and the Working Group went along with that. So they weren't -- didn't represent the gross cuts. Okay. So that adds to 15.1 million in surpluses.

Then, in terms of shortfalls or priorities that were addressed, this is not all of them, this is 14.4 million of them. There were other areas that -- but these are like major ones. In particular, the Employee Medical Health Plan we thought was underfunded. We didn't fill all of the holes there, but given the limited resources we had left, we filled a substantial amount, 7.2 million of them.

So, basically, what we were saying in our review is we felt that these were problems that were going to happen, and the Working Group felt that it would try to do the responsible thing and cover those holes. Similar story can be said for debt service. We reduced some of the revenue that we found really was double-counting in the recommended budget.

Next, Treasurer salaries. We added 472,000 and change in salaries, permanent salaries to the Treasurer's Office, because the recommended budget presupposed that the referendum to combine the Treasurer and Comptroller would occur, and that the Treasurer's Office would not need those salaries, and that didn't happen, so we added the money back.

In terms of health centers, we added 248,000 to the Dolan Health Center to put them at a level that we thought would be responsible. And then another item is contract agencies. We added a little over 1.6 million to various contract agencies to address priority areas that the Working Group felt were important, including mental health, at-risk youth, domestic violence prevention and food pantries. And, also, to note that the recommended budget cut like about 3.7 million from contract agencies, so we just focused mostly on priority areas.

And, lastly, we felt that the Hotel/Motel Tax revenue was significantly overstated, so the Working Group reduced it by 2.2 million, of which 1.5 million directly affected the General Fund, including the recommended budget transferred five positions from the General Fund to Hotel/Motel Tax Fund; that after we reduced the revenue, the money simply wasn't there, so we transferred positions back.

I will stop for questions.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. And thank you very much, Doctor. The first speaker, the first questioner I have is Doc Spencer. Lou, you're next.

LEG. SPENCER:

I heard a lot of speakers this morning and I just wanted to make sure that, you know, this was kind of on the record.

The money that we're using from the Sewer Stabilization and Assessment Fund, which is there to prevent rising, I guess, sewer rates, tax rates, over 3%. So by using this to not debt restructure, we're not taking anything away from our water quality activities; would that be a correct statement to say?

MR. LIPP:

I believe so. Let me put it in different words, because I'm not sure. I don't want to -- I don't want to say simply yes if I'm not sure I understand you correctly. So, if you want to talk directly purely water quality, what you could say is, well, it's not affecting the water quality portion of the quarter cent sales tax. So, in that limited sense, clearly, you'd be correct. Obviously, the Assessment -- Sewer Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund affects water quality also. The way the current grant program, if you will, occurs, there would have been 525,000 put aside for that program in 2014, which would have been spent in 2015.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Rob, could I interrupt just one second? But we added five million, so we offset that --

MR. LIPP:

But that was -- you're the perfect straight man; that is, but, instead, for 2014, the Working Group decided instead to advance five million for that program, and there's a transfer from the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund to the Sewer Infrastructure Program Fund of five million dollars for that purpose.

LEG. SPENCER:

Can you just talk to me a little bit about -- I understand that we're using the relief, the 24.1 million in the tax relief that will stop the restructuring, a program that will cost us a lot in interest. Can you -- 32 million, I'm sorry. Can you talk to me about the restructuring plan.

MR. LIPP:

Sure.

LEG. SPENCER:

The impact --

MR. LIPP:

Sure.

LEG. SPENCER:

-- in terms of that on the taxpayers?

MR. LIPP:

Sure.

LEG. SPENCER:

How much money that is because of the interest?

Special Meeting 11/6/13

MR. LIPP:

Okay. So it's 32.8 million, to be hypertechnical, number one. The recommended budget presupposed that there would be State-enabling legislation to allow that to occur. And the Working Group, I don't want to put words in their mouth, but the sense I got was we felt it was a 50-50 proposition that that would happen. And that, therefore, number one, there's a possibility we'd have a 32.8 million dollar hole in the budget to have to take care of. Number two, 32.8 million would translate to approximately 2.3 million a year over 20 years in terms of repay -- in terms of paying back the -- with interest, the -- basically restructuring.

What would happen is in the recommended budget, the debt service, if you look at it, is actually 32.8 million light, and that's because we're presupposing that we could take 32.8 million and pay for it with bonds and it was taken out of the budget. So what the omnibus does is it puts the money back in, and what happens is you'll see in future years, if the debt restructuring program occurred, if it -- if we got the State-enabling legislation and all of that and we didn't -- we're not doing what the omnibus does, then what would happen is in future year budgets, perhaps starting in 2015, perhaps a couple of years later, depending upon how they restructure it, is it probably would be over 20 years we'd pay it back, and it would probably be in the neighborhood of 2.3 million a year that we'd be paying.

LEG. SPENCER:

So that would be north of 46 million dollars --

MR. LIPP:

Yeah.

LEG. SPENCER:

-- that we would pay. So we're talking about 20 years. So we're really mortgaging our children's future, in a sense. I mean, that may be -- I don't want to use rhetoric, but, in a sense, we're saving 46 million.

Now this money that sits in the fund, the 140 million, what type of interest does that draw when it's just sitting there if we're not putting it to work?

MR. LIPP:

The interest is negligible. Interest rates are like so low, you know, you can't go out and invest in stocks, number one, plus we've been using that money as -- for cash flow purposes also.

LEG. SPENCER:

So what -- by doing this, we're taking money that is not working, we're putting it to work, we're saving debt, we're not interfering with any of our water quality activities, and we have a commitment to replenishing and keeping that fund at its current levels, and we save the taxpayers money, is that -- would that be a fair statement in a nutshell?

MR. LIPP:

You could say more than that, but what you said is accurate.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you very much.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator D'Amaro. Thank you very much, Dr. Spencer.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you. I want to make sure that I understand what exactly we're proposing to do in this budget today, because I'm very concerned about the testimony I heard during the Public Portion today, specifically the concern over, somehow, by enacting this budget, we are going to be threatening our groundwater. I think everyone at this horseshoe is concerned about our groundwater. It's important to all of us, to our future. And over the years you've seen a tremendous commitment from the County and from the Legislature towards preserving the quality of our groundwater.

So I want to start off first with a general question, Dr. Lipp. If the omnibus budget is approved, will we have a balanced budget?

MR. LIPP:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. So I want to go back to the quarter point. The quarter point is a portion of our sales tax that's broken up into four categories, correct?

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

The four categories are tax relief for the General Fund, Open Space Program, the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund, and then the Water Quality Fund; is that accurate?

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. The only portion that we're discussing here today with respect to removing the debt restructuring proposal is the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund or a portion of that being used to the extent of 32.8 million dollars in place of the debt restructuring as proposed in the recommended budget?

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. The Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund's purpose is to ensure that sewer rates for the various County sewer districts do not exceed 3% per year; is that correct?

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Should we go ahead and pass the omnibus budget and use the 32.8 million and remove debt restructuring, will there be sufficient funds left in the reserve fund, the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund, to ensure that those rates don't exceed 3% in sewer districts next year?

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Are we also using any portion of the Water Quality Fund from the quarter point?

MR. LIPP:

No.

LEG. D'AMARO:

We are not. That fund is remaining completely intact and being used for its intended purpose in the future?

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Well -- and I think you stated that the debt restructuring, which we are seeking to remove from the recommended budget, would cost Suffolk County taxpayers over 20 years 46 million dollars in interest, roughly.

MR. LIPP:

That's an estimate that's probably --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Your estimate.

MR. LIPP:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Well, we're always working with estimates. So the point I'm trying to make, Ladies and Gentlemen, is it really pains me when my commitment to the environment, to water quality, to the future of the County is questioned in a forum where what I'm trying to do is balance competing interests between our economy, our taxpayers, and, at the same time, protect our environment, and I think this does exactly that. All right?

As the economy improves, perhaps in a year or two, I know there's a commitment that we will seek to replenish the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund, which, if we don't use it today, you're going to have to raise your taxes to pay the interest on the debt restructuring, because the budget is balanced as proposed, Ladies and Gentlemen. There's nowhere else to go, so we need more revenue to pay that interest. I'm not prepared to do that. I'm also not prepared to damage the environment, however, and this proposal does not do that. I would not support it if it did. Okay?

Bottom line here is that if we don't tap the 32.8 million today, that fund, that amount of money would just simply sit in the reserve fund. It wouldn't be used for sewer projects, it wouldn't be used to protect water quality, it would not be used at all, in fact. We're, in effect, loaning ourselves this money to once again deal with the fallout of a global meltdown economy to try and protect taxpayers, and at the end of the day, we do see the economy starting to improve and we will replenish that fund. I think that's exactly what we should be doing.

And I really have to take issue with questioning our commitment to groundwater and to the environment. Personally, I just think it's completely unfounded.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

So, with that said, the rest of the omni-budget bill works on the contract agencies and the health centers. I think it's an excellent bill. I think it replenishes a lot of what should be replenished. After all, a lot of these contract agencies are doing what we in government are not doing, and if we had to do it, it would probably cost us three times more anyway. So I think it's absolutely the right way to go. I think this is an extremely responsible budget at the end of the day and I urge everyone to support it. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator D'Amaro, and your comments warm my heart. Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

Again, I have, you know, similar concerns, you know, balancing our environment and open space with our fiscal responsibility. I'm thinking of Nassau County. I want to know how much land has Nassau County invested in open space? I do know, since I've been here for two-and-a-half years, I have signed on to 1,817 acres of open space and farmland preservation. We have spent one million -- excuse me, 116 million dollars on open space and farms.

So, again, it's very frustrating to hear from, you know, my friends, my environmental advocates; that I was up there on the front line, you know, not too long ago. We're trying to be fiscally responsible in what we're doing. And, you know, again, I think, you know, the points were made. We're kind of between a rock and a hard place right now, but -- and we will commit to preserve land and to protect our groundwater.

And, again, I thank you for coming here and advocating. But let me get that number for you to find out how much Nassau County has invested. I'm just curious. They're over their heads in fiscal debt. We do not want to get there and we will not get into that mess that they've gotten themselves into. But, again, thank you for coming here and advocating.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator Anker. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Predictably, I have some commentary on the budget, but I'll reserve that until the motion for the budget amendment. I do have some questions for our Budget Review Office.

Robert, in your initial presentation to us and -- well, let me start with this: In answering Legislator D'Amaro's question a moment ago, you said that the budget is balanced, or will be as a result of this -- the omnibus budget amendments. A few moments earlier you talked about some difficulty in making up for shortfalls in different areas of the County's budget. So my question to you is, when you answered Legislator D'Amaro's question about the budget being balanced, I assume you mean the paper document that we're forced to vote on, as opposed to the actual real financial picture of the County, because my understanding is that there are numerous holes in the County's budget. And so, ultimately, what -- my first question to you is how big is the -- is the accumulation of all of those holes that you found in the budget?

MR. LIPP:

I don't have an exact number with me. The only thing I could say is you're right, that my response was it's -- it is balanced on paper, number one. I will say, and this is the discussion I had with the Working Group, too, that the items that we identify as shortfalls have different probabilities or risks associated with them, and we won't know with certainty until the 2014 actual number comes in down the road. So, that being said, we do think that, you know, in terms of a probabilistic model, that there probably is some shortfall there. But, you know, we could get -- we could be fortunate in

Special Meeting 11/6/13

terms of things falling in place, and either it would be balanced or better. But we do think that, at this stage, there are more risks on the downside than the upside.

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

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So obviously none of us is clairvoyant, we can't see into the future, but I do respect your ability to predict to a pretty good degree of accuracy what some of the increases in costs are going to be to the County over the next year or two, what some of the increases in -- or decreases in revenue may be over the next year or two. So I'd be very interested to hear -- I won't hold you to the accuracy, you know, the complete accuracy of the number, but I'd be interested to hear how much of a problem you think we may have in this budget.

MR. LIPP:

Probably in the neighborhood -- and it's hard for me to say now, but since you want a number, I'd say in the \$20 million range.

LEG. CILMI:

Twenty million.

MR. LIPP:

But it is a little difficult without sitting down with my computer and spending a couple of hours.

LEG. CILMI:

Right. Well -- okay. I mean, I would have hoped that we would have done up a thorough analysis of that in the whole --

MR. LIPP:

Well --

LEG. CILMI:

It's a very comprehensive document that you put together for us.

MR. LIPP:

If I could give you a little perspective.

LEG. CILMI:

Well, let me just ask you, before you give me that perspective, if you don't mind. In next year's budget we assume a 70 million dollar cash influx from the sale and then subsequent lease-back of the Dennison Building, right?

MR. LIPP:

That's this year.

LEG. CILMI:

This year, okay, so we have that coming this year, which inures to next year's budget to some extent. We've talked about first the restructuring of 33 or so million dollars of debt, and now we're going to take that money from the Assessments Stabilization Reserve Fund. You've talked about the potential pitfalls in our estimations as far as our Employee Medical Health Plan goes, and those are just two or three items; if pension costs continue to rise, if we continue to amortize for those costs. I've just probably identified \$100 million of basically one-shot, you know, plugs in a budgetary hole that's probably much greater than that. Based on conversations that we've had, and things that are

Special Meeting 11/6/13

in this document, statements that are in this document, I think that that hole could be much bigger than the \$20 million that you're suggesting it maybe.

MR. LIPP:

Okay, I could address that.

LEG. CILMI:

Thanks.

MR. LIPP:

Sure. Okay. So, for instance -- first let me start out with a little perspective. You know, the Legislature has a very short time and very limited resources to be able to adjust the budget or change its priorities. That being said, we did fill a number of holes that in the prior years that wouldn't have been the case, so in that limited sense, I thought we did a decent job. We didn't have sufficient funds to fill all the holes, so that's one thing.

Probably the biggest -- well, not probably, definitely the biggest item you referred to is the pension costs, okay. The problem with the pension costs is that it shows that we have a structural problem but not a problem in terms of balancing the budget. Okay, in particular, we will be amortizing or borrowing from the State Retirement System in 2014 \$87 million, okay; that is not a hole in the budget for 2014 because we can do that. It is, for lack of a better term, though, kicking the can down the road. So it's not -- so the \$20 million clearly does not include that, and we brought that up in our review, too.

LEG. CILMI:

Right. So I agree, when you're looking at the budget in the context of a paper budget, that this budget may be balanced. But in the context of reality, it's far from balanced. When we've borrowed or amortized through next year in excess of \$200 million just to pay for pension debt, clearly there's a much, much bigger problem. And believe me, I'm not blaming the Budget Review Office. I'm not blaming my colleagues on the Legislature, or the County Executive for that matter. But what I am saying is that the challenges are much, much deeper than we care to admit by the passage of a budget that we, you know, can kind of say is balanced just because the paper says it's balanced.

Let me ask you a number of other questions on more specific issues. With regard to the proposal to merge the Park Police with the Police Department, which I understand will require approval from New York State to do so. One of the things that you pointed out in your review is that the Legislature passed a law back in 1999, I believe, that required the County, for every new 500 acres of parkland, required the County to hire an additional Park Police Officer. And based on the amount of parkland we've acquired since then, according to your analysis, correct me if I'm wrong, but we would need to fill eleven vacancies that currently exist in our Park Police, plus hire an additional nine Park Police Officers in order to comply with that law; is that correct?

MR. LIPP:

Yes, that analysis is on page 226.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So if there's been a change of heart by this Legislature or by the County in terms of that policy, then we should address that policy either by eliminating it or we need to hire more Park Police Officers, because we're basically ignoring our own law at this point; is that correct?

MR. LIPP:

You could make a very good case for that.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. CILMI:

Yes, okay. Thank you.

And I understand with regard to the Park Police recommendation, which we have not addressed -- correct me if I'm wrong, but I don't think we've addressed that in the Omnibus budget; is that right?

MR. LIPP:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Correct me if I'm wrong --

MR. LIPP:

That's right, I mean.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes. So there are significant questions with respect to that proposal, questions from a Civil Service point of view, what happens with the salaries of the Park Police Officers once they get transferred, what about the folks who have taken the Suffolk County Police Department exam and scored at a certain level and now, theoretically, are going to be kind of pushed down the waiting list because Parks Police Officers are taking over. Those are just two of the questions, but there are some substantial questions associated with at move, right?

MR. LIPP:

Right. So the way the conversation went in the Working Group was we brought this to light, as we did in the review, that this is an issue that needs -- that you want to consider because of the, you know, uncertainty about the Civil Service rule, number one.

Number two, should the Park Police not be allowed to transfer over to being regular cops, we did say in our review that there was a likelihood, based upon our estimates of an additional million dollars in overtime having to be incurred -- so once again, we had limited dollars and we had to weigh the risk factors in the Working Group and the decision was to let it ride for that particular item.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. To switch gears to some extent, with respect to the Police District and the tax -- the levels of taxation within the Police District. The Omnibus Budget Amendment proposes to increase the Police District Property Tax Levy by two point something percent; correct?

MR. LIPP:

Two point three four, I believe.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. And the monetary equivalent of that is roughly \$10 million?

MR. LIPP:

Let's see if I could do that. That would be 11.3 million.

LEG. CILMI:

Eleven point three million. But the -- the proposal also seeks to increase the contribution to the Police District from our sales tax revenue, over this year, by about \$20 million, right?

MR. LIPP:

I believe it's 20.8.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. CILMI:

Twenty point eight. So in total, between the increased sales tax revenue and the increased property tax revenue in the Police District, it equates to roughly \$30 million.

In the budget, the proposed budget, the -- there's a proposed increase in the Police District of \$19.4 million, as outlined in your Budget Review Report.

MR. LIPP:

The number that comes to mind is growth rate for me, 5.2%.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. My question, though, is if the proposed increase in the Police District fund is \$19.4 million, or approximately, and yet we are proposing, through the Omnibus bill, to increase revenue through the sales tax and the property tax by \$30 million, what happens to that additional \$10.6 million, or whatever?

MR. LIPP:

So the police -- I'm not exactly sure of your question, but the Police District is receiving a sum certain. And the recommended increase of a little over five million that's implicit in the Omnibus Resolution above what's in the recommended budget, that's -- that all goes to the General Fund with a small piece going to 477, the Water Quality Protection Program. So the Police District doesn't get any more of that money, the extra 5.3 million. I'm not sure, though, if that answers your question.

LEG. CILMI:

Neither one of us is understanding each other, I think. Let me try to be simpler. So the increase in sales tax revenue to the Police District and the increase in property tax revenue to the Police District is roughly \$30 million; we agree there?

MR. LIPP:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

MR. LIPP:

I could believe it's more like 33 million.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay, fair enough. In the proposed budget, as per your review of the Police District budget, you indicate that there is a proposed \$19.4 million increase in the proposed budget. Therefore, if you do the math and you subtract 19.4 million from the 33 million or so that we're increasing revenue, you're left with roughly 14 million or so. My question is what happens with that money? Did we increase expenses in the Omnibus over what the budget proposes to increase expenses in the Police District?

MR. LIPP:

No, I'd have to look at the numbers. I know that there was like a \$3 million shortfall in the Police District that had to be made up, but that doesn't account for all of it. I'd have to look at the numbers to see. But, I mean, clearly the budget as presented is balanced on paper, and it appears that it will be close. With the Police District, there are issues with overtime that weren't addressed, but --

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

MR. LIPP:

I'll get back to you on what the difference is.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay, I would appreciate that.

And I guess the last question I have is not for Budget Review, but rather -- there are budget implications, but it's a question for our Counsel with respect to the use of the 404 money. I have heard questions, not only from folks who came to speak today but from others who called me in my office, about the legality of using that money for the purposes that we've proposed. Are you prepared to render a legal opinion on whether or not, based on the laws that have been passed, if this is a proper legal use of that money?

