

**SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

**SPECIAL MEETING**

**APRIL 22, 2014**

**FIFTH DAY**

***Home Rule Message No. 5-2014 - Requesting the State of New York to amend the Vehicle & Traffic Law in relation to establishing a demonstration program to enforce speed limits by means of speed limit photo devices (Assembly Bill No. A09206).***

***Special Meeting held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium***

***Of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building***

***725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York***

**Verbatim Minutes Taken By:**

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

*(\*The meeting was called to order at 9:09 A.M. \*)*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Good morning, folks. Good morning. I'll call the Special Meeting today to order to be led off by the Pledge of Allegiance by Legislator Hahn.

***Salutation***

If you can all just remain standing for a moment of silence for all of our soldiers in harm's way defending our country.

***Moment of Silence Observed***

Okay, thank you

**MR. LAUBE:**

Legislator Gregory, roll call?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Mr. Clerk, can you do the roll call?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Good morning.

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Good morning.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Here.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Here.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Here.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Present.

**LEG. ANKER:**

*(Not Present).*

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Present.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Here.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Here.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Here.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Here.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Here.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Here.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Here.

**LEG. STERN:**

*(Not Present).*

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Here.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Here.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Here.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Here.

**MR. LAUBE:**

*Sixteen (Not Present: Anger and Stern).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. We have several cards, the first being Kevin McCloud.

**MR. McCLOUD:**

Good morning. Kevin McCloud, 1527 East Fork Road, Bay Shore, New York, and what I'm here to talk to you about is your Home Rule Resolution today. I wanted to let you know that I've always strongly opposed these programs for the cameras, and now your proposal to do the speed cameras in the school zones. But, however, in the interest of compromise here, I have been talking to several State Legislators and Assemblymen in Albany and I have good support for this idea to basically take the funding for this program and apply it directly to the school districts rather than to the County.

The program is called *Cameras for Schools*, and what it essentially would do is that the cameras that are placed in the zones, in the school districts, the revenue will directly go to that school district for their program funding, meaning sports programs, extra curricula activities, books, kindergarten, pre-K and other extra curricula programs. Obviously, most of us here will agree that -- or we will publicly agree that this program is for the safety and protection of our school children, and I agree with that. However, I don't agree with this being a revenue issue. And most of you I think will publicly agree that it isn't a revenue issue, it's about the safety of our children.

## April 22, 2014 - Special Meeting

So with that said, I challenge every one of you, or even dare you to go publicly and to say that you wouldn't support this resolution going forward in protection for our children, both in the funding issue for the schools and both for the protection of our children in these school zones where we obviously have an issue with cars speeding. So I'm asking you -- I understand you want to pass this Home Rule Message and give the State or ask the State for permission to do this, however, I have good support for this in Albany and I think this is the way we're going to go and I would suggest to every one of you to look at this seriously as a good program for our children and the safety and the funding for the school programs. Thank you.

### **P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you, Sir. Okay, Ryan Lynch.

### **MR. LYNCH:**

Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning. My name's Ryan Lynch, I'm the Associate Director for the Tri-State Transportation Campaign, and the Tri-State Transportation Campaign's a non-profit policy watchdog organization working in New York, New Jersey and Connecticut. I also serve as our Long Island Coordinator.

We're here today to urge the Suffolk County Legislature to adopt this Home Rule Resolution. Suffolk County is home to some of the deadliest roads for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists in the region. According to a Tri-State analysis of Federal data, 122 pedestrians were killed along roads in Suffolk County from 2010 to 2012 alone, with the Suffolk County portion of Jericho Turnpike seeing 16 pedestrian fatalities. According to Governor Cuomo's Traffic Safety Committee, 278 motorists and passengers and 22 cyclists were killed during the same time period; 52,000 non-fatal injuries occurred as a result of almost 90,000 crashes from 2010 to 2012. The Suffolk County Police Department served as the lead investigating agency in over 80% of these crashes, yet speeding tickets made up only 13% of tickets issued over the three year period, and that's a number that is shockingly low to anyone who's driven on Suffolk County roadways where drivers speed without consequence.

Suffolk County is taking significant steps to address these tragedies and combat reckless driving with better enforcement. In 2009, the New York State Legislature, at the County's request, authorized red light cameras for 50 intersections in Suffolk County. In 2012 this County Legislature passed and Suffolk County Executive Bellone signed a complete streets law that, upon implementation, will redesign our roadways to calm traffic and provide safer infrastructure for those who walk, bike, take transit and drive on Suffolk County roadways, but unfortunately, motorists continue to drive recklessly and break the law. More needs to be done immediately because speeding is illegal and it kills. When a person is hit by a car traveling 40 miles per hour, there's a 70% chance that they'll be killed. When a person is hit by a car traveling 30 miles per hour, there's an 80% chance that that person will live. If you are hit by a car going 20 miles per hour, the speed limit in school zones where speed cameras will be placed, your survival rate is 95%.

These traffic deaths are avoidable and it's crucial that Suffolk County have the tools necessary to address this challenge head-on. Speed enforcement cameras are now in use in over a hundred communities and in at least 14 states across the country. Research shows that speed enforcement cameras reduce injuries and fatalities by 40 to 45% and reduce speeding by 71%. Researchers even suggested that the mere presence of speed cameras in communities and coverage of them in the media has a "*halo effect*" on drivers, reducing speeds on roads with no cameras or signage by up to 16%. Not only will speed cameras reduce injuries and fatalities by changing driver behavior, but they will also boost the effectiveness of Suffolk County's Police Department and serve as a force multiplier, reduce the burden on first responders, hospitals and human service providers, and also save health care costs through the reduction of crashes.

April 22, 2014 - Special Meeting

Now, much has been made by opponents to speed cameras who say that they're nothing more than just revenue generators. Yes, it's true, these cameras are going to generate revenue, but they're going to generate revenue from people who are breaking the law and willingly putting people -- other people's lives in danger. The cameras will improve safety first and foremost, and the ultimate goal of speed cameras are and always will be zero speeding, leading to zero revenues and, most importantly, zero fatalities. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you. Bill Raab.

**MR. RAAB:**

Good morning, all. I've listened to a lot of great stuff about this. My thoughts on these cameras are, number one, I've never seen government find a revenue stream that it didn't like and didn't like to enhance. These things tend to grow and become more about different things than what they originally started.

I also cannot tell you how many times I've gone through a school zone at one, two or three o'clock in the morning with those automated speed signs and have the thing flash and everything else and tell me that I'm going 28 miles an hour in a 30 mile an hour zone when it's not a school zone at three in the morning, I didn't -- these things usually give times and it's when children are expected to be present. Well, at three o'clock in the morning or one o'clock in the morning, yeah, I don't really think so.

I just have grave concerns for this. And again, as the other person said, yeah, it is about money, mostly. We talk about safety and everything else. I don't really see that much of it being about safety, I see more of it being about money, the same as the red light cameras. So unless you can make sure that this thing actually works the way it's supposed to, I would have grave concerns about it.  
Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you. That's all the cards that I have. Is there anyone else in the audience who would like to speak, please come forward? It's been brought to my attention that we have Assemblyman Graf in the audience. I see you hiding back there. Would you like to say something, Al?

**ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF:**

I'm fine.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

You're just here to bless us with your presence?

**ASSEMBLYMAN GRAF:**

Just listening.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Okay, we will close the public portion now. Do I have a motion?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion to close by Legislator Calarco. Second by Legislator Anker.

**LEG. CILMI:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion, Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I realize this is very unusual, but, you know, we -- this meeting has been called on sort of a -- when was it, last week that they called this meeting?

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Thursday, yeah.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I don't think folks have had an ample opportunity to come and actually, you know, speak. We're doing this, for some reason, in a Special Meeting where it could have gone through a committee process, there's absolutely no reason to rush it through. Folks understood there would be a -- there to be a public portion scheduled between nine and ten. There may not be anybody else who shows up to speak, I don't know, but I think we owe the public at least that opportunity to come down and talk to us.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

DuWayne?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Mr. Chair?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yeah, if I can add to that. As a matter of fact, I think Legislator Cilmi points out what is probably one of the most problematic issues associated with the consideration of this bill right now. And I'll make a motion to table or to extend the public portion, because the speed cameras, like any other kind of device that we utilize in order to regulate traffic, does engender a wide range of discussion and debate. We heard individuals who spoke in favor and we heard individuals who expressed concern.

I have a number of questions that I want to go through with whomever is here from the Administration, but most importantly we are taking this out of order. And I know the Assembly is not in session because I see the Assemblyman in the back of the room. I've been told that the Senate is not in session at all this week either. So quite frankly, there is no reason for us to be here this morning. And we are taking a very critical matter out of an ordinary meeting cycle and essentially not allowing the public the opportunity to appear when they generally do to come to address us. So unless there's something that occurred between last night and this morning, the earliest that anybody up in Albany could take up this matter would be next Monday or Tuesday.

**MR. McCLOUD:**

Wednesday.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Wednesday; okay, next Wednesday. We are scheduled for our General Meeting next Tuesday. By all rights, we should be deliberating this, taking comment and then voting on it next Tuesday, regardless of how anybody around the horseshoe does or does not -- is inclined to support it or not.

April 22, 2014 - Special Meeting

And I have many, many questions, and there's more that I think needs to be done. Quite frankly, I think it's premature, I think the thing that we should do is hold open the public portion. So I'll make the motion to hold it over.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Are you done, John?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Sure. Just out of curiosity, maybe George can answer, but this only addresses the Assembly bill. Do we have to have one for the Senate bill also or --

**MR. NOLAN:**

The Special Meeting notice, the subject of it is *Home Rule Message No. 5*, which encompasses both the Senate and Assembly bill.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. And I sent letters to the Administration, through the Commissioner, and I know that you've received second copies with some questions from one of my school districts with regards to the speed cameras. I have not received an answer and I don't know if I will receive an answer and I'd like to know if the Administration has answers today. Because I feel if they can't answer my questions today, then I don't think I'm ready to vote for this.

And another thing is the locations. Where -- are the locations of the cameras set for every school district in every street? Is this just on County roads? Those are questions I do not have answers to. And I like the comments from the gentleman who got up and spoke about where the money's going to go. And, you know, all the kids have to take a five hour driving course, and I think drivers safety with our kids in the school district I think would be a great idea to take some of that revenue and give it to our schools, especially our young people who are starting to drive. So what is going to happen with that money? Is it just going to go to the General Fund or are we going to use it for some driver safety courses or whatever? You know, again, we don't have any answers to a lot of, you know, I think important questions that need to be answered.

