

**SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

**GENERAL MEETING**

**EIGHTH DAY**

**June 2, 2015**

***Verbatim Transcript***

**MEETING HELD AT THE WILLIAM H. ROGERS LEGISLATURE BUILDING**

**IN THE ROSE Y. CARACAPPA LEGISLATIVE AUDITORIUM**

**725 VETERANS MEMORIAL HIGHWAY**

**SMITHTOWN, NEW YORK**

**Minutes Taken By**

***Alison Mahoney, Gabrielle Severs  
& Lucia Braaten - Court Stenographers***

**Verbatim Transcript Prepared By**

***Alison Mahoney, Lucia Braaten,  
Kim Castiglione - Legislative Secretary  
& Denise Weaver - Legislative Aide***

*(\*The following was taken by Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer and transcribed by Kim Castiglione - Legislative Secretary\*)*

*(\*The meeting was called to order at 9:46 A.M. \*)*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Good morning, Mr. Clerk.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Good morning.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Please do the roll call.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Yes, sir.

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

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Here.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Here.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

*(Absent).*

**LEG. HAHN:**

Present.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Here.

**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:**

Here.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Here.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Here.

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

Here.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Here.

**MR. LAUBE:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Please note that Legislator Muratore has an excused absence. Let's please all rise for a salute to the flag led by Legislator Trotta.

***Salutation***

Please remain standing. The invocation will be given by Deacon John Trodden from St. Joseph's Parish in Kings Park, guest of Legislator Rob Trotta.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

I just want to tell everyone how I met Deacon Trodden. About two and a half years ago, my brother was walking up his basement stairs, fell and hit his head on the basement floor. He was rushed to the hospital. My nephew is a Kings Park fireman, he went there and a lot of the fire department members came, and Deacon Trodden showed up. My brother passed away. We went to my brother's house, my nephew was there and, excuse me, Deacon Trodden, I was trying to determine how do I tell my parents. Deacon Trodden volunteered to come to my parent's house at 5 o'clock in the morning and wake my parents and tell them, because my father walks every morning.

So I went back to my brother's house, we're waiting. My nephew says to me, you know, Deacon Trodden's daughter died less than a week ago. And then at 5 o'clock in the morning, a raining January morning, Deacon Trodden shows up in front of my parent's house, goes in my house with me, and we tell my parents that my brother passed away. I just want to thank him publicly for this and I will never forget it. Thank you.

***Applause***

**DEACON TRODDEN:**

Wow. I had actually forgotten that, but thank you very much. I just wanted to stay that it's been

many years since I prayed for this august body. Mike D'Andre was here at that time, so it's been quite a few years. But I'm glad to see that there are still five roses among the rest of the thorns that are here.

**(\*Laughter\*)**

So with that, let us pray, bow our heads as we pray for God's blessings. Let us pause for a moment to remember and pay honor and pray for our brave men and women who are serving us and our country in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Almighty and eternal God, you who are the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob, be with us this day and every day of our lives. You have revealed your glory to all of your peoples and God of power and might, wisdom and justice, through you authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted and judgment is decreed. Let the light of your divine wisdom direct the deliberations of our Legislators of this great County, and shine forth in all their proceedings. Help them to rise above petty partisan politics for the greater good of all of our citizens. Help them address the needs of all of us. Guide them and help them in their fight against homelessness in this County and hunger.

And we pray this day for Steve Bellone, our County Executive, and our Presiding Officer, DuWayne Gregory, as they work together for the greater good of all. We also ask your guidance and blessings for all the members of this body, may they be enabled by you and your powerful protection to discharge their duties with honesty and with great ability, and we commend to their care those citizens of our County who need extra attention so that they may lead their lives with dignity.

And finally, Lord, we ask your blessings upon our all of our County employees, our Police Officers, our firemen, our EMT, our Sheriffs, our Corrections, Social Services, health care workers, all those in the DA's Office and the Comptroller's Office, Public Works, Social Services, and all those who make up the workforce of this great County, who serve us, the people, of this great County. Bless them and their families. And finally, now Lord we say unashamedly in this great County of Suffolk, God bless all of you and God bless America. Amen.

***(Amen said in unison)***

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Please remain standing for a moment of silence while we all remember all those men and women who put themselves in harm's way every day to protect our country.

***Moment of Silence Observed***

Okay. This portion of the agenda we have several proclamations to be made. First will be Legislator Kennedy will present certificates to the winners of the annual Pitch, Hit and Run Competition that she sponsored in April.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

These lovely gentlemen are the champions of our Pitch, Hit and Run, which is open to the entire County. We have done this for a couple of years. They're the stars. They have already gotten their certificates and we just want to give them a little bit of congratulations for all their hard work.