MR. NOLAN:

You're going to have to -- if the Legislature adopts the Omnibus, the Legislature, in order to carry it forth, is going to have to amend our Local Law relating to that program, because right now it doesn't contemplate the use that's proposed in the Omnibus. So if the Omnibus is adopted, we're going to have to amend the Local Law related to the Drinking Water Program, specifically the sewer component, to permit this to happen next year.

LEG. CILMI:

And it's your legal opinion that the Legislature can do that and effectively escape any challenges that might occur with respect to the initial approval of this program by the voters, etcetera?

MR. NOLAN:

That's been my opinion. And this issue is not new, it's come up a couple of times. And in fact, we amended this program a couple of years ago --

LEG. CILMI:

I remember.

MR. NOLAN:

-- to allow money to be used for sewer projects. There was, I believe, a legal action brought to challenge that and I believe it was rejected on grounds of standing. But my opinion always has been is that we can amend this article of the Charter without a referendum.

LEG. CILMI:

But is there a distinction between utilizing a portion of that money for sewers, or changing the allocation and utilizing a portion of it for sewers, as opposed to using it in a very broad sense to fill General Fund budget holes?

MR. NOLAN:

I don't think there's a difference legally. The original State legislation that allowed the additional sales tax talked about tax relief being one of the components of the program. I think we can amend our local program in the manner that's envisioned by the Omnibus without a referendum and it would be legal.

LEG. CILMI:

All right. So if you would provide us with a written description of what the legal issues are and why you're confident in that, I would appreciate it.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

MR. NOLAN:

No problem.

LEG. CILMI:

I think that -- I think that pretty much answers all my questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much for your time. Budget Review, thanks very much for the answers.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator Cilmi. Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have questions both for Robert, and then I have a couple of quick points of clarification that I want to take up with Counsel.

Robert, having been on a Budget Working Group and having worked very hard on what was presented by the County Executive's Office in the early part of September, which I want to pick up a little bit on what Legislator Cilmi had been talking about, maybe too much time has elapsed, but I thought at one point we identified what collectively we considered was approximately \$75 million worth of holes, I guess that's what I would call it. Whether it was responsibilities that we had through County personnel health insurance funding, the EMHP funding, multiple different places that we went and we looked in the budget, and it was generally our opinion that there was either overstated estimates and revenues or insufficient funding that was committed. In any event, let me ask the basic question. From your opinion, from BRO's opinion, was what we got from the County Executive in the early part of September something that would be a balanced budget?

MR. LIPP:

On paper, yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, there's a lot of things on paper. So -- and again, your job is, as the expert, the nonpartisan Budget Review Office, you bring your expertise and your staff's expertise to the paper.

MR. LIPP:

Uh-huh.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So it's fair to say that after your analysis, what was presented that purportedly looked like it was balanced on paper in fact was not; otherwise we wouldn't be here today, would we?

MR. LIPP:

Correct. What we did in our review is we recognized in our first section what the -- what the problematic issues were with budget, okay. And included in there is we identified the largest shortfalls that added up to over \$25 million.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Uh-huh.

MR. LIPP:

We also added up what we felt were surplus that added up to about \$15 million. And then on top of that, we had a separate piece that related to risks implicit in the budget that weren't necessarily shortfalls. So for instance, the 87.1 million for pension costs is not a shortfall in the budget, it is a structural problem, though, in the budget moving forward. Which is not something we'd like to do, but it is not a shortfall explicitly for the 2014 budget itself. The \$17.1 million dollars with the sale of

Special Meeting 11/6/13

the land -- sale of the Foley Nursing Home facility is another risk factor; what is the probability of that occurring is hard to say, I can't put a probability on that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, I wouldn't ask you to say that. But the fact that it's still mired in litigation, that the Executive's Office has attempted to pursue in my opinion would make it highly unlikely. But -- so there were a number of areas that we identified that I guess the Executive's Office had assumed that, in fact, we would question the legitimacy of those assumptions, and so we proceeded from there.

MR. LIPP:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Let's go to the -- I believe the term that the Exec's Office used was debt restructuring? I'm trying to recall specifically how they refer to it.

MR. LIPP:

That's basically it.

LEG. KENNEDY:

What would you call that? I mean, if you were asked to go ahead and characterize that proposal to us as a financial expert -- give it to me like in layman's terms; how would I explain it to a constituent?

MR. LIPP:

I guess the way I would explain it to a constituent would be you're trying to refinance your house, it makes sense to refinance it at a lower rate, this would be at a slightly higher rate -- not a lot, but a slightly higher rate -- and the only reason you'd want to do it is because you could pull out a little money to get you from today till tomorrow.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So it's kind of like what we used to call hard money lenders, when neg and variable rate where you had a fixed loan and you went to somebody who was going to charge a higher interest and a longer term in order for you to get something.

MR. LIPP:

Well, from a financial perspective, the fact of the matter is, is the reason why you need State-enabling legislation is because the debt restructuring would have a small negative present value associated with it, which current State law doesn't allow so we'd need a waiver there.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And how much was that for?

MR. LIPP:

How much was the net present value?

LEG. KENNEDY:

No, no, I'm sorry. The piece in the 2014 Operating Budget.

MR. LIPP:

Thirty-two point eight million.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thirty-two point eight. So we were presented with a choice of embracing what's kind of put our constituents out of the street when a Sheriff comes because they can't make the mortgage payment anymore, or trying to find some alternative.

MR. LIPP:

I think that's a way of putting it.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. The other piece that I want to make very sure of, I thought I understood it as we went through the process, but I want to come back to it one more time. You had given us a couple of graphics and you pointed specifically to the subcomponent of the Quarter Cent that we are looking to access only for the 2014 budget, and then I'm going to turn to Counsel. Walk me through that one more time, please.

MR. LIPP:

Okay. Well, I think you're talking about this graphic over here?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yeah, it's 32 million is what we have looked at. We initially started with a lesser amount, there was a case made that the recommendation on the part of the Executive was so toxic that we had to kind of abandon all of it, and so we came to this larger amount of 32. So that piece there is comprised of what subsection of Quarter Cent?

MR. LIPP:

It's not -- well, it's -- the money comes from or is derived from the Quarter Cent.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Which -- and money is fungible.

MR. LIPP:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I mean, in our minds we think of it as in subcomponents, but in fact, of course, what's thrown from a Quarter Center, money is money is money.

MR. LIPP:

Okay. So right now the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund for sewers receives revenue each year of 25% of the Quarter Cent.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

MR. LIPP:

That being said, the \$140 million top line item in the graphic on the screen is an accumulation over years, so it's not like, you know, a quarter of the Quarter Cent sales tax for a given year, okay. So therefore, the 32.8 million is not being taken from specifically the Quarter Cent for 2014, but rather from the accumulation from prior years.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. KENNEDY:

How many years is that built up over, approximately; 15, 20?

MR. LIPP:

Well, Quarter Cent Program has been --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Since '87; '86, '87?

MR. LIPP:

I think '89, I think, of this version.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

MR. LIPP:

We have an old Quarter Cent, a new Quarter Cent and now we have the new new Quarter Cent Program.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. But so it's conceivable that this 32.8 million, in fact, is actually derived from that one-third portion over those multiple years that's dedicated specifically for sewer district rate stabilization.

MR. LIPP:

Conceivably.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Do you have a projection for 2014 as to what the 22 districts, sewer districts may need in order to stabilize their rates at the 3% ceiling only?

MR. LIPP:

I don't have the number at the top of my head, but the recommended budget implicitly has monies going in and out from the different sewer districts, in and out of Fund 404. That being said, the recommended budget would have a surplus of 525,000 above the 140 million, if it was -- if the recommended budget was adopted and it came through.

LEG. KENNEDY:

The residual 102.2 million, will that be a sufficient amount in order to go ahead and meet what the sewer district operating requirements are above and beyond a 3% increase?

MR. LIPP:

It would be a surplus within 2014, because presumably the sewer districts will be stabilized in 2014 by what's already coming out.

So, therefore, the 102 million wouldn't be touched in 2014. That being said, it could be in 2015 and beyond.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, and therein that's where I think I'm going to go to Counsel.

All right, so I'm fine with that part, I'll leave it there. Thank you, Robert.

All right. George, I want to go specifically to the resolution. What do we call it, the revised Budget Amendment 2.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

MR. NOLAN:

Okay.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I want you to speak specifically about the WHEREASes, six, seven and eight. Tell me again, what does a WHEREAS mean for us regarding its enforceability or -- what does it mean in our resolution?

MR. NOLAN:

Well, a WHEREAS clause is really expressing an intent of the body.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, I intended to be here today and I guess I made it, huh?

MR. NOLAN:

You made it, buddy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

There you go. So, but as far as binding any future activity, does it bind us in any way?

MR. NOLAN:

No, a WHEREAS clause doesn't bind us to do something specific; no, it doesn't.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So if we identify next year where there may be this ongoing or recurring debt that the Executive's Office has spoken about, we have the whole plethora and range of actions available to us and in no way, shape or form are bought into coming again to this Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund to further deplete it.

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah, I think one of the WHEREAS clauses speaks about the possibility of considering that proposal in the future. But --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, I consider being here tomorrow, too, but that's the future.

MR. NOLAN:

That does not obviously bind this Legislature to do that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Right. Thank you. Okay, I'll yield.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Thank you very much, Legislator Kennedy. Legislator Krupski?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

If I could start by asking Dr. Lipp to put up -- you did have a breakdown for 2014 for the recommended 477 Fund?

So if you look at the breakdown -- and I've got a question I guess for Dr. Lipp, or it might be for George Nolan, I don't know. Twenty-four point four million is going to go into the General Fund for General Fund purposes and that's considered to be gone. Now, I think most people, when they voted for the Quarter Percent Sales Tax, thought that it was all going for either open space or farmland preservation or some water quality purpose, but that's obviously not the case. So thirty --

Special Meeting 11/6/13

almost a third of it goes to the General Fund. So the next -- almost the next third goes to -- it says open space, but in reality, out of the projected 23 million, over 16 million goes to pay debt service on this fund because it was leveraged heavily against in the past, and now so over two-thirds goes for debt service every year and doesn't get spent on open space or farmland preservation. So then the bottom category, the almost 12%, the 477 Water Quality Fund, that has -- correct me if I'm wrong -- 80 positions funded out of it?

MR. LIPP:

We're looking that up.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Which would leave very little, if no money left for actual water quality improvements.

MR. LIPP:

That was pretty good, it was 78, actually, not 80. That was very good, I'm impressed.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I'll try to improve. Thank you.

*(*Laughter*)*

So the last quarter of that Quarter Percent is for sewer stabilization. Now, 30% of the County is sewered, 25% of the Quarter Percent goes to stabilized rates in those areas. Does that -- does any of that money that goes to -- this is strictly for rates. Does any of that money go towards rates in like private sewer systems? Like Greenport has their own sewer system.

MR. LIPP:

Right. So I believe there's like 525,000 of the distribution from Fund 404 that goes annually to village municipal systems.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Okay, thank you. So is there -- so is there a possibility -- and this might be a question for George Nolan. Is there a possibility of taking -- because the money from the open space has been borrowed against, so future income is almost gone. The money from the Water Quality is almost completely gone because that was used for salaries for various purposes, and not brick and mortar water quality improvements. Is there any way to take -- because it is -- and I don't know the way the law is written specifically. Is there any way to take the top third of that that goes to the General Fund without legal referendum, use that for Water Quality purposes instead of just pouring it into the General Fund. Is there any way that we could legislatively pass something here that would dedicate a portion of that third for Water Quality purposes?

MR. NOLAN:

Just the way you could amend the component having to do with the Sewer District Stabilization, it's my opinion you could change the law relative to the tax relief component and say instead of 32.15 we're going to -- it's going to be 20% for that component going forward and more will go to other purposes within the program. So -- and again, that change could be done the same way we've done it in the past, without a referendum by a vote of this Legislature, if that was the will of the Legislature.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Could that be done on a -- like on a case by case basis? Say the County came up with one project and it would cost say \$2 million -- I'm just making up a number here -- could then we pass a law that says -- saying that we should fund that out of this? And then next month someone else has a

Special Meeting 11/6/13

project in their district that says for water quality improvements, and then everyone would see the merit of it and say *let's pass -- let's take another million out of that for that purpose*. Is that possible to go along like that?

MR. NOLAN:

I don't know how it would work in real terms, because obviously the 32.15% is being used in this budget to balance it. So I think it would be a matter of timing. I think it would be difficult during the year to keep amending the Charter and say, you know, I'm going to grab money out of that fund to fund something, because it will probably already be spoken for in our budget. We will have already used that money, so I don't think that would work.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

But not impossible.

MR. NOLAN:

I'd had to confer with Dr. Lipp to see if that was possible.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Is it possible?

MR. LIPP:

Well, I've discovered over the years that anything's possible.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Al, I like the way you think (*laughter*). But you do have to have an offset.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I'm trying to reverse the process.

P.O. HORSLEY:

I understand what you're doing, but you would have to find an offset. Okay, Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, some of this will relate to what Legislator Krupski talked about. Let me start out -- you know, the Quarter Penny program was a voter-approved tax on themselves for environmental purposes. And I've been trying to find the language of the initial referendum, and maybe George can help me with it; on our website we only go back to 2000, it would have been from 1999. But I believe it specifically stated what percentage goes to different things; some for sewers, some for open space, some for water quality projects.

Now, I've stated in the past that if we're going to make fundamental changes to this program, you've got to go back to the ballot. In fact, last night on the ballot, because we were making changes to the Open Space Program in terms of sanitary credits for the libraries and firehouses -- which passed, thank you -- we felt that it had to go back on the ballot. Because we had gone on to the ballot with affordable housing and that approved, but now we're expanding those purposes and we put it. So, you know, that was this body's determination.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

I've been consistent on this, I voted against the last time we tried to do this because I felt it should be on the ballot because I thought it was a significant change. Now, even if you get -- even if you get passed that and you don't think it needs to be on the ballot, you still have to determine that you that think that the Assessment Stabilization Reserve fund is sufficient. Now, Robert talked short-term about next year and said that a hundred million dollars is probably enough. But Legislator Horsley, you know, we've got Bergen Point, we've got an outflow pipe that's going to be several hundred million dollars to repair. You've got to look a little bit beyond just one year in making this determination.

Now, if you think, you know, going forward a hundred million is enough to stabilize taxes in all the sewer districts, fair enough. You still have the next problem, which is you're setting a precedent, and this is what Legislator Krupski was getting into. If you can take from this, you can take from any of those other programs. Now, granted a lot of that money is already going to salaries, but theoretically it's going to environmental programs, at least the spirit is maintained. Here you're opening that money for general purposes, which to me is a dangerous precedent. Where do you draw that line? And at some point you're really violating the spirit of the program and you ought to go back to the voters, because they agreed to tax themselves to create this fund. They did it because they believed it was going to environmental purposes, clearly. Now, if you read the referendum, maybe George has found that language, there was some for general -- you know, for general purposes, but it was a small percentage. The bulk of it was for environmental programs; that is changing if we do this, and I think that is a serious concern.

Moving on to another section of the budget. The County Charter is very specific in terms of the County Executive's budget. There's certain things it has to contain and Article C-46(J) speaks directly to the issue of sales tax for public safety, and it says that the County Executive's budget has to have a certain distribution and I have a legal opinion from Counsel on how that's supposed to work. So I have to ask the question whether this complies; I know the answer is it doesn't. There was 20 million additional money, roughly, for the Police District and no additional monies for all of the Police Tax Districts that are outside Suffolk County PD. It was supposed to be in the budget, that distribution, it wasn't and the work group did not address that issue; that to me is a problem.

You know, I have other problems that I'll get into when we get to specific discussions about those items, but for now I wanted to at least get maybe something from Counsel or from Robert Lipp in terms of compliance with Article C-46(J).

MR. LIPP:

I'm not the lawyer in the room, so I wouldn't say anything.

MR. NOLAN:

Legislator Schneiderman, I think I gave you an opinion many years ago that basically stated that -- in general terms, I can only speak in general terms, I can't talk to specifics of this budget -- but in a certain year the Police District's allocation went up, then the allocation should go up for the towns and villages outside the Police District; and if it goes down in the Police District, it would go down the same way.

So if the allocation for the Police District went up this year, assuming that the villages and towns weren't over funded last year, then their allocation should have risen as well.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

And that allocation, at least in the Charter, is based on 1997 distributions, which is roughly 10.4%.

MR. NOLAN:

That's my recollection.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

And the number in the budget, Dr. Lipp, I think is around -- on the proposed budget is around 7% of the total.

MR. LIPP:

I can look that up for you.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Which is roughly \$3 million out of whack, which is a significant amount of money that would be helping to stabilize taxes in those areas, including western Suffolk areas like Amityville that have their own Police Department.

MR. NOLAN:

Well, that's the general principle. Again, in terms of this budget, I can't speak to that.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's fine, I just want it on the record that -- your interpretation of Section C-46(J).

MR. LIPP:

So, point of information; if you look at the 2014 budget up on the screen, 7.27% goes towards town and village revenue sharing which is down from 9.43 the year before.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Schneiderman, just since we were clarifying things for the record, I just want to let you know that in our assessment of the 102 million in the Stabilization Fund, one of the things I found out during this process is that the Southwest Sewer District, which you had mentioned, has put an additional stabilization fund together in the amount of \$42 million that rests aside this as a separate fund in case of stabilizing needs of the district. And also, that in our issues relating to Hurricane Sandy dollar relief, there is a lot of talk now about the outfall pipe being paid for by the Federal government, or Federal government loans. So that is -- I just wanted to put that on the record as well --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

If I may --

P.O. HORSLEY:

-- to note that I'm defending the Southwest Sewer District at all costs.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yeah, and I wouldn't accuse you. You've been a great proponent of that sewer district. My budgetary experience is if you're going to talk about a contingency fund or rainy day fund, you'd find you have to look beyond one year, you have to look over time. And we know with the jail we have had some tremendous expenses including, you know, potentially the Phase II of that jail, but we have 200 million in, big capital, and another potential hundred million to go. With Bergen Point --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Fifty million a year.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

-- the numbers, I've heard on Bergen Point, potentially 200 million, \$300 million for that outfall.

P.O. HORSLEY:

I would say that's fair, yeah.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's a significant number. So to say that a hundred million, and that's just one sewer district; granted it's the biggest.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Right.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm really not saying whether it's sufficient or not, only saying you need to ask that question. And if you're going to ask that question, you've got to look beyond one year in terms of estimates, you have to look literally down the pipe; sorry.

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. And hopefully that pipe is sufficient. But thank you for bringing that to my attention. Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Yeah, thank you. Just a point before the point. The -- what had been raised before, in essence, was looking at -- Robert, would you be able to go back to the slide where you had the breakout of the four areas of 477? Yeah, thank you. And what had been suggested was perhaps utilizing the almost third dollar amount that's put towards General Fund tax relief towards particular projects, which I think is something not only do we know we need, but something I think we would all support. But I think that in rejecting debt restructuring, that, in essence, is what this proposal seeks to do. It might not do it as formerly as might have been proposed, but I think that the effect is essentially the same.

The number that we were working with for this coming year was \$5 million for sewer infrastructure. Now, Robert, there is -- there's a dollar amount that is going to be leftover as a balance from 2013 for that same purpose; correct?

MR. LIPP:

Fourteen and a half million.

LEG. STERN:

Okay, so \$14.5 million, which theoretically could be added to the \$5 million that we're allocating -- or to be allocated in 2014, so that's just under \$20 million. So when we -- by rejecting debt restructuring, which many of us were uncomfortable with in any amount, and by doing away with it entirely, not only is it a much more fiscally responsible move, saving about \$46 million over 20 years, but a good portion of those saved dollars, in addition to others from the fund, are going to be used for the sewer infrastructure that we all know we need.