And again, going back to my letters, it's quite some time that I've put in the request and I have not received an answer, and I think it's very disingenuous. You know, I think I deserve an answer. If you want me to vote for this, give me some answers.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, great. All valid questions, but not to be addressed in the public portion. But Legislator Krupski?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I, too, had questions, but I guess to the sponsor, but when would we ask those questions to get an answer, on the specifics, on the mechanics of --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

When the bill comes up, now we're in the public portion. Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Mr. Chair, is there anything that precludes us from keeping the public portion open while we debate the bill, and if somebody shows up to speak they can speak, if not --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I don't know. Counsel?

**MR. NOLAN:**

The rules say that the one-hour public portion of this meeting could be terminated if there are no more speakers. You know, I don't know what we do in a situation where people don't want to close the public portion. I don't know how we go on to the business until we close the public portion. So I think we have to make that determination; do we want to keep it open or not for the one-hour period.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Our practice has been that we don't debate the bill during public portion, that is strictly for the speakers that come forward to express their interest on whatever topic.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Right. We've never -- we typically don't keep the public portion open and then proceed into the business.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Right, so it would be breaking protocol. Al, you still have the floor, and then Kara and then Lou.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Would it be appropriate -- because obviously you want to hear the public comment if it's been designated for that portion, but could we make a motion to waive that -- the rule today, just for today so we can debate this while we're in public portion, just for this -- the purpose of to get the process moving.

**MR. NOLAN:**

I think maybe the better thing to do would be to take a vote on whether to close it. If we close it and we're debating if somebody walks in who wants to address the body, I think we'd be within our rights to reopen the public portion and allow that person to speak, but right now we have no public speakers. So I don't know if it makes any sense to keep it open if there's nobody here to speak.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

No, no. I just -- but I'd rather not close it. I'm just asking if we could just waive it just for today, waive our rules for today so we can debate while we wait in case the public does come in.

**MR. NOLAN:**

If that's the will of the majority, I suppose we could waive that rule and keep it open and have some discussion about the bill and, before we vote, close the public portion, then go to the vote.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, how about this? How about we -- if someone -- let's close the public portion. If someone comes in during the debate and they want to make a comment, we'll ask if there's anyone that wants to make a comment that hasn't made a comment before the final vote, and if there is someone here we'll reopen the public portion and allow them to speak at that moment. But to hold it open and we're not even sure if someone's going to come, I mean, let's address the issue as it comes before us. I think we do have a motion to close and a second. And Kara, you wanted to make a comment.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yeah, my --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Sorry, Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. HAHN:**

-- point has just been covered since I raised my hand. My point was going to be we have plenty of precedent of reopening a public portion when someone's walked in after. I don't think there's any reason to think that by closing it we will never hear from somebody who might walk in the door. So I agree with the Presiding Officer, I think we should close this, begin our discussions, if anyone walks in we can reopen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Spencer.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I don't want what we do here today to be negated on process, which we've run into before. So I guess to George -- and again, I probably have less than some of my colleagues here experience. Is the correct terminology, because a lot of things -- once we close, I know when we're talking about public hearings and if there's any debate that comes after or anything that changes, then that -- I don't know if there's some -- looking for the best legal course, would it -- can we recess the public hearing and then close it at the end, at ten o'clock? If we're talking about someone challenging this, I'm trying to -- you know, if we waive our rules, do we close it and reopen it? Do we recess it and then close it after ten o'clock? What's the way that will keep us within our rules so someone won't say that we broke our process if there's a challenge to what we've done here today?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Just to be clear, this is not a public hearing on this particular Home Rule Message. This is a public portion which we have to have at every Special Meeting, and pursuant to Administrative Code in our rules, it's one hour for the people.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Okay.

**MR. NOLAN:**

But if there are no speakers we close it, that's all we do.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Okay.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

To be fair to my colleagues, I don't know that I'm ever going to be convinced today that we've given the public enough time to address us on this proposal. And I'm comfortable with the Presiding Officer -- however, the Presiding Officer, you know, proposes to make accommodations for speakers who may show up before ten o'clock. If he wants to do it in such a way where we close the public hearing, although I'm -- sorry, public portion, I would be opposed to it. But if you want to do it that way, you know, I think that satisfies at least the contention that we had a one-hour public portion before this Special Meeting, which, by the way, although -- it would be unusual to, you know, to debate the bill while public portion is open, it's also unusual that the County Executive calls a Special Meeting to deal with a Home Rule Message.

April 22, 2014 - Special Meeting

So again, to the Presiding Officer, however you -- as long as you -- as long as you can make accommodations for speakers who show up before ten o'clock, I'm fine with that.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you. Anyone also? Okay. We have a motion, we have a second on the closing of the public portion. All in favor?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Opposed.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Opposed.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Just keep your hands raised, gentlemen.

**MR. LAUBE:**

*Fifteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right.

**MR. LAUBE:**

*Sixteen, sorry. (Opposed: Legislators Kennedy & Cilmi).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Next on the agenda is consideration of ***Home Rule Message No. 5-2014 - Requesting the State of New York to amend the Vehicle & Traffic Law in relation to establishing a demonstration program to enforce speed limits by means of speed limit photo devices (Assembly Bill No. A09206).***

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Schneiderman makes a motion to approve. I will second. The matter is before us. And we have the Commissioner coming forward. Thank you, Commissioner. As you heard, there are numerous questions and I have question myself, but if you have a given statement that you want to make or you just want to field questions?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, good morning, first off. And again, I'm really here to answer questions, everything -- I would start off by saying everything that we can provide as far information at this point is hypothetical based on, obviously, the Home Rule Message turning into legislation from the State. So I can really only speak on hypotheticals, but I'll answer whatever questions I can.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, I'll go first. The -- just go through, I guess, the mechanics of the program. Because there's a lot of talk about the program will only be on County roads, but, you know, there are a lot of school districts that are town roads. How do you do that mechanically, logistically, for the program itself?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, to answer, I think, a question that Legislator Browning had earlier, from what I understand right now, the legislation is that there will be one location at each of the 69 school districts that

April 22, 2014 - Special Meeting

would be permitted to have these speed cameras installed. We would -- I would envision that we would negotiate with -- you know, we'd have to go in for a waiver, but we would negotiate with the existing vendor for the red light cameras, because of the time consideration, before the whole program sunsets.

That being said, again, this is all just thinking internally. I would look at the likelihood, the most likely scenario I would envision would be schools that would be located on major thoroughfares, roads that have high daily volumes of traffic such as State or County roads, and that's pretty much where we're thinking right now. We haven't gotten too much further beyond that because, again, without having formal legislation, everything is really just a hypothetical discussion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Now, the -- I know there was discussion about Earlene Hooper's concerns about having some of the monies being shared with the villages and towns; is that in the final bill?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, I can't speak to that. I believe -- oh, here, Lisa's going to speak to it.

**MR. NOLAN:**

I think there's something in the bill about Nassau County Villages getting a piece?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

The way it works is the adjudicating authority --

**MS. MAHONEY:**

Please state your name.

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

Lisa Santeramo. The way it works is the adjudicating authority, which is where the camera is located, would keep the revenue. So for instance, the Town of Southold, they -- wherever -- if there are cameras in the Town of Southold, they would keep all of that revenue. So for us, we have jurisdiction over the five western towns with the exclusion of some of the villages that have their own adjudicating authority, so that's where the revenue for us would be and that's where that would go into the General Fund. But if it's specifically on the East End, wherever their adjudicating authority, they will keep the revenue from those --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So those municipalities that have some administrative overhead, they'll have the ability to recoup those costs. Okay. I'll hold off for now, but I see Legislator Hahn has a question, then Legislator Browning.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Okay. So Gil, you said -- Mr. Anderson, you said that probably more than likely schools on major thoroughfares with a large number of cars that pass by. I know that I have a number of elementary schools, middle schools, that have, you know, been in contact with our Suffolk County Police Department because of speeding and what they feel are dangerous scenarios in front of their elementary schools. Maybe if you could also speak with the Police Department about communities that have really cried out for enforcement on speed in front of their schools, that might also be a way, you know, to find schools for placement.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah. I mean, I think we could certainly entertain a discussion with the Police Department since they're the ones who are, you know, familiar with these locations. Again, from an engineering standpoint, it makes the most sense that they would most likely be locations where the schools are

situated on County or State roads because they're going to have the higher volume of traffic, so. If they happen to have something that's on a local road, if we have the ability to and the permission to install them on the local jurisdiction, you know, we could do that as well.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Again, to continue on what Kara said was, you know, my question is have you studied locations already where there has been problems? And you keep saying about the main thoroughfares like the State roads and the County roads, but I can tell you if you go to the William Floyd School District, you can go on a town road, especially when there's parents dropping off their kids, it can be just as busy, if not busier sometimes, than Montauk Highway.

So I'd like to know why -- why are we only looking at the main thoroughfares, why aren't we considering those town roads? And what input have we had from the school districts? And maybe Lisa or Tom, you can respond to the letters that I received from my school district.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

If I could, the -- again, this is all very preliminary. We have not gotten the legislation, we have not discussed this with any school districts. We have only talked internally in anticipation of this, but until we get the final legislation, we're not -- you know, to be frank, we've got other things to be doing. But once we get the legislation, we'll certainly reach out to the school districts, talk to them. Specific to the William Floyd district, you know, we would -- I would expect we would discuss it with the districts because of the fact that unless you have one school located on one road, there's going to be a certain amount of concern, whether it goes to school A or School B and, you know, I don't know that we're in a position to make that decision solely on our own.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Well, if you have opposition from a school district and they say, *"We don't want the speed cameras,"* are you still going to do it anyway?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Again, that hasn't really been determined.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. And as far as the letters that I received and I sent to the Administration from the school district, have we got answers on those questions?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

So we have received a copy of the letter that was addressed to the Police Commissioner, I --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

We can't hear you.

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

Sorry. We have received a copy of the letter that was addressed, I believe, to the Police Commissioner. It seems like the bulk of the questions was concern that they were worried that the -- that these speed cameras were going to take the place of Police presence in areas. The speed cameras are in no way meant to, you know, be there in lieu of Police. We're not changing anything out of what the Police Department does at all, that's not going to change because we have the speed

cameras in school zones.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. And they talked about Resource Officers, and I think probably the majority of the Legislators around here know that -- I know since I've been in office, we had Resource Officers in our schools, and slowly but surely that's dwindled, the presence of a Resource Officer. So when we talk about the revenue that's going to come in, I don't want to see this money just go into the General Fund, I think it needs to be used. If I'm going to vote for it, I want to see that it's being used for, you know, driver training. We have a lot of kids that need the five-hour course, that we could do something like that with it. And again, can that help to fund Resource Officers and now bring in -- we used to have Probation Officers in our school districts, we don't have them anymore. We used to have the Resource Officer for every school district, we don't have that anymore. So why wouldn't we use the funds to help pay for that rather than just put it in the General Fund? Because I can tell you that my school districts have continually, for the past probably six, seven years, have asked for a Resource Officer and feel that the presence of a Resource Officer has been slim to none.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Legislator Browning, I certainly think that that's, you know, an understandable concern. I think that, you know, we can talk about the economic crisis that has -- that the County has been dealing with and about things that have changed under the confines of that crisis. I certainly think, though, that to discuss how money is going to be spent before we actually are talking about a Local Law is certainly premature. This money is designated to go to the General Fund.