It was stated before that going this route would not have an impact on water quality; and if you look at the breakout of the funds, that's absolutely true. But I would ask everybody here to imagine the positive impact that this move will have on protecting our groundwater, because here, in essence, by utilizing a fund for a purpose that it does not serve at this point is going to allow us the

Special Meeting 11/6/13

opportunity to fast track actual sewer infrastructure projects that we know we need. We're using the fund for something that it is not dedicated to now towards something that we all know we need going forward.

So I think it's an important initiative. I think it's an important way of utilizing the resources that we do have for something that's going to have a positive impact for now and for years for generations to come, that's our hope. And that, again, knowing that while it is true that this will not have an impact on the water quality portion of the funds, from an environmental perspective it absolutely will have an impact and I strongly believe it will be a positive one.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator Stern. Legislator Gregory?

LEG. GREGORY:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. If it hasn't been said already, I would like to say -- thank Robert and his office for all their work during the budget process. It's your first budget, so congratulations, as BRO Director, you did a fabulous job.

LEG. HAHN:

(Applause).

MR. LIPP:

Thank you.

LEG. GREGORY:

Understanding -- this is my fifth year, my fifth budget. I've been the Chairman of the Budget and Finance Committee four of my five years here. You know, the Budget process is probably one of the most difficult processes to go through. It's a lot to learn, there's a lot of moving pieces and it's very complicated. And pretty much the process is, as you're our experts in the Legislature, the County Executive has his experts, budget experts on his side. There are no certainties. You do an educated guess with the facts and figures and information that you have, just as they do, and I would like to say we're more wrong than -- we're more right than wrong, I should say in certain areas, particularly sales tax. But, you know, it's all educated guess. And as Legislators that are on the Working Group, we take your advice, you put out your report and we certainly heed your advice as much as we can. We agree and disagree on occasion as well, but we certainly respect your office and what you -- the service that you provide for us.

This budget is, I would say, overall, I feel more better, or I guess less drastic about in previous years. There's no layoffs in this budget; correct? There's no lag payroll, there's no furloughs. We actually added more Police Officers to address -- to enforce, I should say, data-driven crime strategies that the Police Department has implemented. We've actually added about 22 Probation Officers as well; correct.

MR. LIPP:

(Nodded head yes).

LEG. GREGORY:

To address those and to monitor those that are in the criminal justice system to ensure that they're meeting their requirements, so that's a positive thing. We also actually added, I believe it's three auto mechanics. The general public might ask why you're adding auto mechanics; well, that's something logistically that's become very important to us because we're hearing not only our Police personnel but other personnel that use County vehicles, for one, are having restricted use, or using -- because we're not purchasing vehicles like we have because of our budget constraints.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

We're running -- our vehicles are running up higher mileage, so they're breaking down more and there's less vehicles available, so we're trying to reduce that so that we can get people out in the streets doing the jobs that they're getting paid to do.

Also, with the Sewer Assessment Reserve Fund, which has brought much attention today and much concern from the public, and I say rightfully so, this is something new to us. But I look at it in the context of the decision that we made allows us to eliminate the need to go to the State. And by doing so, it gives us more certainty in our budget. Because any time we have to go to the State, there's certainly no certainty in getting approval or seeking approval. We've seen that this year with some of our initiatives; you know, in order to get approval for something, we had to make an agreement or some -- it had to be coalesced with an agreement with Nassau or Westchester Counties and it's not -- it's never ever on the merit of our own request, it's always combined with some other political dynamic that's occurring in the State Legislature. So I feel better that we're controlling our budget, so that allows us to control our budget. And not one cent is being affected from Water Quality funds, as was indicated earlier, and you've verified that, right? You validated that; right, Robert?

MR. LIPP:

The Water Quality portion is not being touched.

LEG. GREGORY:

Right.

MR. LIPP:

The sewer portion is.

LEG. GREGORY:

Right, right. Now, one of the concerns that when we discussed this in the Working Group is -- and I haven't heard you speak to it yet and I would like you to do that now. The ASRF Fund, the Sewer Reserve Fund, as it is funded now, will be depleted in what year?

MR. LIPP:

That's a very good question. Okay. So what we're doing now is we're passing the 2014 budget, which I guess is, you know, in terms of what we have to do, that's all that's in front of us. That being said, we do need a long range plan to understand what's going on.

There have been different projections made in the past as to how long the \$140 million would last; that being said, there are different projections. We had done one a few years back, which is out of date, and it was -- and the Executive's Office had done one very recently, I don't know what their assumptions were, though, but if you had to venture an approximation, you'd say mid next decade, like perhaps 2025, but that's -- you know, give or take a few years, it's hard to tell.

That being said, the County needs a long-term plan, okay. This is a stopgap measure. If that long-term plan embraces replenishing, for lack of better terms, Fund 404, and also putting our structural General Fund and Police District budgets in order, then we would all be happy, but that is -- that plan is yet to be seen. We're basically trying to do the best we can.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes, and I think -- the point I want to make is the fund, if it's not touched, will be -- could -- is projected to be depleted in 2025, I thought I remembered 2029. But certainly, there is a point where we anticipate there will be no funds.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

MR. LIPP:

Yeah, the 2025 was sort of a hybrid number between what I had projected and what Mr. Pollert had projected.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay. So what the plan as proposed in our budget will certainly push that off, because as of right now we take the 32.8 million out, there is the intent of this Legislature to replenish those funds or to put funds towards the Fund 404 beginning in 2017, which inevitably would extend the life of the program should we have -- I mean, that is the intent. And I would imagine that would occur over a 15-year period, a 20-year period, whatever it takes to pay back the 32.8 million; correct? Yes, no?

MR. LIPP:

Well, I think that speaks to the long-range plan that remains to be seen.

LEG. GREGORY:

Right. All things being equal, it will add -- you could say reasonably expect that the life of the program will be -- you know, there will be added life to it. I'm not a dentist, I'm not trying to pull your teeth; you can say yes or no (*laughter*).

MR. LIPP:

I'm not -- could you please repeat that?

LEG. GREGORY:

All things being equal, I know that -- you know, you'll take the view that, well, you know, we can say that we're going to pay it back, but that necessarily may not be the case. Lets think positive, we're going to do it, we have the funds to do it. That will extend the program beyond the 2025 projected year that we may deplete the funds.

MR. LIPP:

I'm not sure.

LEG. GREGORY:

You're not sure.

MR. LIPP:

There are too many uncertainties between now, and I'm not the most positive person in the world.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. GREGORY:

All right.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah, let it go.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. GREGORY:

Yeah. But, you know, I think just even looking at this fund is an indication that we still have tough fiscal times. This is not something that would have been contemplated before. You know, we're -- we could see the sun, before it was overcast, we can see the sun now; it may be in the distance, but we can see it. But we certainly have some way to go to get out of this fiscal situation that we're in.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

So I'm supportive of using the 404 fund for this year, not on a long-term basis. I've expressed my concerns privately in the Working Group about cash flow and the issues that it can potentially cause with cash flow. I am concerned that -- I think it was Jay or Al had mentioned using some other fund. All of these funds are used, borrowed during the year for cash flow purposes, and I'm -- I would hate to see that this opens the floodgates to other ideas for other reserve funds. We have to keep our eye on that and I'm sure you'll keep us in line; right, Robert.

MR. LIPP:

I'll try.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay. And just to Jay's concerns about the referendum. I know several times this has come up, Counsel has advised us that there's no need for a referendum. You may -- you know, from a legal standpoint. From a policy standpoint that may be -- it may take a different opinion. I tend to agree with Counsel that we don't need it.

But on the second point, the intent of the voters when they voted for the referendum, I don't think -- as proposed today, we're not violating that. If we do what we say we're going to do, if we eliminated the fund and the voters voted for it, the intent -- we wouldn't be able to follow through with the intent of the voters. But since we're -- our intent is to replenish the fund, the funds that are there now will be there in the future to address those concerns that the voters had wanted to be addressed. So I don't think it's a violation of their intent.

I know, Robert, you'll have concerns, because you're looking at the bigger picture and how funds are coming and expenses are going. But I think the intent of the program is not in violation of the initial referendum. I'm supportive of it -- and just to, I guess, Tom's point, Tom Cilmi's point. You know, there's -- he had a lot of legitimate questions, there's a lot of concerns and a lot of moving pieces, as I said. And, you know, Budget Review, they give their educated analysis under the County Executive's recommended budget, sometimes they're right, sometimes they're wrong -- because -- yeah, they're never wrong. And sometimes we may project there's going to be something that doesn't happen and it happens. I know there was concerns last year. You know, there were some concerns about the -- again, with some of the State agenda and we got things that we didn't anticipate, BLTs and some other items.

So you know never know, but it's not a process you necessarily want to go through. But, you know, again, it's an educated guess. I tend to be more positive. But I think overall we put together the best budget that we can. I think it's more constructive than what was given to us. Not that it was deceitful or anything like that, I think the benefit that we have is we have more updated information. The County Executive has more time to work on the budget, six months or so, we have a less amount of time, but we have more updated information so we're able to correct some of the things that they put in their recommended budget, and that's the benefit that we have. But it's a tough process.

So, you know, no one knows what's going to happen next year. We're hoping that everything that we will project will happen the way it happens. But, you know, I think -- I feel good about what we put, the document that we put forward today and I urge my colleagues to support it.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator. And I appreciate your comment. Legislator D'Amaro?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Just a few more quick points. Thank you, Presiding Officer Horsley. I appreciate being recognized.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

P.O. HORSLEY:

I always -- I'm anxious for you to give your quick point.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you. I just wanted to go back to BRO. One, does this budget. With the amendment by the Omnibus amendment, would there be a General Fund property tax increase, decrease, or would it stay the same?

MR. LIPP:

Stay the same.

LEG. D'AMARO:

The Police District tax would increase by 2.34% you mentioned?

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Is that below the cap, the State mandated cap?

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So we don't need a super majority to pass that.

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay, so we're living within the cap with respect to the Police District and we're putting more Police. Is there another class in the budget as well?

MR. LIPP:

I believe it's 75 in September of 2014.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay, imagine that, more cops. Isn't that great? Okay.

I wanted to go back to a couple of other quick points that have been made here today. First, this whole concept of a balanced budget. It's always just balanced on paper, because we're talking about 2014 (*laughter*). I mean, of course -- I mean, I don't know what the point was before, but the point I want to make is that, yes, it's balanced on paper. And you're right, you can't be clairvoyant as to what's going to happen in 2014 about whether or not there's going to be a balanced budget. But yet somehow we can be clairvoyant and anticipate there's going to be 75 or \$100 million to unbalance the budget, or as I like to call it, not necessarily an unbalanced budget, it's always balanced on paper, it's just a shortfall based on projections.

So you can't have it both ways. You can't say that the budget is only balanced on paper and *we're not clairvoyant because we don't know what's going to happen in the future. But by the way, I happen to know we're going to be having shortfalls*; you can't have it both ways. I like to believe that working with Budget Review Office and even the recommended budget and the Budget Office from the County that we are doing our very best to base our 2014 budget, which we're not even in

Special Meeting 11/6/13

2014 yet and trying to come up with what will turn out to be, not only on paper but in reality, but I can't give you the reality today because it's not 2014 yet. So it's just -- to throw out there that somehow, you know, *well, you say it's balanced, but it's really not*; it is balanced. It's a very difficult thing to try and get it balanced, but we've done it. The County Executive did it, we did it, we just have different priorities.

The other point I want to make is, again, with respect to balancing the budget. The holes in the budget that you want to reference, they're not in reality either, because we're not in 2014. So how do we -- you know, the holes in the budget are on paper, too. Everything's on paper right now, it's not 2014. So, you know, again, it's maybe fun and entertaining to somehow criticize this budget as being unbalanced or only balanced on paper, but the fact of the matter is the holes are on paper, too, so I can shoot the same criticism right back over to that.

The last point I wanted to make was, Rob, I wanted to ask you a question. You referenced before \$18.8 million in 2014 as going back into the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund, or did I misunderstand that?

MR. LIPP:

So that's the amount of revenue going in on paper from the 2014 budget, you can see it up on the screen.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Going into which fund, the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund?

MR. LIPP:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So the question I want to ask you is when we -- when you do the math and we got down to 102 balance in that fund, after you take out the five million for sewers to accelerate sewer projects and 32.8 million to get rid of the very costly debt restructuring, does that include the 18.8 million projected for 2014?

MR. LIPP:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay, I just wanted that clarification. Thank you very much, Mr. Presiding Officer. I appreciate that.

P.O. HORSLEY:

You're very welcome, Legislator D'Amaro. Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay, I did get the number from our Planning Director, Sarah Lansdale, and it looks like -- according to a 2012 paper by Dick Amper from the Pine Barrens, in 2011, Nassau County spent zero dollars on open space. I will say that it looks like they spent about \$6 million on farmland. Now, if you compare that with Suffolk County, just for the record, in 2011 Suffolk County acquired 785 acres of open space, 17 acres of farmland preservation, which created a total of 863, and that was about \$57 million. So again, you know, in my mind, you know, we need to stay away from as much debt as possible. And I think we can -- you know, we'll continue to preserve open space, but I just think those numbers are important, you know, if you compare kind of apples to apples. And I just want to make that statement.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

As far as, you know, open space, Rob, what's your thoughts? You know, how many more acres do you think we can invest in, perhaps next year?

MR. LIPP:

Well, I believe it was about close to seven million that will be a net going into the Open Space Program after you take care of the debt service. And then, of course, you know, there's money in the pipeline that we haven't appropriated yet that we'll be able to appropriate. I'm not sure off the top of my head, I don't have those numbers in front of me.

LEG. ANKER:

And I'm just curious, and you may not know, but how is our preservation process -- how does that compare with Nassau County?

MR. LIPP:

Well, according to Sarah Lansdale, pretty good.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. ANKER:

Thank you for confirming that.

MR. LIPP:

I'm sorry, and according to Sarah Anker; the two Sarahs.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay. All right, thank you, Rob.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator. Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

It's a little hard when you raise your hand last and you've got to kind of avoid duplicating what has been said previously.

P.O. HORSLEY:

There's one after you, so.

LEG. HAHN:

Well, someone else is going to have it harder than me. And I'm sorry if I repeat some points.

I think there's no question that this body -- and I wasn't part of the Working Group, and so -- anyways. It's no question that this body has worked so hard since I've been here, and I've only been here 22 months now, to right this ship. We're relying, I believe, I've been told and my understanding is we are relying on far fewer one-shots this year than last. We had a structural imbalance that grew over several down years, and to fix that structural imbalance it will take a few more years. And we are making the very, very tough decisions. And it's hard, we don't like doing it. I don't love, or even like, what's being proposed here with the Fund 404, but last year I didn't like voting to sell Foley in order to avoid its closure. Last year I didn't like layoffs, even though we had far fewer than what had been proposed.

We're trying to make responsible choices. My colleagues made very good points about how this is a better choice than the debt restructuring. But it's -- you know, it's not something we want to be doing right now, but we want to get to a place where we have structural balance. I'm absolutely

Special Meeting 11/6/13

opposed to raiding any fund. And when you use the word *raiding*, you're talking about changing those percentages, talking about changing those percentages in a way that, you know, the money forever won't be there for the purpose. And this here is using dollars in a fund that has excess when we're going to replenish it, and it's done every day when we borrow against it -- every day? Maybe not every day, but frequently -- when we borrow against it for cash.

There's no question in my mind, and I've been committed to, I've asked in this Working Group proposed -- you know, this round of budget talks, we need to find more money for open space, there's no question about it. The number one issue facing our environment today is water quality, we all know it. We all find incredibly important sewage infrastructure, water quality projects, we're focused on it. We will replenish this money and this fund; again, it's the tax stabilization for the sewer district dollars that has an excess. And so in the end, I'm going to support this budget and I look forward to all the work we're going to do to get us in the place that we will be replenishing this fund, we will be building more sewers, we will be working -- we will have money for open space.

And just one quick response to Legislator Krupski who hasn't been here very long; the money for the open space goes to pay off debt service for open space purchases. It's not like it's other debt service (*laughter*). That wasn't -- you didn't make that clear when you talked about that.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Understood.

LEG. HAHN:

And so -- yeah, okay. So it's a hard day today. Nobody wants -- you know, we're making some really tough choices, but like I said, I think we're in a better place. And we -- and DuWayne's right. Excuse me, Legislator Gregory is right; we see the sun coming over the horizon, you know, on our budget and we're going to get there. We're going to get to a place -- we're all looking for a time when we are in structural balance and we're making the hard choices and we're getting there. So, thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator Hahn. Legislator Barraga? Here comes the sun.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. BARRAGA:

Is it going up or going down? Certainly when you have an increase in debt service in one year of \$31.7 million, you have to come up with a solution. I just totally disagree with that solution. I really don't think, frankly, that any reserve fund, any Assessment Stabilization Fund or any fund that the County has should be raided or, as somebody pointed out, pillaged when there's a better alternative or solution.

Originally under the Executive budget, I believe his strategy was to go to the New York State Legislature and get legislation passed to give the County the ability to use the State Dormitory Authority. The Dormitory Authority would float AAA bonds and those bonds would be used to pay down the debt service. For some reason, which I have never been able to fathom, certain people and media have characterized that as unwise, something we shouldn't do, but they never clarified as to why it's unwise.

The interesting thing is that I think most people really don't have any idea what the capability of the New York State Legislature really is; when they want to do something, they will do just about anything and everything. Our experience with them in the last couple of years has been rather positive. I mean, we've gotten legislation through on red light cameras, via lottery terminals, a

Special Meeting 11/6/13

Traffic Violation Bureau, a sale on lease back on the Dennison Building, so the track record has been pretty good. The Legislature on the State level has been responsive. I think that's a better proposed solution than this.

This solution excludes them entirely; it's an avenue you can no longer go to. And yet, let me give you an example of what they're capable of doing.

This amendment dealing with this particular issue, supposing I change and I said New York State will give a \$30 million grant to Suffolk County to help pay its bills; that's what should go in here. You would think I was crazy. That's never going to happen, it's preposterous. Well, let me give you an example. Back in the year 2000, and I was in the Legislature -- Mr. Kennedy? Excuse me.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Sorry.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Back in the year 2000, and I was in the Legislature, the legislation came through that formed NIFA; NIFA's been around for like 13 years. Part of that legislation was to give that authority the ability to float \$400 million worth of bonds, if and when they ever had to. Shortly thereafter, a separate chapter came through which said the following; New York State will give a \$30 million grant to Nassau County to help pay its bills. It passed the Senate. And now it comes over to the Assembly and I get a tap on the shoulder, this is the truth, and they want me to debate for that bill. I said, *"Well, why are you tapping me? What about all those Assembly people and Senators from Nassau County?"* *"Oh, they don't want to touch it. They don't want to go near it."*

*(*Laughter*)*

"They've got political problems." And I said, *"Well, why do we have to do it in Suffolk?"* *"Well, you know, Tom, we're trying get certain things"* -- this is my leadership -- *"from the Senate."* So I went out there and I debated for the bill. And you know who opposed the bill? All the New York City Democrats, because there's no Republicans in New York City anyway. They were dead set against it until it was pointed out to them that in '74 and '75 we bailed them out, the rest of the State, and Hugh Carey was there, and we've been funneling hundreds of millions of dollars in funding to them ever since, and the bill passed. A \$30 million grant to Nassau County, they'll pay its bills. The point of the story is this is an avenue I don't think most of us really have a good understanding of the capabilities of Albany and what they want to do when they want to do it.

This amendment should not go forward now. Later on, if that approach fails, you could always come back and do what you have to do. But right now I think that's a reasonable course of action. I think it's a course of -- for someone that said, *"Well, you know, then you get Nassau involved and you get NIFA involved;"* we've paid off Nassau, believe me. I just gave you a good example. They're not even a player on this. And getting permission -- this isn't a bailout. We're just getting permission from the State of New York to use an authority. That is a like lift by the Legislature. They're not going to lose two seconds of sleep on this thing, it's just going to be one of hundreds of issues that go through like that if they want to get it done. And the question is, do we have effective people up there lobbying? We have Assembly people, we have Senators; it's not going to interfere really with their particular budget.

And the other thing, you know, *Well, it increases the debt service;* you've got to be kidding me? What do we do around here? Mr. Krupski just pointed out, you know, 26 million, 16 million in debt, we leveraged that whole thing; we're used to debt. You get 50 insomniacs in the room and you want to talk debt service, they all go to sleep in ten seconds.

*(*Laughter*)*

This is a much better approach. Let's utilize the Legislature. We've got some powerful people in the Senate and the Assembly; let's try that course of action before we do this. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator Barraga. Let me just -- just an add-on to Legislator Barraga's comments that this Legislature has recognized and does recognize that the State of New York has been very helpful in the last couple of years in helping us manage our financial issues, and we appreciate everything that they've done for them. And also, I don't have any -- no one else on my list.

LEG. CILMI:

Well, I do.

P.O. HORSLEY:

I'd like to just, first of all, call the rest of the Legislature back to the horseshoe. But secondly, I wanted to personally thank, while I remembered to do this, the Working Group for all the work that they have done in putting together this budget process this year. It was hours upon hours in a very difficult time, when everyone was running around looking at their own personal elections, to spend so much time on this. And it has been something that I have really appreciated and I respect you a great deal for all the efforts that you put into this. And that also goes to our Budget Review Office. I know sometimes I look at Robert and I shake my head and he shakes his head at me and the like, but the reality is, Robert, you do a great job and I appreciate everything you've done in this whole budget process.

MR. LIPP:

And I would be remiss if I didn't thank the entire Budget Review Office staff, including the little people like little Craig Freas and little Bob Doering.

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

We won't get into that. Okay, Legislator Cilmi, apparently you want to have the last word before we vote on this.

LEG. CILMI:

Well, I was going to speak on the motion, but since we all spoke --

P.O. HORSLEY:

We don't have a motion yet.

LEG. CILMI:

I understand that. But since we've all spoken before the motion, and you seem to want to move on --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Ad nauseam. Yeah, I want to move this along.

LEG. CILMI:

Why don't I -- why don't I just speak now?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Well, speak now.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. CILMI:

I don't want to forever hold my peace.

P.O. HORSLEY:

I was going to go there, then I said I better hold my tongue.

LEG. CILMI:

I just want to, first of all, echo what you said with respect to the Working Group. Despite my misgivings about that process, I want every member of the Working Group and those that sat in on the Working Group, inclusive of the Aides, by the way, who listened in and reported back to their respective Legislators; I want to thank them all for their hard work, because I do know that it is hard work and a lot of hours go into it and I appreciate it.

I also wanted to thank the Budget Review Office, not only Dr. Lipp for his optimism, but the entire office for their hard work.

LEG. NOWICK:

He's not responding.

LEG. CILMI:

I know, I saw that. At the risk of being somewhat redundant, I continue to be troubled by this process, a process that I believe is exclusionary, that invites mistakes, that invites some horse trading, that leads to a less than optimum use of scarce resources to provide the many great services that our County provides, and a process that on the whole, in my opinion, cries out for more transparency.

We received one document at 2:20 this afternoon, another document 2:45 this afternoon, another document a few minutes later changing in some way -- it may have been minor, it may not have been, I don't know because I really haven't had an opportunity to read them -- changing what was presented to us over the weekend, and I just don't think that's right.

One of the speakers said earlier, if the voters had only known what we were going to do. Well, they may not have voted the way they voted yesterday, and I believe that's a fair statement. You know, they may have voted the same way, but it's a fair statement to ask the question.

I continue to be disappointed by the conglomeration of so many disparate issues in this Omnibus Budget Amendment, all in one document. The use of 404 funds, 33, almost \$33 million of funds, to the -- setting aside of five million for sewer infrastructure to setting up a strike force to deal with substance abusing parents and jobs and salaries and allocation of sales tax revenue and more than a million dollars for a variety of human service contract agencies in the County all in one bill. And in and of itself that may not be an issue, but having just received this bill over the weekend, and none of those contract agencies that were included can come to us and say it's enough, it's too much, *here's what we're going to do with the money*. None of the contract agencies that were disincluded can come to us and say *why not change it, please?* I think it is just unfair.

As for the budget amendment itself and the budget that we're proposing to amend, I'm not real happy with either one of them. By and large, in my opinion, again, neither of those documents sufficiently addresses the fiscal challenges that we face as a County or that our taxpayers face. And that's not to say that we haven't made progress, we have made some progress. We've done some good things. And as Legislator Barraga pointed out, we've worked closely with the State Legislature and they have been help, but I just don't think it's enough.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

The cost of mandates continue to rise. Legislator Browning has been an advocate against some of these unfunded mandates that we're faced with. We continue to borrow to pay for government while those costs continue to rise, we continue to use gimmicks like the amortization of pension obligations just to kick the can further down the road. But at some point in time, Ladies and Gentlemen, there's no more road. At some point you run out of road to kick the can down, and then what do you do? So we were faced with a budget that proposed to borrow \$33 million; I don't believe that was the answer. And alternatively now we're talking about what somebody characterized as raiding the 404 Fund for \$33 million. Two of our speakers this morning pointed out that -- I believe it was Dick Amper that said *you're not solving budget problems*, and somebody else said we're taking the easy way out.

To Legislator D'Amaro's point, there's nothing speculative about the \$200 million of pension debt that we've gotten ourselves into through amortization. There's nothing speculative about using this \$33 million out of the Assessment Stabilization Reserve. There's nothing speculative about us selling the Dennison Building and leasing it back just to get an influx of cash. And yet those budgetary expenses that we are dealing with with those revenues and savings -- well, not savings but borrowing -- are still going to exist next year and the year after and the year after that.

The bottom line here is that I don't propose to have all the answers for sure, but papering over the problems is -- with continued use of one-shots and borrowing, is contrary to the honesty that the citizens of this County elected us for. They deserve more from us. And for that matter, how can Legislator Browning and those of us, and it's been many of us that have pleaded to New York State and to the Federal government for mandate relief, how can we honestly go to them with a balanced budget, a quote/unquote "*balanced budget*", and say we need mandate relief now, we can't afford it anymore. How can we do that? I don't think we can. I think the fact that we're passing what we want to say is a balanced budget today I think does us a disservice and does our taxpayers a disservice.

So I think the time has finally come to be honest with ourselves, to be honest with our taxpayers, to be honest with our employees and every other level of government, and in approving this budget amendment and in approving this budget, I think we continue to be dishonest with all of those folks and I don't think it's good for our future here in Suffolk County. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Why don't we move this process along? I think we've all had a lot to say today, and I could argue the points that Legislator Cilmi --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond.

P.O. HORSLEY:

You'll want to do that, huh?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, yeah. You know, I appreciate Legislator Cilmi and the thought that he's put into it, but I think I put a little more thought into it in attending every Budget Working Group, frankly, and I think I understand the problems the County faces. And I really do take issue with being told we're papering over problems and kicking the can down the road. He's certainly entitled to his opinion, but I'm entitled to mine, but there's only one set of facts here and the fact is that this is a good budget, it's a fair budget, it addresses the debt restructuring and it does move the County in the right direction. So I just have to take issue with that.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much. And again, if I can throw my one cent in, what are the alternatives at this point in time?

LEG. ANKER:

Wayne?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes. You can't help yourself either.

LEG. ANKER:

Yeah, because it's just not fair. Tom, you had plenty of time to go to the Working Groups. You did not sit in there. You had an aide there, you could have complained or raised issues with some of the things that you just spoke about. Again, you know, you have to participate. We're sick and tired of the Federal government not getting along and not working bipartisan. Our John Kennedy participated in this Working Group and we appreciate that. You know, Lynne was there; you know, we were all working together to create a budget for Suffolk County. You know, I appreciate your input, but -- you know, and also Legislator Barraga. You're an ultimate conservative, a fiscal conservative. We are taking measures to not get ourselves into more debt. I am sick and tired of so much debt, it is so frustrating. So again, you know, I'm hoping that you can see that we don't need to be borrowing more. We are so in debt right now. We need to work our way out and that's exactly what we're doing.

LEG. BARRAGA:

But you never had a problem with reference to voting all of that debt associated with land acquisition on the East End.

LEG. ANKER:

That land acquisition is going to hopefully increase our tourist dollars.

LEG. BARRAGA:

The point is it's debt. You're paying debt service.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay, I think we're beginning to lose this, and I can see that --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, Mr. Chair, wait.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Now you want to fight?

LEG. CILMI:

Listen --

LEG. KENNEDY:

No, no, no. I'm not fighting, I'm asking for the opportunity to address what a fellow Legislator brought up referencing me in particular, and I'm asking through the Chair to speak.

P.O. HORSLEY:

If you ask through the Chair to speak, I will give you permission to speak.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Me, too.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Mr. Kennedy.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Me, too; I want to speak, too.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, that's -- that's really peachy of you, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Well, this is after three hours of doing this.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No, no, no, wait a minute. First of all, you know what?

P.O. HORSLEY:

It's all good.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Budget debate has gone on quite some time. And as a matter of fact --

P.O. HORSLEY:

It's all good, John, I agree. I'm not going to --

LEG. KENNEDY:

I've got a grandson that I've got to go meet in Nassau County who was born earlier today.

P.O. HORSLEY:

John, why don't you make your statement.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So here's my point. My point is, yes, I participated in the Budget Working Group. But as everybody sees around this horseshoe, I'm not a sponsor. I will probably wind up voting for this budget today because it is the typical Hobson's Choice. We were presented with a terrible budget and what we did is we used our best efforts to make it a less worse budget. It's not a good budget. It's not a good budget at all. As a matter of fact, we look at pieces in there that we're still speculative with, but it's better than what came across from the other side of the street. What came across from the other side of the street, and I'll defer to my colleagues because we get no place beating up what's the past.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Here here.

LEG. KENNEDY:

But the place we started from was, in my personal opinion, pathetic. So we used our collective best efforts to get to something that helps us to keep the doors open and the lights on.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

Now, to Legislator Cilmi's point. We absolutely have to go back into this budget the first time that we can amend it in January and start to do to structural refining that needs to be done, because we're an exoskeleton that is deceiving the public. We do not deliver the services that that budget document purports to put out, in no way, shape or form. When it takes a businessman three stinking months to get a permit to abandon an empty fuel tank, we're not doing what we put out to purport to do, and that's where we have to go back in and reprioritize and put the bodies where we deliver service and not sitting behind some desk someplace. So I'll support it today, but Legislator Cilmi's points are very viable and he needs to have the ability to make them.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator Kennedy. Legislator D'Amaro, did you want to do -- you're good?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, the only thing I would recommend is that we could adjourn a vote on the budget today and wait for the Cilmi proposal if you like. Because I've taken an awful lot of criticism and I have to say, we put an awful lot of time into this budget. And I agree with the Minority Leader, Legislator Kennedy, that these are never good choices that we're making. Legislator Gregory pointed out that we made even some tougher choices throughout the year with layoffs, but at least we're proposing, at least we're trying, at least we're making decisions, at least we're protecting taxpayers. But to sit here meeting after meeting and culminated here in November with the criticism that I'm papering over problems, I'm being dishonest by supporting this budget and I'm kicking the can down the road when I took out \$32 million in debt restructuring, I want to know what your alternative is. I need to know.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. I think we're going to -- we can work on that in January, when you --

LEG. CILMI:

No. Let me respond.

P.O. HORSLEY:

You want to respond? Okay, respond.

LEG. CILMI:

I'll be happy to respond.

P.O. HORSLEY:

I'm sure you will.

LEG. CILMI:

First, let me address Legislator Anker's issue or question with respect to the Budget Working Group. Take the Budget Working Group out of the basement and allow all 18 members, who have equal standing, to participate in the process together. Take it out of the basement and put it here and I'd be happy to participate in that process. I'd be happy to participate in a process where we're talking about using 33 million dollars of a reserve fund where the public can actually, you know, take more than three minutes and talk to us about it, and where we can debate it for more than a couple of hours. I'd be happy to participate in that process, but I'm not going to do it in the basement, and I'm sure as heck not going to go sit outside the room waiting for somebody else to leave before I can participate. That's not my idea of equal representation, Legislator Anker.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

And to Legislator D'Amaro's point, we have a Department of Social Services budget which is 640 million dollars. It far exceeds every other department in the County in terms of expenses. If you take the Department of Health budget and the Department of Public Works' budgets together, they still don't equal what the Department of Social Services budget is. You know -- want to know what my idea is? We continue to ask New York State for additional borrowing authority and to do this scheme and that gimmick. Let's go to New York State and ask New York State to find ways that we can reduce our public assistance budget, not necessarily by reducing services, but reducing our public assistance budget by 10%. Sixty-four million dollars that gives us. If you use the County's share of that, it's 30-something million dollars. Imagine what we could do for 30-something million dollars. Imagine if we added that to our Department of Public Works budget, for example, the beautification that we could do on our roadways. Imagine if we added into our Health Department budget the things we could do to protect our drinking water. That's just one idea off the top of my head. I mean, it needs State authority, yes. There are issues, yes, but these are things that we have to talk about.

We cannot continue to amortize. I don't know for how much longer we're going to amortize our pension contributions. It was 40 million the first year, or 20 million, 40 million the second year, 60 million the third year, it's 87 million proposed, or something like that, next year. So, as our pension, required pension, contribution continues to rise, we continue to add debt service to that. And we don't get to take advantage of an improved economy as it relates to improved return on investment in the pension fund because of this amortization.

I said when I spoke that I respect the work that the Budget Working Group did, and I don't blame any single Legislator, and I don't blame the County Executive. But the financial challenges that we face are -- I know we all like to think that, you know, there's sunshine, the sunlight's peeking out, but, personally speaking, I don't see it. I just see us getting further and further into debt, and unless we really start to -- start to address those financial challenges that we face, boy, I don't know where we're going to end up.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. I appreciate your comments, Legislator Cilmi. I've got a couple more now that have asked it, and I want to keep it down to two minutes or less. How's that? Al, do you want to do your --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I promise I won't comment on any weather patterns.

P.O. HORSLEY:

And/or any other Legislators, hopefully.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No.

*(*Laughter*)*

No, I just -- you know, as a member of the Budget Operating Working Group, I really -- you know, honestly, from where I come from, I like the process because it was open, it was bipartisan, people could speak their minds. The fact that not everyone is included is a different issue, because whoever was in the room there, certainly, I think it was an open process.

And I'd like to thank Budget Review, because Dr. Lipp and your posse there, you did a great job of really giving us the information we needed and giving us straight answers. It was sort of appalling for me because of the debt that we've accumulated in the past and the casual nature in which it's accumulated. However, you know, what I would do is encourage everyone here, and it's a lot of

Special Meeting 11/6/13

ideas going back and forth here, and that's really good, start working on 2015's budget tomorrow. You know, you don't -- don't wait 'til August. And it was good, we started in August, I really appreciate that; starting way before the County Executive releases his budget. It's a great idea, because it's not a budget you know you're just going to rubber-stamp and say, "Yup, that's what we want." So you need to put the work in. So let's start tomorrow.

A lot of us know there's a lot of areas where we could improve. Let's start tomorrow and work on it, and next year at this time we might be -- you might see the -- oh, I promised not to, but you might see the ray of sunshine.

P.O. HORSLEY:

There you go, a ray of sunshine. Here comes the sun.

*(*Laughter*)*

Jay do you want to do it, two minutes or less? Can you do it?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I don't know if I can do it in two minutes. I'll try my best.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Come on, let's go.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let me start by taking deference with something that Legislator Kennedy said about the budget we were handed. I think you described it as pathetic. I think the County Executive did a pretty good job on this budget. It's never been easy. It's an enormous document. It's an enormous, you know, County with a lot of different functions. It's a 2.7 billion dollar budget.

I did have a couple of fundamental problems with the budget, but on the whole, I thought it was a good budget. One was, and I mentioned it earlier, public safety revenue sharing. The sales tax for our police, which is supposed to be distributed fairly, was not. There was an increase of 20 million without the requisite distributions to the other taxing districts. And the other big problem I had was VEEB. VEEB should have been funded for the year. We are supposedly working in good faith to give them a two-year contract, which they've done for the last 72 years a really good job training our firefighters, and that they're only funded in the budget for half a year. The Work Group did not fix either one of those two problems; in fact, create, in my mind, two new problems. One had to do with hotel tax. They had an additional \$110,000 in hotel tax because tourism has been strong, and that money was not, in my mind, shared fairly. It went to those people who were in the Work Group and groups in their district. And they added this change in the ASRF; move from the debt restructuring, which could have problems, to ASRF. And using that money in -- for general purposes to me is also going to have problems, and I will not be surprised if we're sued. The last time, and I know George has given us a legal opinion on this, but the last time it was thrown out, not on its merits, but on standing issues, so we better have a Plan B. And maybe it is the debt restructuring, but I -- you know, I am not confident that we will prevail in that, and only time will tell. So I'm left with a Hobson's choice. It's not great.

The County Executive's budget I thought on the whole was good, except for those two problems. The Work Group budget did not address what I thought were serious issues in terms of revenue safety and the VEEB Board, and created the two problems with the hotel tax and the ASRF, so -- and, you know, it's interesting in this process. Tom, I think I'm coming more along your opinions in terms of, you know, this Budget Working Group, and I participated in that group many years. This

Special Meeting 11/6/13

is the first year that I didn't. But, you know, maybe we do need to rethink how that operates to make sure that all 18 people at this body that represent the County collectively are reflected in this budget process.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator. Legislator Browning, two minutes?

LEG. BROWNING:

Two minutes?

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right, all right. I'll give you -- you haven't spoken yet, so.

LEG. BROWNING:

No, I can say it I think in less. You know, I sat in Working Group, and I want to say thank you to BRO, and to the Working Group, because this was not easy. I agree with Legislator Kennedy, we did not get a good budget handed to us. We look at the contract agencies that were cut dramatically that we had to restore. We also heard from the County Executive's Office, a couple of whoops-we-forgots that we had to fix, so that made it a little bit more harder for us to fix.

I look at the speculative revenue again that we have in here, the sale of the John J. Foley building, and we know that's not going to happen this year. So here we are, we've got more revenue coming in on our budget that we are not going to see from the sale of a nursing home that we don't even -- we don't even have a price on that. They're putting a 17-million-dollar price tag on that. You know, the experts that I talked to said 13, 15 tops. And, really, is that the right thing to do, because I don't know. If I built a house for 42 million dollars, I'm certainly not going to sell it for 13 or 15, and I think that's a really bad move to sell it. And, again, like John had said earlier, with the litigation right now, it's probably not going to happen.

Sales tax, the Police District tax again. We passed this with the intent last time for 2013 to hire 75 police officers. What did we get? We got 40. We cheated the taxpayers by not providing it. I can tell you, go to the Fifth Precinct and go to the Seventh Precinct, and I'd probably go to every single one of your precincts and ask the guys how much overtime they're working. The overtime has gotten so out of control. These guys are being asked to do overtime, that some of them are saying, "I'm getting too much overtime." Some of the overtime has doubled this year compared to last year, because we don't have enough police officers. So, if we're going to pass a Police District tax and we're going to say we're going to do it for 75 police officers, then hire that.

And, again, when it comes to the issue with the Parks Police, God bless you if you think you can get that done next year. I'll give you -- I'll give you a whole lot more credit, because I don't think you're going to be able to do that next year. And, again, we don't have funding for Parks Rangers. If we have the -- what's it called? If we shift the Parks Police over to the Police Department, we didn't look at funding for seasonal Park Rangers. So I don't know what we're doing with that.