We do have a pretty extensive budget process where we can figure out how to best utilize those funds that will go to the General Fund at that period in time. But this right now, as with all Home Rule messages, is a pretty critical first step. We need to get the Home Rule adopted so that way Albany can take their actions and we can move forward from there. And after Albany has taken their actions and we will be burdened with the task of crafting a Local Law, and then we will have extensive hearings and public hearings and public comments and public portions about that Local Law and we'll go forward from there.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

My concern is, though, is, you know, you can ask me for my vote today, but the recommendations that I've made, will you follow through? And I think that I know this is just to get the Home Rule Message passed. I'm pretty sure that this most likely is -- the sponsor of the Assembly bill is Sheldon Silver, Assemblyman Silver, right? So I can pretty much guarantee that's going to get passed.

So I think we all can say that we could put something in place, we could put something -- have a plan in place for what we want to do with the funds that we're going to receive. And I do have some concerns that there is no commitment here to say we're going to put more Resource Officers in our school districts. We have a major drug problem going on. It's going on in our school districts, and that's why I think it's important that we would have youths take advantage of that revenue and work with our school districts to address the drug problem. I know Daytop is in my local high school, so they're admitting the fact that we have a problem. And so, again, you know, give me a commitment that you will put a Resource Officer in every school district like we used to have.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Legislator Browning, I would love to just tell you yes because I think it will make the debate go quicker.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

But that would be pretty disingenuous, so I can't make a commitment now.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

If you told me yes, you'll get a definite yes from me (*laughter*).

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I understand that, but I wouldn't think that it would be -- it would be very disingenuous for me today to commit to how we're going to spend any of this money before we've even passed the bill.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I did have the opportunity to reach out to the Southold and the Riverhead Chiefs about this and they had some of the concerns. Some have been answered already, about -- the one about where the revenue stays, which it should because it's going to put, you know, obviously an extra workload on the Justice Court System. But some of the other concerns were the control and the placement of the -- you know, of the cameras, and they really needed assurance that there would be coordination between whoever is going to place the camera, the location -- the physical location, you know, how far back from the school, and also, you know, the time of operation and the speed limit. We've had a problem in Mattituck with the State DOT, they put up the flashing lights with that little sign that says how fast you're going. And the State DOT, once they put up a speed limit, they're very difficult to move or to coordinate with to change that. So they kind of wanted some assurances that there would be a local coordination of placement and operation of the cameras, and how does that work? I understand on a County road it's -- it would be a lot easier to work with only the County and the local jurisdiction. If you put it on a State road, you've got another player in there, you know, to try to manage the system.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, to that specific question on where to place them, certainly we would have to apply for a permit from the State to put it within their right-of-way. Obviously as we control our own jurisdiction, we wouldn't need that but, again, we would follow all the requisite guidelines. Similarly, on a town right-of-way, if it came to that, we would have to get a town, you know, permit to install these. Again, I wouldn't see any reason why we wouldn't reach out to the local municipalities as far as the PD and talk about the locations, but I would say, frankly, that we would have the last -- if we were -- if we were placing it on a County road, we would have the last say on where it would go, we would take their comments and suggestions into consideration. Similarly, I believe that, you know, there's a give and take when you're getting any type of permitting process from the State or local municipality and, you know, that actual placement, whether it's a hundred feet here or 200 feet there, that still has to be determined.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

The point was made, and accurately so, before that these lights are on at odd times. There's obviously no school in session over the weekend, the lights are on type of thing. So would there be -- who would manage that? And I'm talking about State roads here. So who would manage that with the State as to hours of operation?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, the light itself is only a light. You know, the ones -- the flashing signs and whatnot, in this particular legislation, what's being proposed right now is that there would be -- I believe it's either a 60 or 30-minute -- they would be only in effect from either 30 or 60 minutes before or after the close of school as well as extra curricula activities.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thirty minutes.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Thirty minutes. If -- and that would be controlled by us through the computers within the system that would be installed. So anything outside of that period we wouldn't be giving anybody tickets for if they were, in fact, speeding.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Okay, that was my other question about what is a -- because it's in here, it says *on school days and school hours*. But that would include -- so the school would have to notify you and say, *"We're having a back to school night tonight, it's going to go from 6:30 to 8:30, so then you would program it in to say, well, then at nine clock there wouldn't be any more tickets issued?"*

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Again, that hasn't been fully implemented, it still has to be discussed, how whether it's something that's done before the fact or after the fact, that still has to be developed as we move forward from the legislation.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

But you're saying the County would manage that time.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The County would manage all the cameras, yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Okay. And then one final question, and you mentioned the State and the town roads. If there was one proposed on a town road, then would the town have the right to say, *"No, it's a town road, this isn't an appropriate location here."*

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Certainly, it's their jurisdiction, their right-of-way.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Okay, thank you.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Excuse me, if I can just clarify? It's Phyllis Seidman from the County Attorney's Office. The speed zones are authorized for an hour before and an hour after school hours and up to a half an hour before and after school activities. So I guess that would need to be worked out in terms of the activities.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thirty minutes is the activity.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So then it's up to the -- then it's up to the schools to coordinate with the County, whoever is running that program in the County to give them a schedule for the year, the month, the week? That would be -- the County would have to be -- the school would have to be responsible, then, for setting -- working with the County to set those times.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

That still has to be worked out, yeah. Because, I mean, a lot of stuff isn't implemented until, you know, that month. So I would believe it would be some type of rolling program that would -- and communication between both the school districts and the County.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Schneiderman.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thank you. First, you know, the idea of speed cameras in school zones is not a new idea. Even though we're just discussing it today, we've actually been discussing it for a long time. I first heard it through former Legislator Lynne Nowick who brought the idea to my attention because I think she had seen of these things down in Florida and it seemed like a good idea. In fact, I think most of the Legislators thought it was a good idea at the time. We had no authority to do it. So first we got the authority to do the red light cameras, and we still don't have the authority yet to do speed zone cameras.

When I saw the first bill to do this, I put together a Home Rule Message, but then Governor Cuomo, in his proposed budget, put in the speed cameras, and that no longer was needed, then, the Home Rule Message. Unfortunately, though, that portion of the proposed State budget was omitted in the final budget, so we resubmitted the Home Rule Message to take another shot at possibly getting the authority to do this.

This, again, if we don't pass it, then the State can't pass it. So we don't even have the option. If we pass this, then the State can pass it and we would have the option to put together a program. Commissioner Anderson would work with us and with the schools on putting together that program that would come back to us and we could hash out the details.

If people are concerned about where the money goes, we can do companion legislation that would direct the money to go to specific budgetary lines, that's certainly a possibility. At the town levels, I imagine, Gil, they're going to have to do their own public hearings if they're going to keep the revenue and set up the program. I'm sure we'd assist them and perhaps allow them to piggy-back with our contract, with our vendor through an intermunicipal of some sort, right?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We would control the cameras, the placement of the cameras and the maintenance of the cameras, the actual process.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Even on the East End?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. But the East End towns and villages would get to keep all of it or would there be an administrative fee involved for us?

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

The law provides that the administrative fee would come out of the penalty, the \$50 penalty.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. So we would get some revenue, even on the East End, on the speed cameras.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Right.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So that's really all I wanted to say. I mean, I think, you know, at the least we need to pass this so that New York State has the ability to give us the potential authority to set up these cameras. You know, it makes sense. Obviously, as Tom Vaughn said, you know, the revenues wouldn't hurt. But I think it just makes an awful lot of sense to slow down traffic in front of these school zones. I watch out on the East End we have in Amagansett right on Route 27 a public school, we have one in Bridgehampton, we had a student killed not too many years ago. In fact, the first responder, the EMS volunteer who went and responded to the scene, it was his own daughter; he didn't know until he got there. It was just a real tragedy.

So, you know, if we can do this. And I know schools have tried to put in rumble strips, they turn out to be a problem, they're noisy and, you know, it would lead to all kinds of other issues. The speed cameras could actually slow traffic down in front of these schools, and even if we weren't getting any revenue, I think it would be the right thing to do. So I'm going to encourage my colleagues to support the Home Rule Message and then let's see what Albany does.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, thank you. Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**

You know, we can break this down to different components but, again, the first and foremost is the safety component. And I know my district has a number of schools on major highways and one of them is the Shoreham-Wading River School District. And we've had a number of fatalities, we've had a number of accidents, you know, at that location. We're waiting for the State to come back with a road safety study and we're hoping to get that soon. So again, but backing up a little bit. Commissioner, how -- what has happened as far as the stats that you've received regarding he cameras. In other words, has this actually changed the behavior and, also the investment of it. You know, again, how much has this cost us to, you know, install these cameras and how much revenue have we made? So I'll start with those three questions right now, with the red light cameras.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Okay. I can answer the question on the success of the red light cameras. It has been a success. We've had a number of intersections where we've actually relocated cameras that were originally installed to new intersections because there was such a significant downturn in people going through the red lights, whether it's an illegal right turn or blowing through the red light altogether. So to that extent, yes, the program has been effective.

As far as the costs and the revenue, I can get you that information, I don't have it with me right now.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Okay. And it looks like -- now, how are you going to pay for these cameras, these State cameras by the schools?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Again, I would envision a similar program to what we've already installed where our current vendor actually does all the installation, they pay for the equipment, they install it, and then we share revenue with them based on the tickets that are received.

**LEG. ANKER:**

And again, I'm looking at the notes. This is a -- this will be a pilot program through the State?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

That's my understanding of it, yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

And as far as some leeway between, you know, say a person is speeding up to ten miles over the speed limit, they will not get a ticket? In other words, there's a zone, an area where they will not be ticketed; is that your understanding for this legislation?

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Yeah, it's 10 or more miles per hour over the speed limit.

**LEG. ANKER:**

And again, it's 30--

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Over the school zone speed limit.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Okay. And it's a 30-minute leeway as far as the timing of when a school is open or closed, an hour.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Well, there's some discretion, but it's for an hour before, an hour after school hours, in the --

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thirty on activities, extra curricula.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Thirty on activities, okay. Okay. And again, you know, the financial costs. So what -- and I don't know who can answer this one, but, so what are the odds of the money going towards schools; what's involved? I know Kevin was here discussing that, and I think -- I think that's a great idea. I know the County needs revenue but, you know, the school districts also need the support. And if we're focusing here on schools, you know, is there a way that we can move this into the school districts?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Legislator Anker, I would just say that, you know, the one thing I think that every municipality has in common is a need for revenue.