We didn't get a good budget. We have tried to make this a better budget. There's a lot of items in here that I don't like; like I said, the sale of the nursing home, FRES and the VEEB. I think that -- and I'm hoping that you'll support the stand-alone, because I think it is in good faith. We should be negotiating in good faith. And how many of you here voted to privatize various entities within Suffolk County government? And now you're going to take a private entity and make it public. Doesn't make sense. So let's work with them. Let them do what they need to do in -- at the VEEB and the Fire Academy. Keep them private. Let them do what they're doing and make sure that they can get the necessary funds to improve their training.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

And, again, we have a budget that we keep talking about, you know, the mandate relief. We are going to have to build a new jail, another new jail, an addition. We can't afford it. We should be looking at John J. Foley, as much I don't want to, but we should be looking at that building to try and save money, maybe possibly a lease on that building, if it is going to be with another entity to run the nursing home or something, but I don't think that we should be selling that building.

When you talk, Al, about starting our budget today, I wish we could start today, but we don't know what kind of revenues we're going to have within the next year. And I think one of the things that we all continue -- we need to look at is the likes of Safety Net with the 60-plus million dollar price tag every year, and that's a mandate on us that we're continuing to have to pay that we should not be paying.

I sent a letter to the State asking them to do a residency restriction, because we have people coming from all over the country coming into New York for the Cadillac Safety Net and we can't afford it. Suffolk County taxpayers, it's not fair to them. And I'm not saying we shouldn't be doing the handouts, especially in tough times, but we really should be looking at it and saying, "How can we create some kind of mandate relief for the taxpayers here in Suffolk," or the State should pick up some more of the cost, but they've cut that.

So, like I said, there's a lot of things in this budget I don't particularly care for. Again, there is a stand-alone for VEEB; I'm hoping we can get the support for that. But, if I don't vote for this budget, then I get the other one, and I certainly don't like that, because Joe's Project will be cut, and I'm a big supporter of Joe's Project, as was Bill Lindsay. And I want to make sure for Bill Lindsay that that stays in place, and a lot of our agencies, Thursday's Child, who do a lot of great work.

So I am forced to vote for this budget whether I like it or not. I may not like it 100%, but I think this is a better choice. It's the lesser of two evils, and so I will support this budget to make sure that the contract agencies that do good work for us continue to do the good work for us. So, with that, thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Kate, I appreciate it. Legislator Gregory, quick. Two minutes?

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes, quickly. I think BRO before, and I failed to neglect to -- and neglected to thank those on the Working Group for their efforts. You know, as I mentioned earlier, you know, putting the budget together is a difficult process, it's not easy, but I certainly respect everyone's effort and time that they put into it. You know, I know tempers got heated a little bit. It's not -- I don't want to single anyone out, but as someone said, you know, alluded to, it's not some exclusive country club where we just divvy up the funds amongst ourselves. That is certainly not the case. It's an open process. I would venture to say that most bodies, Legislative bodies, it's a partisan process. The minority is not invited and not welcome into the process. We have members of the minority that participate and I'm grateful and thankful for that. Is it a perfect process? Absolutely not. But it's not a partisan process. Every Legislator has the ability to have input into the process, so I think that is excellent.

You know, to -- you know, I know Legislator Cilmi has -- you know, he has bills that he's put forth to make it more transparent. Like I said, it's not a perfect process, but I think it's a good process. And we're certainly not in a back room, you know, plotting and scheming to deceive the public. I think everyone comes there with clean hands. And I'm not saying you said that, Tom, I'm not saying that. I'm just saying let those in the audience and those that are listening know that --

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. CILMI:

You know --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Come on, hold on.

LEG. GREGORY:

-- you know, we're not meeting in the back room because of -- you know, we're doing some elusive scheme. I'm not --

LEG. CILMI:

Don't suggest that I --

LEG. GREGORY:

I'm not saying -- I'm not suggesting that you did, but just the mention of --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Tom did mention all the hard work we did in the Working Group, and so --

LEG. GREGORY:

Yeah. No, I know, I know. I'm just saying, because every time the words are mentioned --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Take a deep breath.

LEG. GREGORY:

-- "Oh, you're meeting in a private room," and, you know, it has like a nefarious connotation to it.

LEG. NOWICK:

I say we take the vote before we get any --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes. So, again, I just want to thank everyone for participating in the process.

LEG. NOWICK:

I make a motion.

LEG. GREGORY:

Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Let's go to the index, 2014 Budget Amendments that are -- Number One, Mandated Budget. Do you see it there? All the ones on the far left-hand corner under BA number. I'll make a motion to approve the Number Ones. Is that a proper motion the way it's worded?

MR. NOLAN:

Budget Amendment Number One.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second on the motion by Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. CILMI:

On the motion, just very quickly, please.

P.O. HORSLEY:

On the motion.

LEG. CILMI:

We received a new document earlier today. What's the difference between what we had received over the weekend and that new document?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. That's fair enough. Doc, do you want to go -- it's on Number Two, but do you want to just talk about it quickly so we can -- so it can be edified?

MR. LIPP:

It's not the first budget amendment, which is the mandated one, BA One, it's the second budget amendment, BA Two. And there were two omni-codes, DO -- well, DO 13 and DO 31, which were taken out, which were just related to Cornell.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So there were three separate pieces -- three separate stapled documents that we got during the course of today's meeting. All three of them relate to those two separate line items?

MR. LIPP:

Right. So the first, I believe, would be the index, which was changed because of that.

P.O. HORSLEY:

We'll work with the index.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. I have an index.

MR. LIPP:

Okay. The second would be the revised Budget Amendment Number Two, and the third would be the piece that was taken out on Cornell as a stand-alone. I believe that would be BA 12.

LEG. CILMI:

Which is revised Number 12.

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay? We're good? Okay. We have a motion and a second. Are there any other motions? We're all good? Okay. Roll call vote.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Not Present)

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

No.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

MR. LAUBE:

Thirteen (*Not Present: Legislator Muratore/Vacant Seat - District #8*).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. Budget Amendment Number One has passed. The second -- we're now going down to Page 2 of 5 of your 2014 budget amendment indexes. And I'll make a motion to approve BA Number Two.

MR. NOLAN:

Discretionary.

P.O. HORSLEY:

The omnibus Discretionary.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

On the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

On the motion.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

For Dr. Lipp. So, Robert, this is the discretionary portion of the omnibus budget. What degree does this reduce or increase discretionary spending from what the County Executive had proposed?

MR. LIPP:

I'll have to get to the file, if you'll bear with me for a minute.

P.O. HORSLEY:

I think it's 1.1, Robert, restored.

MR. LIPP:

I'm still looking, I'm sorry.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Was it about three-and-a-half million and they -- was taken out, and we put 1.1 back? I'm going off the top of my head, somewhere around there.

MR. LIPP:

No. The mandated and discretionary are convoluted, it's not that simple.

P.O. HORSLEY:

I might be, though.

MR. LIPP:

Okay. So there was a total increase of expenditures on the discretionary side of 8.8 million for 2014, if that's your question.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes. So the County Executive's proposed budget, versus the Work Group budget, there's 8.8 million dollars in additional discretionary spending?

MR. LIPP:

Correct, across all funds.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. And that was largely paid for through additional sales tax that the County Executive hadn't identified, as well as some additional revenues at Parking Violations Bureau?

MR. LIPP:

It's not that simple, because the biggest piece to the omnibus was the 32.8 million that we literally added in expenditures in the General Fund, because we took it from off budget to on budget.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So, for this 8.8 million dollars discretionary funding, it's obviously -- it's not paid for with additional tax increases, so --

MR. LIPP:

Correct. It's paid for there -- as you were saying, you know, there are some revenue enhancements totaling about 15 million sales tax, and ticket fines being the two large --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Not revenue enhancements. These are just identifying money that exists, right? We didn't change fees or --

MR. LIPP:

Right.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

-- increase the tax rates of any kind?

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. All right. So it's basically identifying money that was -- the County Executive hadn't identified in terms of reimbursables or sales tax coming in higher than we thought, those kind of, you know --

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

The added benefit of newer numbers, etcetera.

MR. LIPP:

Correct. Actually it's probably more like 13 million, because I had to add back the interfund transfers. I think they're mostly discretionary, but I'm not sure.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thirteen million in additional discretionary spending from what the County Executive proposed?

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. All right. We have a motion and a second on the --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Hold on. I wanted to --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Oh, I'm sorry. Oh, yes, Lou.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, if I could be recognized.

P.O. HORSLEY:

You can be recognized.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Mr. Presiding Officer.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you for your formality.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

It's appreciated.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I wanted to pick up on the spending also with Dr. Lipp. Not comparing it necessarily to what's recommended by the County Executive, because the County Executive had his set of priorities and we had ours, but what I'd like to know is whether or not, if the omnibus is in -- is adopted, whether or not the spending that would result for 2014 would be more, less, or equal to what happened in 2013 with respect to spending.

MR. LIPP:

Okay. So, basically, this conversation was brought up in the Working Group, and in the narrative to the recommended budget, there was reference to -- accurately, that the 2014 recommended budget was a little less than 1%, less than what was the 2013 adopted budget. And then, when we made our changes to the omnibus resolution, the question was, well, is it more or less? And I said, well, apples to apples. If we take it at the 32.8 million, which was also taken out of the recommended budget, then we wind up with a decrease that's .4% from the 2013 adopted budget.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So the conclusion would be, or the answer to my question would be that if we adopt the omnibus budget today and it goes into effect, assuming no vetoes, we would have a budget that would spend slightly less than what was adopted last year?

Special Meeting 11/6/13

MR. LIPP:

Excluding the 32.8 million dollars.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right, which we put back on budget. Okay. Thank you very much.
Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you for putting that on the record, that was a good point. Okay. We have a motion and second for BA Number 2. Roll call vote.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Not Present)

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

No.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

Fourteen. *(Not Present: Legislator Muratore/Vacant Seat - District #8)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

The motion passes. We have one and two. The third one is a stand-alone from Legislator Schneiderman and Hahn. Maybe the best thing to do is to have you explain this, Mr. Lipp. Dr. Lipp, the first one, Number 3.

MR. LIPP:

Okay. So this is adding positions for the -- I'm sorry. It's adding funding for positions in Environmental Quality in order to, for instance, check on both municipal and private sewer systems for water quality purposes, which is in Environmental Quality, and the offset is State -- sales tax -- I'm sorry -- and, of course, State Aid also, because there is some offsetting revenue from having this.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay? Everybody understand it? May I have a motion on the --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

LEG. HAHN:

(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

And on the record, if I might. When Robert is talking about additional sales tax, he's talking about in the current year, 2013. It is not projecting more sales tax for next year, but as the Working Group applied some five million dollars in additional sales tax, it's likely actually going to be more than that, that we realize in 2013 above what was projected, and it uses a portion of that, plus some other things. And, you know, the Health Department really needs these positions. They're understaffed in this area, and they're important Water Quality positions, so I hope it's supported.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

On the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

The question is how many positions? It was two, was it?

MR. FREAS:

Four.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Four? Four.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Maybe we can bring Mr. Freas up to discuss the specifics.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Dr. Lipp, are any of these stand-alones, and I want you to point them out to us if that is the case, that there are any conflicts?

MR. LIPP:

No.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Thank you. Mr. Freas.

MR. FREAS:

This stand-alone funds four total positions, two Engineers and two Sanitarians in water quality for a portion of the year. It also gives the Department a little bit more in their overtime, which is going to be -- I'm sorry, not overtime, temporary salaries. It's going to be targeted towards the Engineer Hiring Plan, which will allow them to identify Engineers they want to keep long-term.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

These are what, 36% reimbursable?

MR. FREAS:

That's correct.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

MR. FREAS:

On the salary side. There's a little bit more on the benefit, but, basically, it's almost all salary.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

On the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah, hang on. Craig, just what do they do?

MR. FREAS:

These Engineers, they do -- let me put it this way: They can do, because we're talking about Engineers and Sanitarians --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Right.

MR. FREAS:

-- they can do permitting, they can do inspections of sewer treatment plants, and other wastewater functions and pollution control functions.

P.O. HORSLEY:

These are non-County-owned plants, is that what --

MR. FREAS:

We actually inspect both. We -- I believe we have spoken and the Walters have come in here and also spoken about how we have a little bit more of a problem with the privately owned plants versus the municipal plants.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Legislator Gregory, you had a question? Would someone else -- oh, I'm sorry, I knew somebody else did. Okay. Dwayne.

LEG. GREGORY:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. I guess Jay or -- yeah, I guess, Jay, you're --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Cosponsor.

LEG. GREGORY:

This is not a new issue. There was a resolution earlier in the year that tried -- that attempted to address this, if I recall.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

There's been like three or four resolutions -- going back to Legislator Ed Romaine to try to fund these positions with various things including AFRF, various different permitting fees and things like that. These are desperately needed positions.

LEG. GREGORY:

Well, that's my next question. My recollection of that meeting, and, if I may through the Chair again, we had -- I forget his -- the gentleman's name. He came from the department that oversees this.

MR. FREAS:

Either Walter Dawydiak or Walter Hilbert, or both of them.

LEG. GREGORY:

Right. It wasn't Dawydiak, it must have been the other guy.

MR. FREAS:

Hilbert. He's the sewer guy.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay. And my recollection is that he would come to us. There was a change, and I forget exactly what the change was, if they needed any positions. Now, to my knowledge, I haven't heard that from them, so I'm kind of confused why this resolution is before us yet again.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Craig, I know you have talked with the Department. Can you go on record in terms of what the needs are?

MR. FREAS:

Well, I have -- I can, I believe, address at least some of your concerns, Legislator Gregory. If you recall, there was quite a comprehensive presentation done by Mr. Hilbert, with the assistance of Mr. Dawydiak, and I believe Barry Paul, the Deputy Commissioner, was there as well.

The shortage of Sanitary Engineers in the Department is a significant problem, and it has actually contributed to the increase in cycle time in permitting that we've seen over the last, I'm going to say three years, but we've seen it particularly this year. Last year, in an attempt to address the most critical problem, which were some of the layoffs and the loss of personnel with respect to sewer treatment plant inspections, the Department changed their inspection regime from -- basically from a regular inspection regime for all -- for all plants to an inspection -- an inspection regime that allowed them to look at plants that were more frequent violators or new plants on a more -- on a more frequent basis, and then plants who were more compliant on a -- on a less frequent basis. That, to an extent, has mitigated some of the problem that they've experienced.

The Department has consistently identified their engineering shortage, not only -- not just since the 2012 layoffs, but since 2010, which is when they really took the most hits because of -- because of the ERIP. If some of you remember the Early Retirement Incentive Program, they lost several Engineers to early retirement in 2010. Because the economy has not picked up as much, although it is starting to now, the lack of Engineers and Sanitarian to execute the inspections was less of a problem. Now it is becoming, they believe, more of a problem, and actually some of the revenue that will support other Health Department positions and arguably these positions is reflected in the budget, an increase in their inspection fees and fines.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay. Now, the -- we've had this debate multiple times over the past year, 18 months, whatever. Part of this, too, is the State's responsibility. There's a term that I'm forgetting, it begins with S. Safety?

MR. FREAS:

SPDES.

LEG. GREGORY:

SPDES, there you go. We took on that responsibility.

MR. FREAS:

We had the SPDES responsibility for a while. Basically, the State has not increased our reimbursement for the program in several years. They -- it's possible that it was increased like very incrementally, like 10,000 over the 125 that we get, or something like that, but -- excuse me. The revenue hasn't increased.

And Legislator Schneiderman was correct, this was -- we -- this problem was addressed, or an attempt was made to address it, I should say, in 2012 with a couple of Legislator Romaine's bills that restored staff. Some of the staff was actually restored through moving, at least Sanitarians, on moving them into 477. An additional bill, Legislator Schneiderman's, last year, which was sort of the carry-over for Mr. Romaine's bill, also attempted to address it, and because it didn't appear that it would move in -- through the budget amendment process in '13, I don't know conversations completely that Legislator Schneiderman had, but the Department was -- needed the positions and

thought they might be addressed, at least in some way, through the budget process in 2014.

LEG. GREGORY:

Now I made most, but not all, public hearings. And this will be my last question. I perhaps may have missed the Health public hearing. Was it brought up -- did they identify that this is something that they needed? Because if -- I would feel that if they needed it, it would have been in the budget. Was it in the budget and requested?

MR. FREAS:

It was in the budget -- it was in the budget request. I don't believe that Legislator Tomarken specifically identified this as a need. On the other hand, I also don't believe he identified the difficulty in the sale of Foley, the difficulty in the sale -- in the possibility that the jail was going to open later, rather than -- or sooner, rather than later, or the fact that the health centers might be open a little longer than the budget suspected either. You know, he's --

LEG. GREGORY:

Right, gotcha. All right. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator Gregory. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I've heard my colleague from the South Fork talk about the need for the water quality testing at sewer treatment plants. This is the first time I've heard about filling of four positions, though.

The troubling part, and I -- you know, and Kate just talked about the unfunded State mandates, if it's a State responsibility and the State is really decreasing the funding, it really -- we're just playing into their hands every time the State wants to sluff off their responsibilities and we pick up the tab for it. We're not doing what we're supposed to be doing, which is to tell the State, "Look, you're not taking care of your responsibilities. We're concerned about water quality. This is your responsibility and we're not going to" -- "either we're not going to pay for it and do it or we're not going to do it." So you have to meet with them and resolve that issue and not just say, "Well, we're going to hire more people and we'll do it," whatever.

So I can't -- and as far as the permitting goes, that to me is a completely different story, and if you need people -- the Health Department can't get permits out, that's a management issue there, and if they need people to do that, if they don't get permits out on time, it's, one, a safety issue, and it also, you know, hurts the economy. So those are two -- I think two separate issues.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

They're interrelated, because these people are involved in permitting as well.

And in terms of the State's responsibility, they reimburse 36%. So, if you add more people, they are reimbursing more money to us because there's -- that 36% is higher. So the State is doing it. Whether -- you know, we've tried to get the State to cover entire costs of this; they're not doing it. So, that's one more thing we can have our -- you know, our County Executive and the team go up to Albany and try to get higher reimbursement rates or full reimbursements, but we got to live with what we have right now. So we're paying -- you know, the State pays the 36%, we pay the balance, but these are really important.

If we're going to talk about expanding sewers and growing the economy and we're not going to do, you know, a good job in terms of monitoring the potential effluent of these facilities, I think we're going to -- we're going to spite ourselves. I think it's a real mistake. We know these positions are

Special Meeting 11/6/13

needed. We've had internal conversations with the Department. They need these positions, there's no question about it. And they're 36% reimbursable, so we're able to bring them on, you know, with only a portion of it being funded by the County, and I would urge the support of the stand-alone.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Thank you very much. I think we're -- Legislator Spencer.

LEG. SPENCER:

I think that anything that we can do to reach those goals. But I think my concern, being Chair of the Health Committee -- and last year, when we were looking at a lot of these things, I've had very intense conversations with the Commissioner back and forth with regard to vector control, public health nurses, a lot within the Division of that Department. And I asked very specifically during the budget hearing process and looking at their plan for monitoring and using decreased resources to be able to do this, and this is not a need the Commissioner has expressed or supported with me either privately or on the record. So think I'm -- I have a bit of a concern when I have a Commissioner and I ask very specifically what your needs are and he says, "Doc, I'm comfortable with it." So I think that -- I feel a little more comfortable when I would look at the Head, the Commissioner of that Department who has said, "I think the way that we're doing the selective monitoring is working," and it makes it a little harder for me to support.

I just wanted to put that -- so do you have any feedback from Commissioner Tomarken, and why isn't he involved?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let me ask Mr. Freas. Did you talk directly with Dr. Tomarken?