The bill that is in front of us right now does not contemplate sending that revenue to the schools. The bill that we have in front of us right now is a bill that would put money into either the General Fund coffers or into the adjudicating municipalities, that's -- when we're dealing with Albany, we have the ability to deal with the bill that is in front of us and that's what we have here today.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Can I ask Kevin to come up and talk about that?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

No.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Okay, so I guess, you know, once this -- if this is to be passed, then the next step would be to look into see where the revenue will go, possibly school districts.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Legislator Anker, if there was a change in the bill, we would have to adopt a new Home Rule Message. So if there was a change in Albany or a will in Albany to put the money to go to the school districts, then we would be back here with doing a new Home Rule Message.

**LEG. ANKER:**

All right. So do you know if there is a bill right now in the State to designate this?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I'm unaware of that.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Okay. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

You're done, Legislator Anker?

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Barraga.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

I don't want one single penny of the revenue generated from this, if it goes forward, going to schools, not one penny. I mean, the State of New York, the State Senate, the State Assembly, the Governor of the State of New York just passed a terrific package in terms of State aid for schools. And if you speak to schools, it's never enough. But the Legislature and the Governor did a great job this year appropriating monies for schools.

We have a structural imbalance in this County of a hundred million dollars. I want every single penny that's generated from this to go to that. We pick -- there's no need for any comment. You know, we pick up the papers, we talk about the possibility of control boards, we have the structural deficit of a hundred -- this is the reason to do this, from a revenue perspective, we want to grab every single penny we can. We can certainly talk about revenues, we can talk about the safety of children, but the bottom line is that we need the dollars at the County level to help close the structural imbalance, the structural deficit.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

*(Applauded).*

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

In that order.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Now, Mr. Anderson, I just want to make sure, regardless of what's passed by the Assembly and the Senate -- and obviously this is going through, especially when they take a look at what's happening in Nassau County, they need this desperately, and we need it as well. I want to make sure at least there's a policy or an approach by the County that you will sit down and have discussions with each one of the 69 school districts involved, because you may have districts who don't want one of these speed cameras, and they shouldn't -- you know, they shouldn't be forced to take one.

Now, by the same token, if you have 69 cameras, 69 districts and maybe 15 or 20 don't want the cameras and another district wants more than one, maybe there should be some flexibility there as well.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, to answer the first question or comment, yes, we will -- you have my commitment that we will speak with each of the school districts before we establish where the location is going.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yeah, I just don't want -- I don't want you to wind up -- I don't want us to force a camera on a district that they really don't want it.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Understood. As far as the taking -- if we had, as you mentioned, 15 districts that didn't want them, I don't know what the law allows us to do or not to do as far as those ones that aren't used within a district.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Right. Again, I cannot stress how important it is that the revenues generated here go to close the structural imbalance that exists in Suffolk County. Right now, you know, if you take a look at the recent sales tax figures, they are down, they're not doing too well in Suffolk County. It may pick up later, it may not. We have money appropriated in this year's budget for VLT's, which more than likely are not going to come on-line until sometime next year. I mean, my own personal feeling is that I find it incredible that the legislation that was passed in Albany would put OTB basically in charge of the administrative functions of this. We're going to spend hundreds of millions of dollars and we put it in the hands of OTB, an outfit that is in bankruptcy. I'd love to see, based on what's going to happen in the next four, six years in terms of the amount of money we're spending on VLT's, that we have some sort of standing committee here dealing with racing or wagering, so we can keep -- we can make these people toe the line. This OTB operation should have gone many, many years ago. It sticks around because it's a patronage dumping ground; it's plain and simple. But I don't want -- you know, I want to be very straight forward, as I am with reference to the funding here. The schools get nothing, the County gets whatever revenue we can generate to close that imbalance.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you, General. Counsel?

**MR. NOLAN:**

I just wanted to point out, the revised copy of the Home Rule Message was passed out because there was a scrivener's error in it where the bill numbers didn't match. It was correct in the title but not in the body, so that's why there was a revised copy just passed out.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Thank you. I just wanted to ask a question that I think Legislator Schneiderman kind of hinted to this already, but just the procedure that we have to go through before this program gets up and running here in Suffolk County, if we choose to do so. This is simply the Home Rule Message that gives us. And I guess the question's to Counsel -- that gives us the option to do this should the State pass their version of this law.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Right. We're asking the State Legislature to pass authorizing legislation that would allow us to pass a Local Law to implement this program later. So just like with the original Red Light Camera program, there's another step for us, we'd have to do a Local Law later to actually implement the program.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. So when that Local Law process comes forward, at that time we can really hash out a lot of the details in how we're going to implement and put this program in place, because clearly right now Commissioner Anderson has only been giving it a cursory review of how they look to implement the program. And I remember during the Red Light Program, they came in with a full analysis of how they're going to run it, how they're going to decide the locations, and I think that once they have a little more assurances that this is actually going to happen, which it looks like it's a pretty good possibility, their department would be able to put a lot more work into this, and then we'll be able to give it a much further review and analysis. And all this is doing is really giving us that option, and if we don't do this then we don't even have that ability to do that cursory, that real in-depth review to make sure it's a program we really want to participate in. So I'm supporting this. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, thank you, Legislator Calarco. Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I have a couple of questions. So at eight o'clock in the morning, the students come in, the cameras are turned on at seven o'clock. So then the students are in the building at 9:30 and it's a 30 mile an hour zone and now it's reduced to a 20 mile an hour zone. Someone drives by at 31 miles an hour, there's no students in sight anywhere, they're going to get a kick; is that correct?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

If the law states that, yes.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Okay. So for six hours, people are going to be driving through that zone at 31, 32 miles hours an hour, upstanding citizens, our neighbors, our friends, and they're going to get thousands and thousands of tickets.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Again, I don't know that we're in a position to differentiate what the law states. I mean, I'll defer to Legal, but if it's a school district and the law states that they're only supposed to be going 20 miles an hour, that's the law.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

If I can just clarify. There is a section of the Vehicle & Traffic Law that provides for school zone speed limits, so it's not to say that there isn't a speed zone in effect in front of a school, it's just that we're talking about the times of the operation of the speed cameras. So, and then all of the details, obviously, need to be worked out in terms of the timing provided in this law that we're discussing. But the speed zones will stay in effect and the times of the cameras will be the criteria that changes for each district.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So if there's a soccer game or some school function on a Saturday and the cameras are turned on and the people who are driving by there, thousands and thousands of them are going to get tickets and it's going to generate millions of dollars.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Well, there's going to be a speed -- a school speed zone in effect anyway in that area, most likely.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Correct. The analogy is --

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

So, yes, they -- if the option is to turn the cameras on half an hour before and after that activity, then obviously it will generate violations if people are speeding.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I'm just thinking of schools in my area, in everyone's area, where you can't even see the school from the street. The school is set back, you can't see it, so now our tax-paying citizens are going to be going through at 31 miles an hour and are going to be charged, whatever it is, \$80. And more importantly, a lot of this money is going to be sent to Texas, because they're the people who paid for the cameras, they're the people who are doing it. So a lot of this money that's generated is going to be sent away; correct?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, if you look at it that way. But also remember that these guys, this company, if that's the way we choose to go -- and again, we haven't gotten there yet, this is way preliminary -- but specific to red light cameras, I would make the statement that, yes, they took all the risk. They helped provide us with the analysis and they, in turn, should, you know, get some benefit for their risk that they're involved. The County takes no risk by -- under the Red Light Camera, by installing cameras, everything is paid for by them. So, you know, certainly we negotiate to make sure that we're not being taken advantage of, but it's a symbiotic relationship, if you will.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

In order -- I'm sorry.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

During the time these are on, when the kids are coming to and from school, you know, the activity at the school is taking place, correct me if I'm wrong, but there's crossing guards everywhere.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Not at every corner in every district.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Well, in the districts that I live in, I drove by in the past couple of days and looked, they're there. They're in front of the schools.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

The crossing guards don't monitor the speed of the vehicles. And I've seen, in my district at least, plenty of situations where cars are speeding past a crossing guard. And I just wanted to address your comment about sometimes not being able to see the school from the roadway. There should be signs up warning that you're in a school speed zone, or a school crossing area. And if I'm not mistaken, I believe that the camera zones will have flashing lights, so there will be warning, you'll know when you're going through.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

The law doesn't state that. And did you research this at all? Because in different Counties in this country, I think Baltimore actually saw an increase in accidents between 2009 and 2012, where these cameras were put up. And there's studies shown that radar signs saying they're there are just as effective as the cameras themselves. So I know there's a great revenue shortage, but this is nothing, clearly nothing more than a money grab. Because to ticket someone for doing 31 miles an hour in a zone that's 20 during a time when students are in their classroom safely away on a major highway is nothing more than taking the taxpayers money as a tax. In my mind, that's what it is.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Right, if they're speeding.

**P.O. GREGORY:**  
(*Laughter*) Right.

**LEG. TROTТА:**  
They're doing 31 in a zone that's 30 when the school normally isn't.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**  
No, it's 10 or more miles per hour over the speed limit.

**P.O. GREGORY:**  
Aren't you a retired Police Officer? (*Laughter*).

**LEG. TROTТА:**  
And having said that, in the 25 years that I was a cop, I can honestly say I never handled an accident or a child getting hit in a school zone, nor did I ever hear of one happening.

**LEG. ANKER:**  
Try my zone.

**MR. VAUGHN:**  
But, Legislator Trotta, with all due respect, a couple of things. One, I understand your comment about not being able to see the school. I think that the concern is to make sure that the driver is driving at a speed so that way they can see the student who may or may not be doing what they should or should not be doing during those hours. So for example, of course all children should cross at a corner, but they're children and they don't do that. Of course all children should be in school during the hours of school, but unfortunately sometimes children don't do that. Either they walk -- we have all seen that tragic case in New York City where a child wandered away, we've all seen incidents where kids may be cutting school. The idea is to have -- what was the last line in the speaker that spoke, a program that has zero infractions because people are doing what they're supposed to be doing. I understand your concern that this is nothing more than a tax and a money grab; we respectfully disagree with that and the concern is to make sure that people are driving the speed that they're supposed to be driving when they're in the school zone. And if they don't do that --

**LEG. TROTТА:**  
Why don't we put them everywhere? Put cameras -- because when kids do leave school, they go on side streets. They go everywhere.

**MR. VAUGHN:**  
Sure, and it's a pilot program, Legislator Trotta, and without the data that becomes available through this program, then you would never be able to put them everywhere. You have to start somewhere.

**LEG. TROTТА:**  
I see it as you're using the kids, the thing of the revenue generator is, "Oh, you can't say no to the kids. You can't say no to the kids." But the bottom line is when you have an elementary school, at eleven o'clock there's no kids out on the street.

**MR. VAUGHN:**  
And there should be no kids out on the street.

**LEG. TROTТА:**  
And they could be on any other side street. This is strictly a money grab. You know, thousands and thousands are going to be people getting tickets. I don't go to a party or socialize with people where everyone talks about the red light cameras and I cannot think of one person who got a ticket for

running a red light. They all get them for making a right on red, for not fully stopping, where as a cop, you give the guy a break when he, you know, stops, pulls up and his wheels don't sit, you know, cease to move, but this doesn't do it. I've seen video, I've watched video, you couldn't get closer to stopping. And, you know, people are -- you know, if you want to raise revenue, then do the right thing. You know, if you want -- if they feel it should raise revenue, raise the taxes, but don't be doing, you know, the disguise of raising taxes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Is that the caucus position?

*(\*Laughter\*)*

All right. Legislator Martinez.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Thank you. Good morning. I just have a couple of comments when you're about to create your Local Law of the County, at the County level. I know we're talking about the different timings and the 60 minutes and the 30 minutes. Just be aware, there's some school activities that go till five o'clock at night, you know, where it comes to sports and things like that, or PTA meetings and things of that nature. So I would appreciate the conversation between the school districts just to make sure that you do get the calendars for them.

Also, will there be information for citizens, for the constituents to know that you are placing the cameras there for them, aside from the speed zone limits already that are instated there? And also, will you be following the Eastern Suffolk BOCES calendar? Because most school districts follow the Eastern Suffolk BOCES calendar just to make sure that the cameras are placed exactly when the schools are in session and not.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah. As I stated earlier, I would fully expect that we would coordinate with the school districts and, you know, especially for the opening and closings, you know, the extra curricula activities, things like that.

As far as the actual placement right now, that portion of it, you know, identifying the location to the public, we do -- with the red light cameras, we do put signs out. To be honest with you, you can't miss when we come in and we put the cameras up anyway. So there will be the ability to identify where the locations are going to be, it may be the actual school district that advises its residents where the placement's going to be. That hasn't been identified and we won't get to that point until after this Home Rule Message gets passed, it goes up to the State, the State creates the legislation and then we can start the whole detail.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. HAHN:**

I'm still a little, like, shaken by my colleague's remarks earlier. You know, I hold four community meetings a year in my district since I've taken office, and one of the top complaints is speeding. And as a mother of two, I live within the one-mile radius from the junior high school. My daughter, who's now graduated, had to walk to junior high school every day, and I did wind up driving her a fair amount of time because the SUVs that race by on the streets and the crossing guard -- there's one crossing guard and it's on the north corner of Christian Avenue and Mudd Road. We happen to

live south. (*Laughter*), she would never cross that intersection. She would have to walk almost a mile on the road where the school is, where they race by probably close to 50 miles an hour trying to get their kids to school. And it's not just the, you know, walkers' parents who bring their kids to school anymore, it's everyone, because they miss the bus, they have doctors' appointments, etcetera. Kids don't -- you know, I don't know if you have children, but kids wind up walking to school late sometimes because they're late, they're a little bit sick in the morning, they go a little bit later, they're out there. We have schools with play grounds that are right along the road.

I mean, I don't know what to tell you. But I would -- you know, there's a reason there's a law, and I'm sorry, but just because you don't think the law should be enforced doesn't mean it should not be enforced. And we have citizens crying out for more enforcement of speed limit in front of -- not only in front of schools, but really everywhere in our communities. And these are incredibly effective, and the most -- I would imagine that my school districts would want them, at the very least in front of every elementary school. And, you know, I can't -- maybe not everyone's appropriate, I can think of one or two that probably might not be appropriate because of the windiness of the roads and it just -- you might not be able to -- I remember from the red light camera discussions, sometimes there's just a geographic inability. I don't know if it's the same with a speed camera as with the red light cameras, but I imagine that there may be some places that are just not geographically appropriate for the cameras. But it's really -- it's just a safety issue. And as a mother, this is incredibly important to me, that we get these cameras where they're wanted. And there are thousands and thousands -- tens of thousands of parents out there calling for this and people should slow down in front of schools all the time, because activities are going on all the time. And, you know, obviously, late at night, the cameras aren't going to be going and that's appropriate. But I was at a baseball game yesterday afternoon. People were walking home. Kids walk home from school after practice in the dark when, you know, Fall practice goes late, kids walk to and from their school practices on Saturday mornings, early hours when they've got to be out there on the football field. And people have to respect the fact that kids want to walk, get to walk to school, get to use those fields that are there for exercise, for clubs, for study halls, for meeting up with their teacher, for violin practice. You know, there all kinds of things that go on. And sometimes parents can carpool and drive them there and sometimes they can't, and those streets around the school have to be that safe zone, safe from drugs and things like that. We have safety zones, but safe so that kids can walk there, too. And this is a way that's going to help make those zones safer, and I fully support it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you. Legislator McCaffrey.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Thank you. I have a couple of questions, kind of following up on some of the other questions already asked. The hours of operation, from what I understand, now, are 60 minutes before school hours and 30 minutes before -- 60 minutes before and after school hours and 30 minutes before and after school activities. And listening to everyone here, there's quite a bit of variance in terms of what times those activities could be taking place. There could be something going on at night or something along those lines. How will people know when this is going to be in effect? Are we going to notify them somehow? Is the light going to be flashing?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Again, I -- and with all due respect, it's really pursuant to the law. If the law is in effect during that period, people shouldn't be going above the speed limit. It was established at the level it was usually by the local community and, you know, I don't know how we're going to advise anybody that the lights are on-- the cameras are on or the cameras are off other than the fact that the legislation states that if there's a program, an extracurricular activity that could be in effect, you know, you should know that -- again, it comes down to the basic question of the school zone speed; it's 20, 30, whatever that speed is, that's what you're supposed to be driving.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

But you did say that we wouldn't be giving tickets out at certain periods of time, I don't know if it was ten or eleven o'clock at night.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah. I mean, as far as the cameras itself, yeah, but you could have -- you could have a Police Officer enforcing it any time.

As far as advising the public, it is -- the statement -- and again, we haven't got that far in the detail of the operations, but it would be 60 minutes regular school in either -- I'll try this again in English. It would be 60 minutes either before or after normal school days and then 30 minutes before or after extra curricula activities. I would anticipate that the school district would advise us what those extra curricula activities are. How we would identify that to the public hasn't been determined yet.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Is it something that has not been determined or something that we are not willing to notify them of? I heard --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I don't know how we would notify them, short of having, you know, something that says -- oh, sure, hold on. I'm going to defer to my colleague.

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

Legislator, just so you know, the school speed zone, it's my understanding, is always in effect. So it's not like we're turning the speed zone on and off.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

No one has ever gotten a speed zone ticket at two o'clock in the morning. I would find that hard to believe. And if they did and if people got these at two o'clock in the morning, they're going to be very upset, and that would be problematic.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Right. There are usually speed zones in effect during certain hours during the day, and the speed camera demonstration project mirrors the law providing for speed school zone limits. So technically there should be beacons that flash during the time when the speed zone is in effect. And when the speed zone is in effect, the cameras will be in effect, because like I said, it mirrors the law. So there should be some warning that the cameras are in effect.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

So there will be some warning.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

That's what the law provides and I'm sure we will try to work within the law.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Thank you.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

It says *may*.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Okay. Now, going back to what -- about the Home Rule Message versus our ability to pass a Local Law, procedural -- I'm new here. So we're voting on a Home Rule Message that will give the State the ability for us to pass a law, and so we could have some variance in terms of what we see in this law that the State is proposing, we could modify that to a certain degree in terms of these things

about notification hours and things like that?

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Well, we'll work within the parameters of the law, obviously, and with the school districts based on whatever our studies show.

**MR. NOLAN:**

What we pass, Legislator, has to be consistent with the State law. And, you know, the State law we're talking about is before us, we're requesting them to pass this particular law, and if they do, the law we ultimately adopt here to implement it will have to be consistent with this law.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

So it gives us the ability to put some sort of notification in there, right; it says it may?

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Correct.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Okay. Residential areas. Obviously we're going to be putting these in school districts and there will be quite a few in residential areas. I've gotten a lot of complaints from residents who have these red light cameras in front of their homes, and this would be even more so, I would have to assume, in the school zones where most schools are operational. The problem they're getting is the flashing of the lights and the red light cameras. Are we going to take some sort of steps to mitigate the effect of these which would be more predominantly in residential areas.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We have been, in newer installations, using newer products that minimize the amount of flashing. I can't speak on the science, but somehow it more -- it localizes the actual flash to have, rather than just spreading all over, to kind of minimize it to where they want it to go; pointed, if you will, things like that. We are continually trying to minimize the impact on the local community.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Okay, and last question. In terms of the villages and towns splitting their revenues, you're saying that they would get a portion of -- they would get the revenue minus the admin fee that we're being charged, or the fee that we figure the County is entitled to.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Correct, the adjudicating authority in the five eastern towns --

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Very good.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

-- receive the proceeds, the net proceeds.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Okay. And the villages as well, right?

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Yeah, that's correct.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, thank you. Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

My question was asked and answered. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Okay, I have a series of questions. First of all, let's start with Mr. Vaughn or whoever. Why did the Executive choose today to convene for a Special Meeting?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

So if you read the State bill, it's joint legislation with New York City, Nassau and Suffolk County. We -- Nassau and New York City have already held their Special Meeting and passed this, we were the last one to be able to get this scheduled. The Speaker has requested this legislation as soon as possible so that they can start moving it on their end.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

But they are not going to be in session until, at the earliest, I think, Wednesday of next week; correct?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

I believe that is correct. I know that Luis Montes, who is here, has been requested to drive this up to Albany if we pass it today. So they're asking for it -- you know, they asked us to have a Special Meeting last week, we were unable to do that. This is going up today, hopefully, if it passes. There is a time urgency that we're getting from our end from the State to get this authorization done.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, that may be what the Speaker is sharing with you folks, but the issue goes to one of taking up something out of our normal course of General Meeting schedules. And had there been any kind of session going on this week, then I might have thought that, yes, in fact there is some validity to it or some urgency. But it's an impossibility that the State body could do anything with this until after our next General Meeting.

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

I can't really speak to what the State, their process right now. I can only advocate what we've been requested to do, and we have, you know, tried over the past two years to work very closely with the State to get some of our Legislative items moved, so when they request something from this body we try to deliver that.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Who drafted this bill? Who put it together? Is this something that you folks brought to Albany, or was it the sponsors who crafted it? How -- what were the parameters? How'd this thing get onto paper to get before us?