MR. FREAS:

I have not spoken directly about -- to the Commissioner about this issue.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you.

MR. FREAS:

Not to the Commissioner.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. All righty. I think we have everything that we need to vote. We have a motion and a second. Roll call vote on Number 3.

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

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No.

LEG. BROWNING:

Pass for now.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. MURATORE:

(Not Present)

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

No.

LEG. MONTANO:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

No.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

No.

LEG. STERN:

No.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No.

LEG. SPENCER:

No.

P.O. HORSLEY:

No.

MR. LAUBE:

Four. Oh, Browning. Sorry.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

MR. LAUBE:

Five. *(Not Present: Legislator Muratore/Vacant Seat - District #8)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

All righty. Budget Amendment Number 4, again, this is introduced by Legislator Schneiderman. Dr. Lipp, do you want to tell us what this is?

Special Meeting 11/6/13

MR. LIPP:

Sure. So this is what Legislator Schneiderman was talking about earlier in terms of the distribution of revenue sharing for town and village police departments. It increases the revenue sharing in 2014 by a little over three million. The offset, once again, is -- well, it's sales tax, but it -- yes, it's sales tax, period.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

It would bring the budget into compliance with the Charter.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Do we have a motion on --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to approve.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion's to approve; second by Legislator Gregory. There's a motion and second in place. Anyone -- Legislator Gregory.

LEG. GREGORY:

Just quickly. This is a measure that I've supported in the past. I have Amityville Village Police. I suspect it will end with the same fate that it has ended in the past, but, you know, I can't advocate against myself. I live in the Village of Amityville. This -- you know, they certainly seek, you know, a more equitable revenue scheme for the various Police Departments outside the Police District. So I will be supporting this measure. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. And I'd just like to add on that, that I think this is a worthy goal to bring equity to the fund. But, at this point in time, it would throw the entire budget off. I'm surprised that this is -- this can -- this is not in conflict.

MR. LIPP:

No. What it would do is the offset would be to increase sales tax in 2013 by a like -- by a like amount. And what the omnibus did is it increased sales tax in 2013 with a slight offset in 2014. So as long as the increase is in 2013, it's not a conflict, as far as we understand.

P.O. HORSLEY:

That's how we got around --

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. All righty. We have a motion and a second on the --

MR. LAUBE:

Legislator Horsley, could I just get a confirmation on the motion?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah. The motion was made by Legislator Schneiderman, seconded by Legislator Gregory.

MR. LAUBE:

Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

You're welcome.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

On the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

On the motion. Hang on now. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yeah. I'd like to echo what Legislator Gregory said. I mean, this is very important. The training is very important to the volunteer fire departments.

P.O. HORSLEY:

No, wrong one.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

This is the revenue sharing. I'm sorry.

LEG. BROWNING:

It's revenue sharing for the Police.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Revenue sharing for the Police.

LEG. BROWNING:

That's the next one.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Robert, while they're looking that up, is it really three million dollars in extra sales tax?

MR. LIPP:

Well, that would be up to Legislator Schneiderman to make a case.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Oh.

LEG. CILMI:

He's suggesting that there will be an additional three million dollars.

P.O. HORSLEY:

No. This is to close out the year, three million dollars.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Closing out this year, there'll be three million more than the five million more that Robert Lipp has already -- the Working Group had already anticipated.

P.O. HORSLEY:

So it's somewhat speculative, wouldn't --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Robert, is it a reasonable assumption?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, that's on paper, right? That's on paper.

*(*Laughter*)*

MR. LIPP:

Yeah, if this passes, it will definitely happen on paper.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Well put, Mr. D'Amaro.

LEG. KENNEDY:

We're going to go through that again? Come on let's go through that again.

LEG. NOWICK:

Let's vote.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. All right. All?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

On the motion. I will support it because -- and I don't see why, although I disagree why it's an offset, because if it's revenue sharing, it should be sharing the revenue and not saying this is extra revenue.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. But, you know, in the future, this issue, it does have to be resolved, and I agree with you on that, but okay. Let's roll call vote.

LEG. ANKER:

Wayne. Wayne.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Oh, whoa, whoa.

LEG. ANKER:

Just one more comment. Show me the money. That's what I want to see first, and then we can go look into that. But, if we don't have the money for sure, then how can we invest in this -- you know, this --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

A lot of the budget is speculative, you know.

*(*Laughter*)*

There's a lot of projections. All right? So you could say that to anything. You're projecting sales tax growth for next year at three percent. The County Executive projected it at 3.8%. There is a lot of speculation in a budget, you do your best guess.

Robert, you have the latest sales tax numbers. Is it reasonable to assume that instead of having five million dollars more than we had projected for 2013, that we'll have a total of eight million dollars more?

Special Meeting 11/6/13

MR. LIPP:

Well, first of all, it's seven million more and change in '13, offset by a decrease of two million and change in '14 to get to the five million and change.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So you would then have ten million more in '13 --

MR. LIPP:

Right.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

-- rather than seven million?

MR. LIPP:

There's a possibility.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Reasonable or not reasonable?

MR. LIPP:

I'd say plausible.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Thank you.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. ANKER:

Yeah, but -- all right.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'll take it.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. He's got "plausible" on the record. Let's -- I'm not sure. Let's go with a roll call vote and we'll decide this now.

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

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

No.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Not Present)

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. HAHN:

No.

LEG. ANKER:

No.

LEG. CALARCO:

No.

LEG. MONTANO:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

No.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. NOWICK:

No.

LEG. STERN:

No.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

No.

MR. LAUBE:

Four. *(Not Present: Legislator Muratore/Vacant Seat - District #8)*

P.O. HORSLEY:

All righty. Number 5, right? Okay. We're moving -- did a good job there, Legislator. Okay. The -- Number 5. Robert, do you want to tell us what Number 5 is about?

MR. LIPP:

So what this resolution does is it puts back VEEB for the full year. As you might be aware, on the recommended budget has VEEB in there for half a year. This would put it back for the full year and it would take out the 10 positions created in the Fire Training Unit.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Everybody know what this is? We're all good?

LEG. BROWNING:

I'll make that motion.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

P.O. HORSLEY:

We need a motion.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Mr. Chair, I'm going to make a motion, and with the motion, I'm going to ask that Commissioner Williams and Director Holly come up to address this.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Hang on a second. Let me get a motion and the second.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, I made the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion. Legislator Browning makes the second. We have a second on the motion. Chief?

LEG. CILMI:

Just very quickly, Mr. Chairman. Clerk, Mr. Clerk, I had asked Budget Review earlier in the week or -- yeah, I guess earlier in the week to list me as a cosponsor of this. They said to mention it on the floor, so if you could add me.

MR. LAUBE:

Will do.

LEG. CILMI:

I appreciate it. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

And you're on. Okay. Gentlemen, why don't -- why don't you come up and --

LEG. ANKER:

Tim, cosponsor.

LEG. KENNEDY:

-- sit at the table.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Kennedy wants you to sit at the table. Do we have to get another chair? All right. Gentlemen, tell us about where you want to go with this.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

I'd just like to --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Commissioner, welcome.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Oh, how are you doing? Welcome. I'd just like to bring up a point here. I know we're mentioning about negotiations and everything else. This particular bill right here, right now in my budget, there's the full amount of that money in my budget already. It's already in the budget. The first six months right now is -- we will be funding VEEB, because that was our agreement in good faith. We extended the current contract to June 30th of 2014. We have had two meetings with the VEEB Board. We've heard -- they've heard our concerns, we've heard their concerns. I have a meeting

Special Meeting 11/6/13

tomorrow with our Legal Department to start to put some of those concerns on both halves into the budget.

With this particular thing, by funding it for the whole year, I need to bring up a very important part we ran into this year also. We tried the contract negotiations this past year with the VEEB Board and we realized there's some communications problem. In the County of Suffolk here, which I know you're very much aware of, you can only extend the current contract six months. July 1st this year, 2013, Audit and Control stopped payments for the VEEB Board because we did not have a contract. We went out and we got a contract done in three days in 2013 in good faith.

If we do not reach a contract, which I anticipate we are working on right now, but if the -- this does happen again, if the -- some of the things that we'd like to see in the contract are not approved by the VEEB Board, which I don't anticipate that to happen, but it could happen, we could be sitting here July 1st with a contract agency funded for a whole year, and we can't pay them a dime after July 1st because they don't have a contract. That is my concern with this particular bill.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Chief?

DIRECTOR HOLLEY:

As the Commissioner said, we are in negotiations right now, and both of us feel very confident the negotiations will go forward to a conclusion.

By asking or having this resolution passed, which will give us the full year of funding, I have to develop a program, a schedule for the entire year, regardless of what my funding is. By putting this funding in, if we don't come to fruition on a new contract, the County would take over anyway, so that money would come back to the County for FRES to use it to run the Academy. I feel developing this schedule for the year, I need to know that I'm funded for the full year in order to put a schedule in place.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. I think -- you want to go back and forth on this or --

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

No, I really don't want to go back and forth on this, but myself and Bob, we get along well. But what I just want to mention is that, you know, we're working on -- they're working on a schedule right now for 2014, and they're working on the schedule right now and we are working together on it, oversight back and forth. And that's all I want to admit to here, so --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Mr. Chair.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

If I can.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Kennedy.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you. So, Commissioner, let me see if I can cut through the wheat and the chaff here. It sound like you're saying that you'd rather us not pass this budget amendment, and, Bob, you're saying at this point you would like us to pass the amendment; is that pretty much where we're at? What do you -- okay, Commissioner. What would -- I'm a sponsor on this, along with several of my colleagues. What would you suggest that I do or don't do? Would you like me to vote yes or no?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

I'd like you to vote no.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

I don't see the reason for it.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Thank you. Bob, what would you like me to do, vote yes or no?

DIRECTOR HOLLEY:

I would like to see you vote yes so I know I have a full year's funding.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. I have been pretty vocal with this with both you gentlemen. Commissioner, you indicated that there is -- you've had two meetings, and those two meetings have been since we had the budget hearings, roughly what, two, three weeks ago? When was the least time you met?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

We met last week, and I personally have an internal meeting tomorrow with Legal.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. When are you scheduled to sit down or with Director -- of whoever you negotiate -- are you -- Bob, are you doing it, or is it Mr. Sanok? Who's negotiating on behalf of VEEB.

DIRECTOR HOLLEY:

Well, it is myself, the President, Vice-President and two other members of the VEEB Board --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

DIRECTOR HOLLEY:

-- who are discussing -- who are having negotiations with the Commissioner.

LEG. KENNEDY:

When are you next scheduled to meet?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Our next conversation is going to be on this Friday just between myself and Bob. That was the agreement last week with the Board Members there that were present; that we did offer to have a meeting on Friday just to bring you up to date on what were some of the concerns, if there were some, I heard tomorrow, what is elected to do so me and Bob can talk by phone tomorrow, Friday, or in person.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Among the whole myriad of things that were presented, one of the most pertinent things I think was the field trainings. Do we -- do we have a meeting of the minds here? Are the two of you in concurrence about field trainings?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Yes. They have increased them. We've talked to them. They -- we have a meeting of the minds on the field trainings.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So that item is off the table.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

In my mind it is.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Good, excellent. Curriculum update, and, in particular, getting it online. I believe Firefighter I is online now, and is Firefighter II that is almost online?

DIRECTOR HOLLEY:

Firefighter II is online right now. We rolled that out first because it's a smaller program, using that as a pilot.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

DIRECTOR HOLLEY:

It's got two weeks left to run. It's been a huge success.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Good.

DIRECTOR HOLLEY:

Firefighter I will be online in January.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Great. Do you agree with that, Joe?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Yes. You know, as far as the online training, we're leaving that to the Fire Academy. And they've been giving us reports on that, and I agree, they're moving along. We're looking at more vision for next year.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So you want language in the contract, or that's on the table, it's not even negotiable?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

It's going to be in the contract that we're going to have some -- offer some classes online. That will definitely be one of the items on the list that we'd like to see --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Good.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

-- in the Academy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. What's left to decide, then?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

The only thing that's left to decide, we're going to talk about what class is given next year. The big item still has to be, which I'm not going to get into publicly here, but is the administrative cost. You know, there just needs to be a debate on what we consider administrative costs and what they consider administrative costs. And I'm sure, sitting down across the table, we're going to come to some type of conclusion that both of us will be -- in the County we have.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. But you two both agree that in 2014, the configuration on the admin side is going to be fewer bodies than what we've had now, correct? We're shedding one Admin III and one Admin IV that was filled in 2013, it's not going to be filled in 2014.

DIRECTOR HOLLEY:

That's correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. And you agree, Joe?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Yes. We see the decrease in admin costs. We see there is a reporting that somebody's going to be retiring, not being replaced on a full-time basis. I've let this be known publicly, and everything else, is that I do see we're getting good cooperation off the VEEB Board. We are sitting down, we are talking. They are coming back to us, they're going back and forth. That's the purpose of my meeting tomorrow, to put some of those ideas on paper and then, you know, show it to people I have to show it to, to make sure we're all comfortable.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. All right. So it sounds to me like maybe like, you know, 60, 70% of the way there?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

I imagine so.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

You know, there's an awful lot of people I need to talk to also to get their --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. That's fine, that's enough. All right. So I made the motion to approve.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator Kennedy. Legislator Gregory.

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Oh, Legislator Hahn. I've got a couple of more, yet, too.

LEG. GREGORY:

Thank you. I just -- Joe, Commissioner Williams, I just want to understand what I think you said. So there's a six-month contract. The contract is due to expire in June, so July 1st we wouldn't have the ability to pay?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

That's what happened this year, Legislator. Right now, we have a one-year contract. What happened last year, between January to June, we were working on a contract with the Vocational Education Board. There was a different Executive Director and a different attorney at the time, also.

What happened, we had brought across some concerns that we wanted to see in the new contract, and we got nowhere with the two individuals that we were dealing with. When we were making the decision back in the summertime that maybe the County would take over, we announced it even that way, we heard from the VEEB Board members that they were not aware of that existing offers that we had before.

So what happened in July, on July 1st, unbeknownst to us, we didn't realize that they were getting their checks for their payments. July 1st, Chief Holley received a phone call from Audit and Control, his Treasurer did, advising him that they could not send anymore checks to them because we were still operating off the 2012 contract, which you can extend the contract by a maximum of six months. So what we did, we signed the 2013 contract in four days. In the meantime, half the year was already gone, we were working on 2012. So now the current contract we have right now runs out December 31st, 2013, but we're legally allowed to operate on that -- under them for a maximum of six months, which would take us to the end of June. And what happens is that I anticipated they were going to come to resolve before then, but that some outside -- that all these talks fell apart. We could not pay them after July 1st unless we had a 2014 contract in place.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay. So you kind of answered my next question, because it was my understanding that the contract expired in January. So you're saying it expired in July.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

No. What happens is that the 2013 contract that we're operating under now expires December 31st of this year or January 1st.

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

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Yes. What happened is, the contract you are talking about is the 2012 contract that technically had an end date of December 31st, 2012, but we are allowed to operate under that until -- actually for six months.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay. So that leads to my next question, because that was my understanding, so you assume that they wouldn't be getting paid for 12 months. So -- but it was only really six months that they were technically getting paid probably that they shouldn't have because it expired?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

No, they were allowed to get paid. What happens is you are allowed to have a contract -- the County lets you have a contract in place and you can extend it up to six months, which what happened in 2012 the contract got extended until we sign the new contract.

LEG. GREGORY:

Got you. Okay.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

We never signed that new contract, we never got to that point with them, so we could not go past July 1st, 2013. That's where the problem came in with the payments. So what we did, we regenerated the 2012 contract just the way it was to get through the rest of the year and put the 2013 date on it. So technically the contract they signed in July was really their operational contract for all of 2013.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay. And, Chief Holley, you certainly bring up an excellent point that, you know, you're being asked to put forth a full year schedule and you're not sure what your position is going to be for the remaining six months of 2014. I understand your position, but I also understand the County's position where -- I mean it's tenuous, where they want to, you know, they want to negotiate with you, but be prepared that in case those negotiations fall apart that it's in the budget for the transition. It sounds like you're further along than I think any of us, or at least I'll speak for myself, may have thought. I would like to see that progress move along faster.

I won't support this standalone today but -- because I don't think it's necessary. I think if in March or April we see that things aren't going and they, you know, that the negotiations aren't being -- people aren't negotiating in a fair manner and we need to extend it for your benefit, I think we can do that. We don't have to do that right now. Maybe March, April. So I would like -- so I guess what I'm telling you is I would like to see significant progress by March or April. If not, if someone brings forth another memo -- legislation like this I would be inclined to support it.

I want to see both you of you negotiate, you know, with the intentions of coming to an agreement. We can't have the academy in limbo. There are many organizations that are relying on your training and we should have a full scale program in place. So again, I won't be supporting it today, but I will consider it in the future.

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. Commissioner Williams, I want to ask you a question. You're currently doing what you're supposed to be doing, and that is negotiating a contract for the County of Suffolk, keeping the County of Suffolk's best interest in mind. And the proposal put forth by the County Executive is to fund this particular contract agency for six months as a sign of good faith, that hopefully within the next few weeks or months an agreement can be reached.

I am not in favor of passing this standalone similar to what Legislator Gregory had said. I don't think we need to do this right now. What I do want to see happen is to put you as the person negotiating on behalf of Suffolk County residents in the best negotiating position I can, and I think as we would do with any contract agency, they need to know that until we come to terms and until you're satisfied that the contract is in the best interest of Suffolk County residents, we're not prepared to fund it. So I am not going to support this particular amendment.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

Do you feel that if -- I mean, you've already stated that you're not in favor of this amendment also, if I understand right. Now, we all want the training to take place, we want the VEEB Board to succeed, or if we're doing it by County in-house we want that to succeed as well. But do you think it hinders you or helps you to have the funding in place for the entire year?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

I honestly think that it would hinder me in my negotiations only because then it would force us into -- if we didn't reach an agreement by July 1st, I would be forced into signing an agreement that may not be in the best interest of the County.

LEG. D'AMARO:

That's correct and I feel exactly the way you do. And this is not anything against the fine work that's done by the VEEB Board or the individuals who have run it or who are there and are dedicated, and I appreciate that. But the fact of the matter is I can't imagine passing this resolution to undercut your position while you're sitting at a negotiating table trying to cut the best deal that you can, as the VEEB Board will do also as a contract agency. You are trying to cut the best deal you can for the residents of Suffolk County. So I am not going to support this.

Should there be negotiations in good faith on both sides, and I'm sure there will be, and should you come to terms, we can always put the funding in. The funding is not even the issue. This is not needed to be done right now. In fact, it's counterproductive, I believe, to the County's position. I'm not going to support it.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator. Legislator Schneiderman, did you want to speak?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No, I do because, you know, I fundamentally disagree with Legislator D'Amaro on this in terms of good faith. Commissioner Williams, you are negotiating not for a six-month, they've already got the six month agreement, right? You've got a contract with VEEB for the next six months.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

No, I don't. The contract I got with VEEB ends December 31st. It is -- it automatically could be extended for six months.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. And the intention is to extend it for six months; is that correct?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

That is our agreement that we --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

And you also are in negotiations with VEEB for a one or two year extension beyond that. Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

That is correct.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So that is what we're talking about, not the six month, but the extension, the year or two years beyond that. And I believe that the issues that you have identified have to do with oversight, administrative costs, training levels and there may be a few other things. You have conveyed to me that you are optimistic in terms of how those discussions are going. Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

That's correct and I stated before I feel those negotiations are going very well. I think that we could reach some type of agreement, but I have --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

So you do believe that we will -- we will likely reach an agreement that has VEEB continue in this training capacity beyond July. Is that fair?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

I think -- I will believe that when we sign the contract. I believe right now that we are negotiating in good faith --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, if you are negotiating in good faith, the belief must be that you will reach an agreement. And if you do reach an agreement we will need to have VEEB funded. Now, if you don't reach an agreement we can always do a budget amendment that shifts the money so that FRES can do it through a different agency or in-house. But to me, if you're going to negotiate with VEEB with the hope that they will continue on as the training entity, then they ought to be funded in the budget. To not put it in to me would be to negotiate in bad faith. You know, we've seen this before where things weren't in the budget, they were only funded for half a year, whether it's salaries or operations of certain facilities, and we know the trouble it's caused. To me, there's no budgetary impact. The money is there, it's just in a different line. Move it over so it's available to VEEB should those talks prove fruitful, and the indications are that they are likely to be fruitful, that everything is progressing in good faith. So to me the right thing, the good faith thing to do is to put the money back in there for VEEB for the full year. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator. Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

Sorry, I kind of forgot what I was --

P.O. HORSLEY:

You don't have to.