**MR. MONTES:**

Good morning. Luis Montes and I'm Assistant Deputy County Executive with Steve Bellone. It was basically a request that we made at the beginning of session, but the actual text of the bill has been drafted by mostly the Legislative Bill Drafting Commission at the request of the Speaker Silver and Senator Jeff Klein in the Senate.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Senator Klein is the sponsor. And as my understanding at this point is, he is the only sponsor in the Senate?

**MR. MONTES:**

That is correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

That's all you need (*Laughter*).

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Maybe, maybe. Let me go to Phyllis, if I can, for a second. Thank you, Luis, I appreciate it.

Phyllis, there's a couple of things we've talked about as far as the ability for a motorist to be aware. You know, the Red Light Camera was challenged on basically due process types of challenges. And as a matter of fact, it was upheld all the way up to the Court of Appeals, that there was an opportunity, it was a violation of the VTL, and so if an individual committed the act, that they were guilty. But there you have certainty, always. You're always going to have a traffic signal functioning. I mean, the only defense you could do is maybe malfunctioning traffic signal. Here we're talking about the concept of school day and student activity. What's the legal definition of student activity?

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Well, I apologize, I'm not able to answer that right now. I really think that it's something that eventually will be worked out between --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Is it a PTA Chinese auction? Is it a soccer event? Is it, you know, band practice? Is it -- there are an infinite number of activities that can go on at a school, but this says *student activity*. So it takes on some significance as to when the action on the part of the equipment is or isn't valid. And just as my colleagues have talked about, at two o'clock in the morning, you know, if Acme Cameras generates a violation and some constituent gets it, they're going to be screaming bloody murder. But student activity is a time when the apparatus is valid.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Well, I can't speak to what the definition of activity is under this law. I can say, though, that the school speed zone is defined as 1320 feet from the building, the door, the exit, entrance.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes, we went through it with Cleary School. I remember when it got set by the town, that I agree with you.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Right. So, you know, it's not such a stretch to think that for that short distance you're in a school zone, you're going to slow down anyway, which I know is personally what I do. Because, quite frankly, I'm never sure when a school speed zone is in effect. I just know when I'm in a school speed zone, you're right, children could be --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Phyllis, if everybody operated a motor vehicle like you, we wouldn't have to sit here and we wouldn't have spent the last, you know, hour and a half, because there are folks that drive out there like a bat out of hell.

April 22, 2014 - Special Meeting

The essence or the element of this is, is unlike what some of my colleagues have alluded to, what goes up there today is it, the fat lady sings. They're not going to change one word in here. Student activity is going to be what the measures is. And as a matter of fact, on page five on the bottom, the last line, 56, "*Signage may, may be installed by a County,*" not shall, not must, it may. And so when the cost to put in signs becomes something that's a further degradation of a hundred million dollar budget hole, we won't have any money for signs.

It's a poorly drafted product. That's what the issue is at this point right now, and we're bound by the words on this page. I'd say it needs to be amended. Yes, they may want it from us, but we've got another whole week to go ahead and get it right. I think we should table it today and get the words down that need to be set down specifically so we have specificity, because we don't have it now.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Legislator Kennedy, with all due respect, I would say that if the State is telling us *may* and we decide to adopt a law that says *shall*, that will be the decision of this body. It gives us permission to -- it says we may do it, and when we bring back to you a Local Law, if there are ten plus members of this body that want to see in the Local Law a *shall* instead of a *may*, we're still going to be within compliance of the New York State law that was set out. That's the bottom line.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

So you're saying at this point that you're going to go ahead and look for local implementation that dictates signage around every school.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I'm not saying that at all. What I'm telling you is that if that's the will of this body, if this body comes back and tells the Administration, "*We're not passing a law unless it says shall instead of may,*" then that's going to be what we're bound to.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

What I'm saying to you is why doesn't the enabling legislation say *shall*?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Because the enabling legislation deals with at least three other municipalities. New York City, Nassau County and Suffolk County. If Suffolk County decides that it wants to go *shall* instead of *may*, then let Suffolk County go *shall* instead of *may* and let New York City and Nassau County run their own municipalities.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Again, I would say that we ought to have some specificity in it, and I think the fact that we do not leaves us with a less than workable product. And ultimately, just as we saw with the merger with the PD and the Park Police, if you don't get down some specific answers, what you wind up getting back is something that is difficult to implement at best.

Last question I'm going to ask -- and Phyllis, I'm going to go back again. Commissioner Anderson talked about from a practical perspective, and I admire him for his view on practicality, he always brings that. But to you legally I'll ask you, is the Administration seriously contemplating adding this to our existing vendor through waiver, or are you going to put it out for RFP?

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

I can't speak to that right now. We're not far along. I mean, the law isn't even passed yet. You know, it's one of the many possibilities. We're going to procure it within the County procurement laws.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Which would basically at the start compel us to go ahead and put it out. We would be very hard pressed to go ahead and support a waiver on this to demonstrate uniqueness. There are many vendors out there. I remember going through this process when we put red light in in the first place.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Legislator, if I may, to respond to that, it is premature. As I stated earlier, this was our thinking at the moment, there's a long process to get it from here to where we want to be where we're actually implementing these cameras. So again, we have to come --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I -- and as a matter of fact, as I said, I heard that from you on the implementation side, that's why I was speaking with Counsel.  
I'll yield.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**

I just wanted to state, I think this is expediting government. Government is so slow sometimes. But when you put children safety above everything else, you have to move forward it with it. And you know -- and this isn't about politics, it's about getting something done. So, you know, again, there were some questions regarding why are we doing this so quickly; it's getting the job done.

So, also, I wanted to mention, too, a law is a law is a law. I mean, there's no ifs, ands or buts. When you see a traffic -- a traffic speeding sign or whatever speed sign, you have to go that limit no matter what, especially around schools. And like I said, I've had so many issues. My schools are on 25A, right through the center of major traffic. You have to slow down. A lot of people are not slowing down around our school districts. So I'm -- you know, I'm looking forward to this legislation. And as our Commissioner said, you know, there's -- the details have not been worked out, but we'll be able to work out those details, and I'm very confident with that.

I also wanted to mention, now, as part of this Home Rule message and what the Governor is doing, will there be a sign that will display that there is a camera in this area? How is that being done?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Again, that's still yet to be determined. That would be part of the program that we would establish and bring back before this body at the time of implementation. So I think as was discussed earlier, the legislation says we may, its up to us, you all, whether we do.

**LEG. ANKER:**

But we could make it required that, again --

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

-- people driving through these areas --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. ANKER:**

-- they need to know that there's a camera there and it will ultimately slow -- you know, slow the cars down and change their behavior. And again, that's the ultimate goal. So, thanks.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Are you done, Legislator? Okay, I'm sorry. Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thank you. I just -- I do have some questions and a lot of the questions that I've had in my mind have been asked and many of them unanswered. That leads me to, I guess, the primary question I have which is why the haste? Why did a Special Meeting need to be called late last week for today to pass this Home Rule Message? And I ask that question in this context. I am personally conflicted with this. I can see the arguments for it and I can see the arguments against it. Overwhelmingly, folks who have gotten in touch with me about this have been overwhelmingly opposed to it. So I'm just curious as to know -- I'm just curious to know why the haste? Why can't we go through a more lengthy process by which residents in our County can have an opportunity to voice their opinions on this?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Legislator Cilmi, the first thing that I would say is I'm not sure that I agree with the notion that there would be a more lengthy process than the one that we're engaging in today. Typically speaking, when we do Home Rule Messages, they come up at the end of the night at the end of a General Meeting, they may or may not go through committee. There's no defined method by which they have to go through committee; it generally seems that they go through committee at the will of the sponsor. People were -- there was more of a highlight in the notification about this meeting than I would argue than most other Home Rule Messages that we do. I'm not even positive that Home Rule Messages typically appear on the agenda of a General Meeting; whether they should or they shouldn't is up for the will of this Legislature. But typically, Home Rule Messages show up in whatever color packet at the end of the night; they're given a glance, they're debated, sometimes at length, sometimes at not. But I think that this process is certainly more lengthy and more extensive than a typical Home Rule Message gets.

And it's not unusual for this body to have to call Special Meetings to adopt Home Rule Messages. I can think of a time, I think in either 2007 or 2009 -- you'll forgive me for not knowing the year -- where we had to call multiple meetings because the versions of the bills that we were trying to get passed continued to get changed in Albany, they continued to get new letters after the bill numbers, so needing additional Home Rule Messages and we had to call Special Meetings to do that.

So I just disagree with the notion that people are not getting a fair shake when it comes to this meeting or that this bill is not getting properly vetted.

**LEG. CILMI:**

When was this meeting announced?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

Legally it's required two days, I think we announced it on Tuesday or Wednesday of last week. I think we tried to give a week.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. So Tuesday or Wednesday of last week you put out a notice.

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

Yeah, and we advertised.

**LEG. CILMI:**

What's that?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

And we advertised this meeting.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. Where?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

The County papers.

**LEG. CILMI:**

The County papers. I'm sure thousands of people have read that advertisement.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Legislator Cilmi, you know and I know that we don't set the County papers.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

*(Laughter).*

**LEG. CILMI:**

I -- listen, yes, we both know that. But the fact is is that regardless of who decided what papers they were going to be advertised in, there was some little blurb somewhere, hidden in a paper somewhere, that announced a Special Meeting to ask the State Legislature and the Governor to authorize Suffolk County to install these speed cameras when we have few details about how that -- how that installation is going to work and how the whole process is going to work. And I understand that we want to get it done, but I just -- you've explained to me that we -- that you believe the process has been more transparent or more -- you've given more notice than usually is given for Home Rule messages, which I'm not -- you know, the usual is not necessarily good. I still haven't gotten an explanation as to why the rush.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I think Assistant Deputy County Executive Lisa Santeramo covered the need for the rush. We had the request made to us by Albany, we are trying to work with the State, we are not the only municipality involved in this, we are going to be the last -- if we adopt this today, and I certainly don't want to get ahead of myself, but if we are to adopt this today, we will be the last municipality to sign on to this. Albany wants to take up this matter as soon as they can. And look, I --

**LEG. CILMI:**

So the answer is because Assembly Speaker Sheldon Silver asked for us to rush.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Because the State asked for us to take this up as quickly as possible, which is what we are doing.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So the Speaker is the sponsor of the bill in the Assembly and Senator Klein is the sponsor of the bill in the Senate. Where does Senator Klein's district, who does he represent?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

The Bronx.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I haven't the faintest idea where Senator Klein represents, quite frankly, Sir. And I will -- just to go back, I would just wonder, and it's probably back in 2007 or 2009 or whenever it was that we had to do the last Special Meeting for a Home Rule Message, but I would say that whether or not you like the paper that we advertised in, didn't like the paper that we advertised in, we abided by the rules that are set forth by this body. And I would just --

**LEG. CILMI:**

I'm not suggesting you didn't, Tom.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

No, I understand that. But it's also more notification than a Home Rule Message ever gets. When -- what would be the -- when was the last time, other than to -- the last time that we needed to call a Special Meeting on a Home Rule did the public get notification about anything?