LEG. HAHN:

No, I know I don't have to, but this is an issue that is important to me. Are you feeling -- this is to the Chief. Are you feeling like the negotiations are going well?

DIRECTOR HOLLEY:

To be very frank, the negotiations so far have just been conversations between the Commissioner, myself and the VEEB Board because we do not have anything concrete to look at.

LEG. HAHN:

I feel like we probably shouldn't negotiate in public, but I was contacted by my -- early on, so almost two years ago, by my local departments wanting more training. So I think the gist of this is we need to get to a place where we have more training opportunities and less administrative costs. And I don't know -- this is very difficult for me because I don't want to vote on one side and it appears like I'm not supporting the other side and vice versa.

This is -- we want the VEEB to continue. We want the VEEB to give the departments eight training sessions like they used to have in the -- not the classroom training, but the hands on training. We want to get there. We need to -- we've lost State dollars. We clearly have high costs. You clearly

Special Meeting 11/6/13

are in a completely different position then, you know, there was a previous individual there, you're new. You're new to this, you've shown a complete willingness to find other revenues, to look outside the box, to get us on-line with classroom training so that we can offer more or offer more hands on training. You've talked about reducing positions, you know, we're feeling very good about the VEEB right now and we want to have -- we want to show that. But we also don't want to say you've got it forever and so you don't need to come to the table. And so any which way we go right now, you know, we don't want to send one message or the other message. It's kind of -- we're in a very difficult spot and I'm having a hard time with this, and I don't know that what I just said helped at all, but I'm sorry about that.

DIRECTOR HOLLEY:

If I may. Commissioner Williams and myself have had numerous conversations and this is not antagonistic in any means. We both have the same goal. He's looking for more training for the firefighters and that is my only goal. As far as the eight drills, we never really did eight, we did seven, which is what we're back to, but if I can give ten, I will give ten. That's why, as you referred to, I've looked for additional revenue streams. We now have a Fire Academy Foundation who is working with us and probably going to be doing some great things for us next year. All of this comes into play and the only goal we have is to keep the firefighters trained and safe in this County, and we've been doing that, the VEEB Board has been doing that for 71 years, and it's my goal to make sure that they continue doing it into the future.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Let's negotiate the contract now.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Kara, are you done? Very good. Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. So we have sat here for a long time and I think a lot has been said. But I'm not hearing -- I haven't yet heard a guarantee from FRES if this now falls under the County under FRES, that there's going to be a guaranteed eight trainings every year for all the fire departments. Are we getting a guarantee that if FRES takes over there's going to be eight trainings a year?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Well, with all due respect, what I would like to say right now, with all due respect to you, ma'am, is that you're asking me to negotiate in good faith and then you're asking me what I'm going to do when I take over. I'm not going to discuss when I'm going to take over, in all due respect. We're going into this negotiation right now with the Fire Academy in every good faith. For me to sit here and tell you how I'm going to run the Fire Academy, I think that's -- I can't answer that question.

LEG. BROWNING:

Well, I think if you were going to be running it in six months you would have to have something in place, that you would have to have some kind of an alternate plan. And I know that that's one of the major reasons why there is a lot of criticism of the Fire Academy, that there's not enough training, and so therefore, you know, the County could do a better job. And again, I'm sitting here at this horseshoe and we've talked about health centers and privatizing our health centers and privatizing the nursing home and privatize, privatize. And here we are, we have a private entity that we're now going to make it public and put it now into the hands of Suffolk County government. And do I have faith that Suffolk County government will do a better job? Not really. I really don't. I think that there should be the continued negotiations. I think things have moved along. From what

Special Meeting 11/6/13

I can see, there is a person who is retiring and I'm seeing something like a \$90,000 savings, is that right, Bob?

DIRECTOR HOLLEY:

(Shook head yes).

LEG. BROWNING:

Already as it stands. I mean, how much more savings -- what's the total savings that you can realize over the next year or two?

DIRECTOR HOLLEY:

Well, our office Clerk is retiring. Her salary is in the \$76,000 range, with benefits would probably be a \$90,000 savings. Myself, my Deputy Director and the Treasurer are freezing our salaries. The Clerk's that work there operate under -- operate parallel to the AME contract, so Civil Service. They would get their step raises. But we are exempt employees so we're freezing our wages. There are other savings with consolidation, putting classes on-line, which will give us more training dollars that we can use both on the field and in the classrooms out at the firehouses.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. And the bottom line is, I mean, I have talked to some of the fire departments who tell me, you know, sometimes that, especially if you go to the East End. I mean, Al and Jay, their fire departments are all the way out on the East End. I mean, they're creating these small training facilities in their own areas so that they don't have to drive to Yaphank. I don't know about the Legislators on the West End who have training facilities now on the West End, but they don't want to drive to Yaphank. They're volunteers, they have jobs. Some of them have one and two jobs, three jobs. They can't all make it to Yaphank for their training so they're doing a lot of their own training at their own facility. So, you know, whether we're going -- I don't see that we're going to get that guaranteed eight trainings a year for each fire department because I know that travel is an issue for many of them.

And again, why are we sitting here talking about making it a public entity now when there's been so much conversation here about privatization with this Administration, so it don't make sense. I'm asking you to support this and to keep it private as it was. Let the negotiations go on. I think they've done some good savings and I know there's going to be more coming forward.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Alrighty. Thank you very much, Legislator Browning. Legislator Cilmi, you got a quick one I understand.

LEG. CILMI:

I do have a quick question for the Commissioner. So I guess I'm struggling to just understand whether or not there's a harm in being prepared budgetarily for what seems to be the eventuality that this is going to get worked out in some way.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

Well, that is our hope that it's happening, you know, and this is not derogatory towards the Fire Academy, but all the negotiations -- we have a meeting tomorrow, but by the same token I have asked for certain information off the VEEB Board, which I never got in writing. The same even with the people that are leaving, things like that. So, you know, we're going back and forth. I also -- we've asked this question even of our budget department, that if we sign a contract we can do another budget mod and just move that money over back again.

LEG. CILMI:

So -- but we're going through our budget process now, so aside -- you know, if you set aside the negotiating part of this whole equation because, you know, I agree you don't want to get into that here. What's the harm in setting aside the funding?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:

I look at it that the funding is there already. The exact amount of money that we would give VEEB is assigned to my budget area right now, and what we did, they split the half a year, the first six months, that's going -- we acknowledge the fact we're going to pay that to VEEB. The other half of the money is encumbered in my budget, labeled under fire training I believe it says. So the full amount is already there. It isn't any less money for the County running it, it isn't any more money for the County if it had to run it, it isn't more money if the VEEB runs it. So the exact penny, the exact money is already sitting in my budget line.

LEG. CILMI:

Except that it's the will of some of the members of this body from a policy point of view that we do continue to move forward with VEEB, and if that's the will of the majority of this body, and I can't say that it is, it seems to me that we should prepare budgetarily for that. And if for some reason negotiations don't work out and you come to us and say, "Look, it kind of all fell apart, here's what's going on," and we, you know, we say, "Okay, well I guess there's no turning back at this point", then we can switch the budget lines, if you will. But I think -- from my point of view it makes sense to just be prepared with the hope that you are able to come to an agreement between the County and VEEB. In my opinion, that's the better way to go.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay? Legislator, thank you very much. Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yeah. Mr. Chair, I'm going to try to wrap this up and let's move the question because the hour is late and we have to move on.

P.O. HORSLEY:

There you go. Thank you.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I appreciate you two gentlemen being here. Commissioner, I appreciate the fact -- actually your department and the Executive's Office brought to light what was something that I guess in my opinion my appointees were not dealing with. But I'm going to go back to the fact that Legislator Cilmi kind of raised this issue, the VEEB Board is a legislatively created board. Actually, it is a board that was created by the Suffolk County Board of Supervisors, our predecessors, and so I'm very much supportive of that board continuing as it is now, which is a Legislative appointment. You are our appointment through the Exec's Office to administer through FRES and you stood before us and you got a confirmation and on you've gone. But when it comes to education I feel more comfortable with the appointees that are there by virtue of this body, and I think that when we talked before we kind of indicated we got about 70 or 80% concurrence, the balance of negotiations, in my opinion, are things that are fixed costs, and we've spoken about them before.

Tom DiNapoli doesn't send him a letter and say, "Would you like to pay this much or would you like to pay that much?" He sends him a bill which he's going to get in about two weeks. When it comes to NYSHIP, NYSHIP doesn't say, "Would you like to pay this much or would you like to pay that much" for the current employees and for the 16 retirees who, by the way, if VEEB disbands come July one, will be out of coverage and God knows what they'll have.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

So the certainty that we're saying here we want from a policy perspective I think transcends this notion of negotiation. And I think from a policy perspective it's prudent to put the funding in, connect the dots, get a document that's a contract. You get the measure and degree of certainty you need for the training to be put in place on the behalf of the 11,000 firefighters, and he's a new guy that showed good faith. So I'm going to renew my motion to approve and I'm going to ask the body to support it.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Thank you very much, Legislator Kennedy. That is the last speaker we have. Do we have a motion and a second? Oh, Mr. Vaughn, do you want to quick --

MR. VAUGHN:

Yes, sir. I promise I will keep it quick.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

MR. VAUGHN:

The only thing that we would ask this body to consider is the following. One, the resolution as it stands doesn't add any money to the budget. It simply takes money from one line and puts it in a different line, so the funding is there. The ability for us to continue to negotiate in good faith, that is what we are talking about and that is what we find most important, and that's why we think that the budget needs to stay the way that it was adopted in the omnibus.

We don't want to undercut our ability to negotiate this. The -- we have made a pledge to negotiate in good faith for six months. At the end of -- if during that time VEEB or anybody else feels that we have not done our duty, not done our diligence in negotiating in good faith, there will be at least two opportunities for this body to introduce budget amendments to say, "Hey, you guys aren't doing what you committed to do." And that will take place before June, before the funding runs out, as it is currently there. The money is in the budget. Just let us negotiate, please.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Vaughn. We appreciate your comments as well as the Administration. All right, roll call vote. Let's get going.

*(*Roll Called by Renee Ortiz, Chief Deputy Clerk*)*

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Absent).

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

No.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

No.

LEG. STERN:

No.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No.

LEG. SPENCER:

No.

P.O. HORSLEY:

No.

MS. ORTIZ:

Nine (*Vacant Seat - District #8*).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Close.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Very good. All righty. We're moving on to Number 6.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Mr. Chair, one of our members has to depart.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Oh yes, absolutely. Thank you.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Can I ask that we take 12 out of order?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you for bringing that up.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Actually, I got to depart, too.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Well, we don't want to lose you, John.

LEG. BROWNING:

I'll second that.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Motion to take it out of order by Legislator Kennedy, seconded by Legislator Browning. What we're taking is ***Number 12 (This resolution corrects the activity names of certain Cornell Cooperative Extension programs to reflect specific program titles and reverses the transfer of the CCE Family Health and Wellness program (JHUI) from the Department of Health Services to the Department of Economic Development and Planning as the core mission is more consistent with Health, and the transfer could jeopardize 36% Article 6 reimbursement)*** out, that is the funding for Cornell Cooperative Extension. Okay we have a motion and a second. On the motion I have an understanding that we have a recusal. Legislator Krupski, want to state your recusal?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. I did receive an opinion earlier this year from Suffolk County Ethics Board, and based on that opinion I will recuse myself on any budget amendments or budget matters relating to Cornell Cooperative Extension, and I have filed the appropriate paperwork with the Presiding Officer and the Board of Ethics.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. So we have a recusal and we have a motion to approve. No, we don't. Who wants to make the motion?

MS. ORTIZ:

Just on the motion to take it out of order.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Where is this?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Number 12.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Number 12. Why don't we have -- Doc, you want to tell us about what this is about?

Special Meeting 11/6/13

MR. LIPP:

Well, my last name is not Spencer, but I'll try.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Sorry.

MR. LIPP:

That's okay. What this does is it moves Cornell's Health and Wellness Program back to the Health Department, which it is in this year. The recommended budget moved it to Economic Development and Planning. That's number one. Number two, it corrects the names. Some of the activity names were just called Cornell Cooperative. Instead, it actually defines what it is, the name of the program, like the Marine Program or Ag and Horticulture Program, etcetera.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Are we all set?

MR. LIPP:

Those are all technical corrections.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. KENNEDY:

On the motion, Mr. Chair.

LEG. ANKER:

Cosponsor.

P.O. HORSLEY:

On the motion.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Robert, does this budget -- does this amendment just change titles? Does it increase or decrease the budget or is it budget neutral.

MR. LIPP:

It's budget neutral. It's just technical corrections.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. All right? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. It has been approved.

MS. ORTIZ:

Sixteen. *(Absent - Legislator Muratore; Vacant Seat - District #8).*

P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you. We're going back up to *Number 6 (Adds \$85,000 in 2014 to the Legislature's fees for services budget line to fund lobbying efforts in order to represent the County's interests relative to public assistance mandates at the State level, which is offset by an increase in revenue from County Clerk Fees)*. Dr. Lipp, would you like to describe what number six is?

MR. LIPP:

Sure. This is a resolution that adds \$85,000 in the Legislature's fee for service line to fund lobbying efforts to represent the County's interest into what Legislator Cilmi was alluding to go earlier in terms of mandated Public Assistance Programs, and it would be paid for, the offset would be -- in the Budget Review Office report we identify that Clerk fees, County Clerk fees could actually be raised.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay.

MR. LIPP:

Revenue, that is.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Everybody understand this?

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes and no. Tom? Can we have the sponsor?

P.O. HORSLEY:

Sure.

LEG. CILMI:

So I wanted to find a way in the budget to deal with some of these issues. I think there's potential for savings in these programs and, in fact, if you look at attachment number one, it lists three specific areas where there might be savings and then talks about -- generally about other programmatic savings, but it has to do with waste, fraud and abuse and some other things. Robert might be able to better explain to this body exactly what those savings -- what those proposed savings are, but suffice to say that in working with Budget Review on this, they believe that the potential savings here is reasonable to expect if we were to make an effort at it, and it amounts to about nine million dollars in all total if we were to see this savings, at least. So it sets aside \$85,000 for a lobbyist or for lobbying efforts I should say, just to basically get it into the budget that we look at this.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right.

LEG. GREGORY:

(Raised hand).

LEG. BROWNING:

When you talk about lobbying, I mean, who are we talking about? You got something in mind? I mean, somebody's going to go Upstate? Because I'll lobby myself. I've gone there three times already.

LEG. CILMI:

Well, I would join you.

LEG. D'AMARO:

(Raised hand).

LEG. CILMI:

I would join you, but I think we need somebody dedicated to addressing these issues. You and I going up and whoever else going up is one thing, but if we had somebody specifically dedicated to looking at this we might be more successful.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay.

LEG. CILMI:

Whether it be an employee or somebody who we contract with.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. I think I have a growing list of people that want to speak on this, but maybe what we might want to start with, do we have a motion on this?

LEG. CILMI:

I'll make the motion to approve.

P.O. HORSLEY:

We have a motion to approve. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. BROWNING:

I'll second it. I guess if it's something that we can't do or it's not going to work out it's no loss.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. We have a motion and a second on the motion. I guess that we have to go through all the speakers. Legislator D'Amaro, I think you're first.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, just very briefly. I want to understand the amendment. This is to pay for services, whether it's in-house or consulting, for efforts up in Albany I would assume, to talk about public assistance mandates. Is that right? The problem I have is that -- how did you arrive at the 85 -- through the Chair, how did you arrive at 85,000?

LEG. CILMI:

Just a reasonable guess. We had a certain amount of money through -- that was available to us through what Budget Review believes to be will be increased revenue in Clerk's fees and we took a portion of that and used it towards this.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I think it's a good idea. However, I think that I don't think 85 million would get you where you want to be, let alone 85,000. I understand what you are trying to do here and it dovetails in to our discussion previously that, you know, we can use mandate relief and I agree with you, but I think this is a wholly inadequate amount of money for the lobbying effort that you would need for Suffolk County to succeed to get someone to even take a phone call, to be honest with you. So I'm not going to support it. I do support the concept, but I just don't think it's sufficient. I don't think it gets you where you want to be.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. CILMI:

Well, you may be right. Through the Chair, if I may respond.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Sure.

LEG. CILMI:

You may be right, Legislator D'Amaro, but you may be wrong, we don't know. And if we set aside the money, which according to Budget Review is avail -- you're singing a Billy Joel song in the background.

MR. LIPP:

Exactly.

LEG. CILMI:

If we set aside that funding and we don't -- we can't find an appropriate use for the funding itself, then it won't get spent and it's sort of no harm no foul. However, if we can find an appropriate use for that funding, whether it's enough or not, \$9 million is enough money for me to spend 85,000 to see if we can't make a difference.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. I don't disagree with that, but we are -- I'm sure we're doing that right now as we speak and I just -- I don't see how this is going to help that effort.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Who else? I saw some hands. DuWayne -- Legislator Gregory.

LEG. GREGORY:

Thank you. I want to thank you, Tom -- Legislator Cilmi, for your efforts in looking at this and your concern. Some of these issues I actually attempted to address myself, particularly I guess the third one, with undercover -- of custodial deadbeats. I had spoken to Acting Commissioner O'Neill earlier this year to revisit that issue. He told me it wasn't as a viable issue as it was three years ago. I had put money in the budget for this because there used to be a team of individuals that would go out and look for these people. The reason why it's not such a -- it's beneficial to us, the reimbursement rates have changed, they have lowered, so it's more costly to do that.

As far as Medicaid fraud, we have, excuse me if I forget the name, I think it's the SIU Unit, they do that. The State IG's office cherry picks the good cases so they can get the money. I don't think that's going to change. So -- and I just question in general hiring lobbyists to do our work, to advocate for us, particularly when we could use that money to -- we just debated earlier hiring Sanitation Engineers. There are other uses where that money can go.

And my last point I want to make is there's an organization that came to this body, I want to say five years ago, four years ago, Legislator Browning and I spoke about it not too long ago, where they would look into a lot of these areas that you're concerned about and it won't cost us a dime. Actually they're paid out of the savings that they generate. They were in -- they worked in Nassau County. They approached DSS a few years ago and there wasn't an interest for some reason, but certainly that I think would be potentially a more viable use where the County wouldn't have to expend any funds. So I will not be supporting this measure today. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Alrighty. Anyone else who would like to speak on this? I think we're good. Should we just have a vote on this? Let's do a roll call.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

(*Roll Called by Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk*)

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

(Not Present).

LEG. MURATORE:

(Absent).

LEG. HAHN:

No.

LEG. ANKER:

No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Pass.

LEG. CALARCO:

No.

LEG. MONTANO:

(Not Present)

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes to mandate relief.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

No.

LEG. STERN:

No.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No.

LEG. SPENCER:

No.

P.O. HORSLEY:

No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No.