**LEG. CILMI:**

But that doesn't mean that it's right, Tom. And I --

**MR. VAUGHN:**

It means that it's better than it typically is.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Well, that may be, but that doesn't mean that it's right. And I asked the question about the Senate sponsor and the Assembly sponsor for a reason. I'm wondering, are there any Suffolk County -- any of the Suffolk County delegation that are sponsors of either of these bills?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yes. Assemblyman Englebright, Assemblyman Ramos, Assemblyman Theile, Assemblyman Hennessey, Assemblyman Sweeney; I think that covers Suffolk County.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So that's the Assembly bill. What about on the Senate bill?

**MR. McCLOUD:**

One.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

You know what? I don't have the Senate version of the bill in front of me. So I see that Senator Klein is listed as the sponsor.

**LEG. CILMI:**

All right. Well, listen, I -- obviously we all reserve the right to vote however we want as things come before us, and I will reserve the right to vote in favor of or against the local -- Local Law at such time as that Local Law is presented to us. But I cannot in good conscious support a Home Rule Message when there are so many questions left unanswered, and when this has been a process that to me has been hastily, hastily done and the explanations as to why it's been hastily done have not been satisfactory to me.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Thank you. I just have a couple of quick questions. First going to the notice of the meeting itself that we're sitting here today, was -- are there legal guidelines or requirements with respect to

notification for a Special Meeting?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

Yeah, it's 48 hours, I believe, and there's no --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Were they followed?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

They were?

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Yeah, we followed the rules under both the code and the rules of the Legislature, your rules.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yeah, right. So you followed the rules that's set by the Legislature for calling a Special Meeting; that's what you did?

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Oh, I see. Okay. So I guess if --

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

And we --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

-- we feel that that's not giving enough notice, we should think about changing those rules, I would assume; right?

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Well, as Ms. Santeramo explained, we gave even more time than is required under the rules.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

There were at least six or seven days as opposed to two.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So you went beyond what the Legislative rules called for with respect to notice.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yes, Sir, we did.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

You did?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Yes, Sir.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. So I guess we can discuss it another time, if this notice is insufficient, then maybe we should think about changing our rules.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I would agree with that wholeheartedly, Sir.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yeah. Okay. Because, you know, I've sat here now since the beginning of the year when we adopted our rules and I've never heard anyone suggest that that rule should be changed until today, when I made the suggestion.

I have another question, listening to some of the testimony from my colleagues. So the cameras will operate only when the school zone is in effect; correct? Or, you know, the half hour before, half hour after, hour before, hour after; right?

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So let's assume that the cameras in and the school zone is in effect and the school speed limit is 30 miles an hour, okay, and this mechanism picks up my vehicle going 31 miles an hour; will I get a ticket for that?

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Right, it's ten or more miles over the school speed limit --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay, right.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

-- that would --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right, right. What if I'm going 32 miles per hour?

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

I'm not -- and what is the speed limit? If you're not --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Thirty.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

-- ten or more miles over --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right. Because I heard --

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

-- the camera is not supposed to operate.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

-- a lot of -- I heard 31 miles an hour; I thought that was something that was said. I don't understand.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

School zones are 20.

**LEG. HAHN:**

That's eleven miles over the speed limit.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Oh, I see. So school zone is 20. Okay. All right, now I understand that, okay. So -- all right. So if the school zone is 20 miles per hour and you're going 31 miles per hour during a -- when a school zone is in effect you'll get a ticket, right?

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

I believe that that's --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

You believe or is that a yes or a no?

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

It's ten or more, so --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay, so ten or more. So 31, even 30, then, ten or more. Okay.

Anyway, the point is that -- so the school zone is 20, it's in effect and I'm doing 31, so am I breaking the law at that point? Like, I don't understand how -- like I see anger at getting a ticket at 31 when I'm breaking the law; I don't understand that.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I agree with that statement. Yes, you would be breaking the law under this bill.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well --

**MR. VAUGHN:**

You would be breaking -- I believe you'd be breaking -- you'd be speeding and breaking --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So we might be better off, then, not having these cameras, because instead if we put a Suffolk County Police Officer at that corner to enforce it at a much higher expense, at least I got a shot at not getting a ticket. Right? Because I want the Police Officer to decide, sitting in that police car, whether or not the law should be enforced or not. Isn't that a better system?

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I guess so.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

It's rhetorical.

*(Laughter)*

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I mean, I think it's actionable under Federal rights, Civil Rights law, so I don't really expect an answer to that question. But I certainly think that when we fund our County Police Department and they take an oath to uphold the law, I think that's what they need to be doing.

All right. Next, revenue. I'm not going to vote for this unless the County gets all the money. All right? So I want to know what discretion there is in the bill to just give it out.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Other than the five eastern towns will use the money for their administrative expenses, I don't see much discretion that the money would go to the County. You know, in terms of whether it goes to a school district or to the County, my understanding is the money goes to the County.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No, no, no. But in other words, you're saying -- so the County enacts this law, we put up the cameras, we -- Commissioner Anderson I think stated we maintain the cameras or we hire someone to do it, and it's at our expense; correct? So is there a part of this law that would allow us, despite the fact that we're installing, maintaining and paying for them, that would allow us to give the money away to a school district, a separate taxing jurisdiction?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

No. There is not a -- this bill does not give money to school districts.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. So if we pass this and then we come back and have a full debate on whether or not to actually implement the law, it would -- if the bill were written -- the County bill were written in a way to share the revenue with another taxing jurisdiction, that would not fly because it's not permitted under the State legislation; is that correct?

**MR. VAUGHN:**

I would agree that that is correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. Then I want to talk just very quickly about letting -- even though we're passing it, maintaining it, paying for it, that I heard discussion about allowing school districts to determine whether or not they want a camera or where they should go, and I would just like an explanation as to the level -- who has the authority to decide where the cameras go? Who has a veto over that decision? How does that work, Commissioner?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Again, this is all premature based on the legislation, but pending --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

From what we know at the present moment, the County would make the determination as to where the actual camera would go, the actual placement would be -- I would anticipate that we would discuss the locations with the school district because we'd want to get their input on to which school would be the best one. The juris -- the municipality having jurisdiction over the roadway, because we either need their permit, or if it's our road we don't need their permission as to where to put it, that type of thing. But the final say would come out of the County.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. And if -- instead of this mechanism or camera giving a ticket, if the ticket were given by a Suffolk County Police Officer, would the County get that revenue?

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

I believe the County would get that revenue.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right, it would just be a ticket for speeding in a school zone. So I don't understand why it is that if the tickets being given by the camera instead of the County, why are we even talking about giving that money to the school district? I mean, it's our fine. Like just like we pay for the cop writing the ticket, we're paying for the device to capture the speeding. I don't understand the logic here.

I mean, as Legislator Barraga pointed out, I wanted to stand up and cheer while he was speaking because all we do is sit here and debate for 12 hours -- 12 months a year about how difficult our finances are, and then there's something that, number one, enhances safety, which Legislator Hahn pointed out so eloquently. And as a parent myself, I completely agree that safety is the number one issue here.

Second of all, the law should be enforced. I don't care who you are, it should be enforced evenly and not selectively and not discretionary. I don't think any Police Officer in this County should ever be given that authority, and I think it's inappropriate to even suggest it; that's second of all.

And third of all, the revenue is something that the County should be getting because it helps our budget which ultimately helps our County taxpayers. That's our job. Our job is not to sit here and also think about school districts that have their own taxing ability and to enhance their budget somehow. I mean, you know, I want -- if I had a limitless amount of funds, I'd like to give it out to every taxing jurisdiction and solve every problem, but my sworn oath in this Legislature is to help the County taxpayer. So why am I sitting here saying when I get revenue in from a ticket, that if the cop gave the ticket the County would get the revenue, but if the camera gives the ticket, which is going to cost me money to maintain that system, I want to give that money to the school district. That is absolutely unacceptable to me and I will not support any form of this bill unless Suffolk County gets the funds which is where it rightfully belongs. And I have no problem saying that because I have no problem saying that that protects Suffolk County taxpayers, that's what I'm here for.

In any event, I had one more question and I can't remember.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

I just wanted to follow up on what Commissioner Anderson said. The law provides that the criteria for consideration of where to put the cameras should include speed data, crash history and the roadway.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Oh, okay.

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

So there are some factors.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

That's funny, you're jogging my memory and I appreciate that. I wanted to know, and I have it here, objective criteria. It should not be based on, you know, a school district feeling, "*Well, we'll get too many complaints from parents.*" It should be based on objective criteria. If it's a safety measure, we measure and we keep track of accidents and injuries to children, and there should be some criteria set out and I would hope in this law, and that's what you're telling me--

**MS. SEIDMAN:**

Yes, sir.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

-- that would objectively determine, based on the safety considerations which should be the only consideration of where the camera should be placed; is that basically what this law provides?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct. And I would make the statement that we will be doing a study to identify the locations. Again, we will reach out to the local school districts, the Police for their thoughts, but it would be based on --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, because the school district can be helpful, very helpful, being on-site and knowing the needs and what's happening on the roadways --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Understood.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

-- in front of their schools and all of that.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

But again --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

There would be an objective decision made on it.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

It would be an objective decision based on data and study that you would, your office would accumulate.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And that's the way this decision should be made, in my opinion.

So I feel very strongly about the fact that although people will complain when they get a ticket, I know I do, I know I don't like that feeling. But you know, when I drive away I say, you know what, but that's what keeps everything together, that we have laws and we live by them. We do not empower our Police Department to selectively enforce those laws. In fact, if I could prove that in a court of law, we'd be spacing trouble damages under Federal statutes. So I'm going to support this. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Thank you, Legislator D'Amaro. Just a remember, we are an hour past our committees starting, so if we can wrap this up relatively shortly, I'm sure Chairman Anker would appreciate that. Next I have "give 'em a break on the speeding tickets Legislator Trotta".

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I just want to point something out, that Legislator Hahn said --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

It's supposed to be a joke; everyone's all tense.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

That Legislator Hahn said that couldn't be more true. The person doing 50 miles an hour, speeding to drop their kid off, absolutely positively deserves a ticket. And if you were to give someone like that a red light ticket, and in your district if she happened to be wealthy, she would get one after another after another, and she would never be removed from the roadway because the Police Officer -- there's no points in those tickets, so she could just pay them, or he could just pay them. There's no deterrent effect other than the fine that does it. So now I am for that, but I am not for hundreds of people driving by when the school's closed and nobody there. And maybe Legislator D'Amaro should go to the Police Academy, because the first thing they teach you in the Police Academy is discretion in terms of violation. When you have stopped someone for a violation, the Police Officer has the discretion to do that, to say, "*Hey listen, this is a warning. You were going 31, it's a school zone,*" and not blatantly handing out thousands of tickets. Okay? You know, we're all -- you know, these are our constituents, the taxpayers, they pay our salary, they pay everyone's salary, they deserve some discretion and this takes it away from them.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Ten miles an hour discretion?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Can I respond to that, please?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Come on, guys. Let's not do the back and forth. We're discussing the same issues over and over. Legislator Stern, do you have anything to add?

**LEG. STERN:**

Just very quickly, then, Mr. Presiding Officer. Thank you. I appreciate the fact that the legislation that we're considering right now provides some discretion, because how we implement a program here in Suffolk County might not necessarily be the same or appropriate the way it might be ultimately done in other counties. So I appreciate the comments of the Commissioner, knowing that how we ultimately decide to implement should be specific to the locations and to what our constituents want and need here within our own municipality and not just an across-the-board, one-size-fits-all. So I look forward to continuing that discussion with the Commissioner and the Administration to make sure we have a plan that works specifically for us.

I think it's also important that any plan that is ultimately implemented take into account not just what we think the signs may or should be, but many of the signs that are out there, even, even in locations that aren't necessarily camera'd, because there are some signs around the schools that say that there's a school zone that's in effect, speed zone on school days; there are others that are in effect when there's a flashing, yellow light and you can't have something that's going to be consistent just at the camera'd locations because everybody traveling around town is going to be under a certain impression that a law applies in their local neighborhood that might be different than at the locations that we come up with. And so I think it's very important that we have something that is clear, something that is consistent, that is applicable across the board, not just in camera'd locations, because as a safety measure, you know, nobody wants our motorists to be a victim of a game of *gotcha*. It has to be consistent, it has to be clear, it has to be applicable across the board so that there is always a sense of fundamental fairness that our motorists can expect.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Muratore.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

I'll pass. I'm good, don't worry about it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I just want to follow up. The -- again, I'm going to support this bill because -- I'll tell you a little story. I have two little kids myself, and I happen to see them walk to school, they live very close to the school that they attend; one's in 4th grade, the other's in 7th grade. And it's very scary as a parent, as I'm sure many of us know, that when your child starts to get old enough to walk to school, it's tough as a parent to let that happen because you're always worried about it. And I will say this; I don't have to go to a Police Academy to know that when my 7-year old child is -- or 8-year old child is walking to school, that I don't want someone doing ten miles over that speed limit when they're out in the middle of that roadway.

So this is really -- this debate is not about the speed limit, this debate really is about an enforcement mechanism. The laws are already set. The speed limits, the school zones, everything's already in State law, it's already there. And, you know, we rely on our Police Department to enforce that law; well, this is another tool, another way to enforce it. And I can't imagine opposing and ignoring the fact that technology is bringing us to a point where we have other ways to enforce law. I mean, that should be a good thing and I think it will save lives, to tell you the truth. I think just the fact that the cameras are there, if they're on, if they're off, people -- it will raise consciousness, people will be more aware of the fact that school zones are really that important, and they are.

I think that overall, I would welcome this being expanded beyond a pilot program, because it ultimately will make our roads much, much safer. If you look at statistics of accidents and death rates from automobile accidents, much of that is because of speeding because -- you know, the laws, even though we live in a very fast pace society and we feel like those speed limit laws are ridiculously low, they're really not, you know. If you -- I think a gentleman spoke here earlier about the fact, you know, there's a difference, just ten miles per hour difference in an auto accident can mean the difference of life and death or spending the rest of your life as a quadriplegic as opposed to being rehabilitated. It makes a big, big difference. And I think that if we're going to use technology as a way to help us enforce the laws that should have been enforced all along, I'm all for it. So I would encourage everyone to support this. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, thank you. We do have someone that came in, and I'm going to use my prerogative as the Chair to allow Mr. Garvey to come in and speak during the Public Portion. Sir, you do have three minutes.

**MR. GARVEY:**

Okay.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

You are my -- I am your Legislator, so be kind on me, though I know we're going to disagree on this.

**MR. GARVEY:**

And the letter is -- you've got the letter in front of you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes, everyone should have gotten a copy of the letter as well.

**MR. GARVEY:**

So I'll just state it for the record that I oppose speed cameras, even in school zones. And if, despite my opposition of the Sixth Amendment, the speed cameras are to be installed in the school area, they should be disabled during school hours when the children are safely imprisoned in their classes. They should be disabled after all the schools -- the children have left the school, overnight, on weekends and holidays and during vacations. And when the cameras are on, there should be warning lights. This will serve two functions; one, it will warn people that this is a school zone and the schools are getting in and out and there are children present and people are more likely to slow down, and particularly if those lights are accompanied by a warning that the speed cameras are there. You're trying to keep people slow in a specific area.

And if there's a malfunction, I have to be -- at 1:30, I have to be in Nassau County to fight a red light camera, because the first one point two seconds of the camera shows me at a dead stop and I'm accused of not having made a stop before making the right turn. So this technology is not infallible and most people, it's not worth their while to fight it, it would probably be worth it for me to pay the \$80 instead of gobbling up billable time to go over there. But that's the sort of thing that happens with this technology, because the people who are implementing the technology get a share of the revenue. I'm told a lot of the support comes from this -- from this comes from employee unions who think this will generate enough revenue to raise everybody's salary; I think that's highly unrealistic.

Also, I would just like to point out a statistical analysis that I did of speeding. It said that 90% -- if you do a traffic survey, 90% of the drivers are speeding 90% of the time. Speed is a factor in 30% of the accidents and 15% of those are driving too slow. So that the 15% of the drivers who are speeding are responsible for -- I'm sorry, 80% of the drivers who are speeding are responsible for 15% of the accidents. And the 20% of the drivers who are driving at or below the speed limit are responsible for the other -- the other 80%.

So in other words, the slow drivers are your real danger, if you do that statistical analysis. If you're traveling at or below the speed limit, you're more likely to have an accident. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you, Sir.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

DuWayne, can I just make one final point?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I know the time, I know it's running late. I just want to make it very clear that my comments with respect to speeding and having discretion to give out tickets, my comments are within the context of this discussion. I'm talking about in a school zone when it's in effect.

I just want to clarify that point. You know, I'm not saying that in every single instance there should be no discretion, but what I am saying is that when you're in a school zone and you're speeding and it's in effect and children's lives are at risk, I don't think there should be any discretion there, I think it should be enforced 100%

**UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:**

I think all school zones --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Sir, no comments from the audience. Thank you. All right, last question, Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'll make it quick, but just as I'm sitting here trying to contemplate the revenue aspect. I think I made it clear that I'm opposed based on the way the bill is written, but nevertheless. Have you looked at how many school districts are in our Police District as opposed to what's in the East End, percentage wise or proportionately, have you looked at what the revenue is that's going to be generated, assuming that it does get passed and then comes back, as opposed to what our expenses going to be that we put in? You have a tremendous number of smaller districts out on the East End. Some of them, as a matter of fact, New Suffolk only goes up to 4th grade. And if you're selecting by district, percentage-wise you're going to have a significant number of additional pieces of equipment out on the East End, I would imagine. I'm just curious; did you look at it at all?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Okay. From the Public Works standpoint, I don't know, I can't tell you what is within our district and what is on the East End. There are 69 districts, I believe, County-wide.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

What that split is. However, how we actually initiate the program, again, we were talking about that before. If we went with our -- if we went with the current vendor, the Red Light Cameras vendor, and assuming we're in the same process that we use with the vendor, and there's no guarantees of that, there would be no cost to the County to initiate the program. We do not pay for any of the equipment that goes in, we do not pay for the installation, we do not pay for dime one on the actual installation of the equipment and the maintenance of it; that's the vendor's responsibility.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. But what I'm talking about is, is if you look at statistically the number of points of revenue generation, Sachem School District has, what, 12, 13, 14,000 students? It covers 28 different school buildings. New Suffolk has one building and there's tons and tons of small -- Tuckahoe, Springs, all kinds of small districts out there on the East End. So by identifying your revenue point as the geographic definition school district, your aggregate -- oops, I'm sorry -- a significant number of additional points for your East End towns. I mean, I guess we're being very, you know, magnanimous. All those East End towns are going to love us.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

We like to call it fair.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

You like that, huh? So it will be a \$50 fine, but the \$30 admin is reverting to us or staying with them as well?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

We haven't set the fee schedule yet. There are 23 school districts on the East End that are outside our Police District, there are 46 within our Police District.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

All right, so stat wise. But I do believe, doesn't it say \$50 is the fine in the bill?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

That's right.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Right. So the fine is going to be 50 bucks, and the admin is -- I don't know if that's quantified, but admin we go, what, 30 bucks on every electronic ticket issued now?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

I don't know.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I don't -- I can't speak to that.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I know we do \$30 because we just waive.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It sounds right.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Legislator Calarco sponsored the bill to go ahead and throw out the \$30 admin on tickets that were unfounded.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

But you're saying at this point you don't know if that's going to hold with this?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay, thank you. I'll yield.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right, can we have all Legislators to the horseshoe?

If I may just -- I've been very quiet. I live near a school district, actually probably 75 yards from a school district. I see dozens of kids walk by my apartment every day. Whether there's a \$50 fine or a thousand dollar fine, I can guarantee you to the tee, that parents, the grandparents of those children do not care about the fine, they care about the safety of their children and their grandchildren. Is there a revenue impact? Obviously. But I also think that, you know, looking at the statistics that were cited earlier with the accidents in school zones, doing -- you know, how does the saying go? *"Doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result is the definition of insanity"*. If the current system is not ensuring the safety of our children, maybe this extra tool that we have of implementing fines and capturing people, those that are speeding through school districts, may be the impetus to get more people to monitor and obey the law. Not everyone will obey the law. We see that with the red light cameras.

I have one of the red light cameras that was one of the first ones on the corner of Sunrise and Dixon. It's a local community, not a lot of out-of-towners, I was just there the other weekend at a red light and I would have sworn, it was like the paparazzi, the light just kept flashing. People just don't obey the law, but I think some people will. And I hope that during a school -- in a school zone, that people would be more inclined to pay attention to, you know, children safety. It should be just generally really more inclined to be more safe in a pool area, period. So I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

April 22, 2014 - Special Meeting

We have -- we have a motion, we have a second. Do we have any other motions?

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Roll call.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. Roll call.

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

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MCCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

No.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

April 22, 2014 - Special Meeting

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Since I haven't had all the answers to my questions, I will abstain.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**

*Fourteen (Opposed: Legislators Trotta, Kennedy & Cilmi - Abstention: Legislator Browning).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. We have no further business. We stand adjourned. Thank you.

***(\*The meeting was adjourned at 11:16 A.M. \*)***