MS. ORTIZ:

Four (*Vacant Seat - District #8*).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Moving along, ***Number 7 (Adds \$50,000 in 2014 to fees for services in the Legislature for a LEAN Pilot Program, which is offset by an increase in revenue from County Clerk fees)***. Dr. Lipp, want to talk about Number 7?

MR. LIPP:

Sure. So this would add \$50,000 in Legislature's fee for service line for a LEAN pilot program in 2014 and the offset, just like in the previous case, was identified Clerk fee revenue.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Legislator Cilmi, you want to talk to us about LEAN a little bit? I know you go on.

LEG. CILMI:

Sure. I won't, I won't go on very long. I will simply say that I believe that there are opportunities to make our government more efficient through the use of outside assistance who specialize in just that, in making processes more efficient, and I think as we continue to struggle with ever limited resources that's -- it becomes more and more important to try and be able to do more with less. So -- and to provide services to our residents with the limited resources that we have. So this would take \$50,000, again, from the additional Clerk's fees that we expect for that purpose and this consultant theoretically would aid our Performance Management Staff in finding some efficiencies in our government.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Thank you very much, Legislator. I don't have a motion on this as yet. Would anyone like to make a motion?

LEG. CILMI:

I'll make a motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Cilmi makes the motion. Is there a second on the motion? Is there a second on the motion? For lack of a second, the motion fails. All righty. ***Number 8 (Creates one new Clerk Typist position in the Department of Finance and Taxation to process tax certioraris, which is offset by an increase in revenue from County Clerk fees.)*** Dr. Lipp, you want to tell us what Number 8 is?

MR. LIPP:

Sure. This was something that was discussed during every budget committees by the Treasurer and it was a request to add one new Clerk Typist position in the Treasurer's Office in order to process tax certioraris and there wouldn't be a -- and the offset once again would be Clerk fees.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Thank you very much. Is there anyone who wanted to be heard? Do we have a motion?

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. CILMI:

I'll make a motion and if I could speak on the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Let's see if we have a second on the motion.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes, I'll second it.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Legislator Kennedy makes the second on the motion.

LEG. CILMI:

And if I could, through the Chair, ask our Treasurer to come up.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Oh, sure.

LEG. CILMI:

I see Angie has been listening intently in the audience.

MS. CARPENTER:

Oh, it was fun.

LEG. CILMI:

But basically if I could lay the groundwork here. The County sacrifices considerable money in interest payments to those who seek tax certioraris, and if I'm not mistaken, in 2012 I think we spent something like a million-two for this, and the Treasurer's Office believes that we could save about half of that in, you know, the -- in not having to pay those interest payments if we can get those tax certs processed more quickly. Additionally, we expect a much greater number of these applications to come in as a result of the impacts of Sandy. So to me we're spending, I think we have, Robert, 35,000 or something in here which is three-quarters of a year, I think, of salary and other expenses.

MR. LIPP:

Actually we have a full year in here.

LEG. CILMI:

Full year, okay, good.

MR. LIPP:

So the salaries are a little over 30 but then the net increase is almost 48,000.

LEG. CILMI:

And so that potentially could save us about half a million dollars a year in interest payments. This is not -- we might get into this debate a little bit here, but this is not an on budget, I guess, item is the best way to put it. It inures to the tax levy ultimately. Was that correct, Robert?

MR. LIPP:

Correct. It would result in future savings on the tax warrant.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. CILMI:

On the tax warrant, okay. So with that, maybe if I could ask the Treasurer to just elaborate on what I said if necessary and otherwise --

MS. CARPENTER:

Well, you pretty well covered it. Yes, the interest rates in '12 were 1.3 million. We did an analysis and with a full-time person in there it could bring that down about \$500,000. And we're anticipating, there was a meeting a week ago convened by the Assessor's Association of Suffolk County because the Governor did sign that legislation, the Sandy legislation allowing victims of Sandy to have their assessments reduced. And their best guess is that it could be around 3,000 people that will be applying for it and in the amount of about ten million dollars.

So I'm glad I have the opportunity to just talk a little bit about it because the head of the Assessor's Association suggested that we embark upon a very aggressive lobbying effort to see if we could get the Feds to include that ten million dollars directly to us so that we are not out of pocketing that ten million dollars in waiting for it to be returned to us since this is a one time on the Sandy component. So he's suggesting that we try to get to Schumer and so forth and I was going to reach out to the County Executive's people and to the Legislature and see if we could be doing a combined effort to try to get that ten million dollars. With the billions of dollars that are being passed around for, you know, things that have happened because of Sandy, this certainly would be in line and it would just be a ten million dollar grant to a municipality that's having to endure the reduced tax assessment. But that's apart from this other issue.

There were 18,000 that were processed last year. This morning I had a phone call from a gentleman. In fact, it's a constituent of Legislator Anker, who was looking for his \$415, and when we researched it discovered that we've only gotten the paperwork October 16th of this year. So, you know, he was not too happy when I explained that it's probably going to take him another year, but that he would be getting interest, but it's just how long it takes. So, one, you know, adding this position would be helpful. If not, you know, we'll muddle along, but it is what it is. I felt I would be less than -- I'd be derelict in my duties if I were not trying to raise the issue. We did request the position in the budget. The County Executive removed it. Remember, too, that some of you were not here, but two years ago when positions were eliminated we had four positions, vacant positions. This was one of them that was eliminated from the budget.

LEG. CILMI:

So it seems like the benefits are twofold. One is the cash flow issue.

MS. CARPENTER:

Absolutely.

LEG. CILMI:

And the other is the savings of interest payments for our taxpayers.

MS. CARPENTER:

Correct.

LEG. CILMI:

Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Thank you, Legislator. Legislator Hahn, do you have a quick question?

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. HAHN:

Yes. So what you're saying is basically this will pay for itself and then some.

LEG. CILMI:

(Nodded head yes).

LEG. HAHN:

So then why is the offset -- why do you even have an offset and not be the fees that come in.

LEG. CILMI:

Because -- Robert could probably explain that better than I. It's not -- the savings are not on budget. They're part of the tax warrant, so --

LEG. HAHN:

Can you explain that? That doesn't resonate.

LEG. CILMI:

Robert, take it from there.

MR. LIPP:

Okay. So they show up on tax warrant under errors in assessment so it's on your tax bill, but it's not in the County's budget. It's an off budget item, the errors in assessment. Basically to oversimplify, there is a taxing jurisdiction on your tax warrant called errors in assessment that is in the neighborhood of, I haven't looked at the numbers lately, but \$70 million as opposed to \$49 million for the General Fund alone. So this adds to that.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Would anyone else like to be heard on this? We're good? All right, do we have -- oh, we've a motion and a second on this?

MS. ORTIZ:

(Nodded head yes).

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Why doesn't we have a roll call vote.

*(*Roll Called by Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk*)*

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Pass.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Absent).

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

No.

LEG. CALARCO:

No.

LEG. MONTANO:

(Not Present).

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

No.

LEG. STERN:

No.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No.

LEG. SPENCER:

No.

P.O. HORSLEY:

No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No.

MS. ORTIZ:

Seven *(Vacant Seat - District #8).*

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. ***Number 9. (Adds \$25,000 in 2014 to fees for services in the Legislature for a consultant to review pension benefits to determine options to reduce the County's obligation, which is offset by an increase in revenue from County Clerk Fees in 2013).***

LEG. KENNEDY:

Let's wrap this up.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Lipp -- I'm doing the best I can. Okay. Dr. Lipp, I'm sorry.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

MR. LIPP:

That's okay. You can call me anything, just don't call me late for dinner. Okay. So this would add 25,000 in fee for service in the Legislature for a consultant to review the pension benefits to determine options to reduce the County's the obligation. The offset would be once again Clerk fees, which Budget Review identified.

LEG. CILMI:

Mr. Chair, if I could.

P.O. HORSLEY:

You can.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Here again is just another thought to try and deal with one of our largest expenses in the County, our pension obligation. I've listen to, participated in a couple of different seminars, webinars, that deal with pension reform and some other jurisdictions attempts to find savings in the whole pension system, understanding that there are contractual obligations obviously and we have New York State law and the Comptroller's Office and New York State that governs much of what we do, but I thought if we could devote \$25,000. It's a number that doesn't really come from anywhere. Some of these agencies will do it at no cost, but I wanted to at least appropriate something. If we could save, you know, half a million dollars or a million dollars, seems to me a \$25,000 investment is probably a pretty good bet. So I'll make a motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. There's a motion to approve. Is there a second on the motion? Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'll make a second for purposes of discussion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. We have a second on the motion.

LEG. CILMI:

Thank you.

LEG. KENNEDY:

It's no problem.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Is there a discussion? Is there a discussion? Okay, I don't see anyone calling for a discussion. Roll call vote.

*(*Roll Called by Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk*)*

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

No.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Absent).

LEG. HAHN:

No.

LEG. ANKER:

No.

LEG. CALARCO:

No.

LEG. MONTANO:

(Not Present).

LEG. BARRAGA:

You should have at least two votes yes.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. CILMI:

I will -- Jay gave me a second so don't be misled.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Okay, no.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:

No.

LEG. STERN:

No.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I say yes to pension reform.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. SPENCER:

No.

P.O. HORSLEY:

No.

MS. ORTIZ:

Three (*Vacant Seat - District #8*).

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right, the motion fails. All right. ***Number 10 (Revises the breakdown of property tax items between the per parcel benefit charge and property tax levy in the Southwest Sewer District to reflect updated information on the number of parcels and assessed valuations)***, something I put in I guess.

MS. ORTIZ:

That's actually four.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Dr. Lipp, do you want to tell me what we're doing here?

MR. LIPP:

Okay. This is very smart of you or wise of you to put this in. So all this does is in the Southwest Sewer District, when the recommended budget comes out, the number of parcels and the assessed valuation is not really known at the time so there's an estimate and then we get the exact numbers in after the budget comes out and we make this adjustment and everybody lives happily ever after.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

What happens now?

MR. LIPP:

It just rejiggers the monies going to the different portions of the benefit charge, user fee and/or tax property tax within the Southwest Sewer District doesn't affect anybody outside of the district.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Is this revenue neutral?

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Come on. Make the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. I make the motion.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second, second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator D'Amaro. Sounds like a good idea. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. It's been approved. Hey, I'm good.

(*Laughter*)

Special Meeting 11/6/13

MS. ORTIZ:

Fifteen. *(Legislator Muratore and Montano - Not Present; Vacant Seat - District #8).*

P.O. HORSLEY:

Number 11 (Provides on an increase of \$25,000 for Parents for Meghan's Law Crime Victims Center in 2014, which is offset by an increase in revenue from County Clerk Fees).

Dr. Lipp, you want to tell us about 11?

MR. LIPP:

Sure. So this adds \$25,000 for Parents of Megan's Law Crime Victims Center. The offset is County Clerk fees as recommended in the BRO report.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Everybody understands that? I have that this is from Legislator Hahn, D'Amaro and Stern. Do we have any motions? Motion by Legislator Hahn to approve.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I'll second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

And who gets the second? By Legislator D'Amaro. Okay. We've got -- we have a motion and a second. On the motion, anyone want to talk? DuWayne.

LEG. GREGORY:

I will not be supporting this standalone. This position came out of the work of the Hate Crimes Task Force, so it's not that I don't appreciate the work that it's intended to do, and not that I don't appreciate the work that Parents for Megan's Law does. They're an excellent organization. I just disagree with the concept of the County fully funding the position. I spoke to the Detective Lieutenant Hernandez, who is in charge of the Hate Crimes Unit. There were 70 hate crimes committed last year, which is an increase from the year before, but primarily because there was a change in law for what crimes were designated as hate crimes.

I think from -- I mainly disagree with this standalone from a budget aspect. I think it's poor budgeting that the County fully fund -- this will fund an advocate for \$50,000. It's not unusual for a contract agency or not-for-profit agency to have a person funded who actually works on several programs. To fund this program would mean that the County is fully funding one person to work on hate crimes advocates, advocacy, \$50,000 and they see 70 cases per year. I think it's a poor use of resources and I will not support it.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All righty. Thank you very much, Legislator. Would anyone else like to be heard on this?

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Kara -- Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

Yeah, I mean, this program was implemented in October of 2011. It was in response to what was going on at the time, the hate crimes in Suffolk County. You know, the Crime Victims Center Parents at Parents for Megan's Law staffs the 24-hour hate crimes hotline seven days a week, every day of the year and provides victim support services for all victims of hate crime in Suffolk County.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

The Justice Department, U.S. Justice Department, relies on these victim services statistics to document Police Department referrals for victim services. This -- they work incredibly hard. We agreed -- we put the \$50,000 in the budget. At one time we were funding this organization, fully funding this position. This -- it's greatly needed in our County and I think that we need to fully fund it and --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Oh, I'm sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off.

LEG. HAHN:

I know you're trying to cut me off because you all want to go home, but I think this is a very important program and I'd like to see us fully fund it.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Very good. Would anyone else like to be heard on this? Would anyone else like to be heard? Okay. Roll call vote.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

On the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Oh, Legislator Krupski. I didn't see you there.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

It's just a question to one of the sponsors. Is that -- I mean, Legislator Gregory brought up a point that there were 70 cases a year. Is that the number? Or, I mean, is that what we're working with here?

LEG. HAHN:

In 2012 there were 79 referrals received.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Anything else? Legislator Cilmi has a quick question, though.

LEG. CILMI:

I guess to Legislator Hahn. What would happen if this were to not pass?

LEG. HAHN:

I don't know that that hate crimes advocate can continue to be there. But I'm not a hundred percent sure. I don't have --

LEG. CILMI:

And so does the County then -- would the County then have somebody else dealing with that issue or no?

LEG. HAHN:

Not that I'm aware of.

LEG. CILMI:

And the role of the advocate in a nutshell is?

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. HAHN:

It's multiple. We, you know, when the agency receives a hate crime referral from the Suffolk County Police Department, they try to -- they try to contact the victim via telephone numbers that are provided. They make all -- every attempt to contact the contact the victim. They do other things. They educate about hate crimes all over the County with hundreds of organizations. They conduct the intake either over the phone or by appointment. They sometimes will -- they have advocacy services for the victim in a number of ways. Claims assistance, telephone counseling, information and referrals, criminal justice advocacy, etcetera. You know, it's not just a single phone call. They help them with applications for the help that they can get after being a victim of a hate crime. They do prevention programs with this. They do outreach and many more comprehensive crime victim support services.

LEG. SPENCER:

Call the vote.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Does the Suffolk County Police have a Hate Crime Unit, person, bureau?

LEG. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Unit?

P.O. HORSLEY:

They do. Okay. Any other questions? Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah. I'm sponsoring this as well because I know that we say no to a lot of things, you know, but this is something that at least for me is very high on my priority. I mean, we're talking about a real person doing real investigation to prevent something that is ugly and shouldn't happen and that is hate crimes, and I think, you know, we should stand behind this type of effort. And it's not \$250,000, it's a smaller amount of money. It's \$25,000 that'll make sure or insure that that person remains in place, and I think it's a good use of our resources. That's why I put my name on it.

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. Anyone else? We're all good?

LEG. BROWNING:

Can I ask Robert about --

P.O. HORSLEY:

Oh, DuWayne? You're back.

LEG. GREGORY:

Quickly. Legislator D'Amaro had just said the person investigates. I'm not sure if he misspoke or maybe I misheard. If people are familiar with the rape victims, there's an advocate. It's very similar to domestic violence. If there's an incident they get called, someone's there to kind of hold their hand through the process. This person does that for hate crimes. That's the nexus of this program. In addition to that, they go to school districts, they make presentations with the Hate

Special Meeting 11/6/13

Crimes Unit about the law and, you know, things like that regarding hate crimes.

I'm very familiar with not-for-profits. This person does a lot -- obviously this is not the only thing this person does. If this person was sitting around waiting for a phone call 70 times a year getting \$50,000 that's a pretty good gig. But, you know, not-for-profits generally, as I stated previously, they, you know, there'll put people on various program streams, funding streams, so this would be a part-time job for someone which this is a part-time function. They would get paid from this and paid from something else. If we were to approve this funding, someone will be paid full-time to -- this will be their sole function and we're paying them \$50,000 to make presentations to schools and wait for the phone to ring 79 times a year. I don't think that's appropriate use of County funding.

In addition to that, I think the program itself -- I think it's a great program. Laura is great. The program needs to be revamped. When hate crimes -- when this was an issue hate crimes were generally targeted towards day laborers and much of the hate crimes program that's established is based in Farmingville and Patchogue areas. When I spoke to Detective Lieutenant Hernandez the majority of hate crimes that are coming in today are antisemitism. They're swastikas being painted on synagogues and things of that nature. Crimes against gays is probably the second highest. So the program itself needs to advance with the times. It's outdated in its approach and its outreach. So that would be my advice to do that. But specifically to this, \$50,000 waiting for someone to -- the phone to ring, I think is excessive given the budget climate that we're in.

LEG. HAHN:

I don't think that's an adequate description of what's going on there and I don't think that's fair in any way, shape or form.

LEG. GREGORY:

It's true.

LEG. HAHN:

It's not true.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. We share a disagreement and that's amongst friends. Okay, let's go for a roll call vote. Oh, we have more?

LEG. BROWNING:

I mean, this is coming out of fees from the Clerk's Office. I mean, does she even know you're doing this? I mean, is this a legitimate offset?

MR. LIPP:

We identified Clerk fees were short or could be raised in the review and the Working Group didn't take -- yes, we're aware of that.

P.O. HORSLEY:

How did that happen?

LEG. CALARCO:

We did it.

MR. LIPP:

Do you want me to --

Special Meeting 11/6/13

P.O. HORSLEY:

No, no. Okay. Roll call vote.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Can we go now.

*(*Roll Called by Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk*)*

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Absent).

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

(Not Present).

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. NOWICK:

No.

LEG. GREGORY:

No.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. SPENCER:

(*Laughter*) That's only eight. Two more. I couldn't decide this one way or the other.

LEG. GREGORY:

Fifty thousand dollars.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Come on, Doc. Keep it up.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. SPENCER:

Pass.

(*Laughter*)

P.O. HORSLEY:

No.

LEG. SPENCER:

It fails. It's only nine. Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:

So is that ten?

MS. ORTIZ:

Nine (*Vacant Seat - District #8*).

P.O. HORSLEY:

Oh, okay. All right. Just hang on, gang. I got of couple more things here. I have a ***Procedural Resolution*** that's in your packet, I guess. ***Number 16 - 2013, Authorizing Public Hearing for approval of ferry license for the South Ferry, Inc.*** Legislator Calarco, is this yours? Whose is this? South Ferry.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

My new district. I'll make a motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

I'm sorry. Legislator Schneiderman makes the motion. Second by Legislator Calarco -- not Calarco, Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MS. ORTIZ:

Fifteen. (*Legislators Muratore and Montano - Absent; Vacant Seat - District #8*)

P.O. HORSLEY:

All right. I got one more thing. I'll make the motion to set the date for the following --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Cliff Clark can go home now. He's been waiting here all day through our entire budget meeting, Mr. Clark from South Ferry.

P.O. HORSLEY:

You're quite a guy.

Special Meeting 11/6/13

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you, Cliff. He got to see the whole, you know, our work in action. It was an education, right Cliff? Get home safe.

MR. CLARK:

It was good. Appreciate it you guys. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Setting the date for the following public hearings for November 9th, 2013, at 2:30 at the Rose Caracappa Auditorium, Hauppauge.

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

1949, Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Charter Law to increase Budget Transparency.

1963, Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to update the Suffolk County Advisory Board on Child Protection.

1977, Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Charter Law to improve budget and fiscal communication in County Government.

Do we have a second on the motion?

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

Second by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. We have a budget. Congratulations, everybody. Thank you for all the help. This has been -- we're good. We're into 2014. We're adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.)