***Applause***

Have a good day.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Great job. Okay. Next we have Legislator Spencer will present a proclamation to Carol Rainson-Rose, the Northport High School girls Lacrosse Coach for her significant coaching record of 25 years.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. Could I have Carol please join me?

**MS. RAINSON-ROSE:**

I'm right here.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Okay. Paul, please come up also. Carol has been the Girls Lacrosse Coach at Northport High School for the past 25 years. She earned a Bachelor in Physical Education at Cortland and her Master's in Administration at the College of New Rochelle. And also a Master's in Physical Education at Hofstra. She is married to Al and they're proud parents of Colby and Cameron.

Over the years, Carol has worked in the field of education, having served in numerous capacities. She's been a teacher, athletic director, coach and during her tenure at Northport High School, she can claim over 351 career wins, over 60 high school All Americans and more than 85 Division I players. She has been inducted into the Manhasset Sports Hall of Fame, the LIMLF Hall of Fame and Suffolk County Athletic Hall of Fame. She has been Newsday's All Long Island Coach of the Year, Suffolk Coach of the Year Class A, and she led the Northport High School Tigers to the Long Island Regional Championship seven times, and to the Suffolk Championships 11 times. In 2013, Carol was named Northport Chamber of Commerce's Woman of the Year by the Northport Times.

As Legislator of the 18th District, it gives me great pleasure to present this proclamation to Carol for an outstanding career. Thank you for enriching the lives of our young people and thank you for your excellence.

*Applause*

**MS. RAINSON-ROSE:**

Thank you.

*(Photograph Taken)*

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

Okay. Now we'd invite Legislator Stern to present proclamations to the Elwood John Glenn High School's Girls Varsity Basketball Team.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Presiding Officer. Good morning, everyone. It is a great pleasure to welcome some special young athletes from the Elwood community joining us here this morning. First, the Elwood John Glenn High School Lady Knights, the 2014-2015 League VI Champions. Year after year this is a team of special young women who do such an outstanding job and continue to bring such great pride to our entire community. So please join me in congratulating the 2014-2015 League VI Champion Elwood John Glenn High School Lady Knights.

*Applause*

Coach Athanas.

**MR. ATHANAS:**

Good morning. My name is Andy Athanas. I coach the girls at John Glenn. We've had another very, very successful season. This was our fifth year to the County final, and over the last five years in our league record we're 59 and 1. We've had just a great run. Great kids. We're proud of them in the Elwood community, their parents are proud of them, and now it's wonderful to know that Suffolk County has also recognized them. So thank you very much for this proclamation and we appreciate it very much. Thank you.

*Applause*

*(Photograph taken)*

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

Legislator Stern, I want to invite you back to the podium. Elwood John Glenn has another honor.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes, thank you, Mr. Deputy Presiding Officer. As I said, we're joined by several special young people from the Elwood community today. We're also joined by an outstanding group of young men. The Elwood John Glenn 2014-2015 Knights Varsity Wrestling Team are not only the League VI Champions, but also the first ever Suffolk County Dual Meet Champions. They're joined today by their Athletic Director, Lou Tuorto. Lou does such a great job in working with all of our young people who participate in the athletic program in the Elwood community. And, again, a special group of young men who bring such great pride to the entire Elwood community. I wish them all congratulations and wish them every success in the future. Congratulations.

*Applause*

**MR. TUORTO:**

I just want to thank Steve Stern and the Legislature for inviting us here today. This is a very special honor. This team was the first ever Dual Team Meet Championship. It's quite an honor because a lot of teams, we talk about who the best team is, so this year they decided to settle it on the mat and these young men won that championship. So, again, thanks to the boys and thank you everyone very much for being here. Have a great day and thanks again.

*Applause*

*(Photograph taken)*

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

Okay. Next up several Legislators will be presenting Top Cop awards. I want to bring up Legislator Hahn, Legislator Lindsay, Legislator Browning, Presiding Officer Gregory, Legislator Anker and Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes, if Officer Saracino could come forward, please. So the Suffolk County Police Department recognized the Top Cops for Stop DWI Program recently, and Officer Saracino was not able to be there that day, so we insisted that he come down here so that we could recognize him in front of our legislative meeting.

Each DWI arrest protects Suffolk County residents against the violent crime of drunk and impaired driving, and Officer Saracino had the highest number of DWI arrests in the 6th Precinct, and thus was named the 2015 Stop DWI Top Cop Award for the 6th Precinct, and he has been relentless in his efforts to curb drunk driving in Suffolk County, making it a safer place to live, work and enjoy. So

we congratulate him.

*Applause*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I just want to add congratulations. Great job, and I'm going to keep this short. Thank you for all that you do.

*Applause*

**LEG. BROWNING:**

A number of years ago I lost a good friend to a drunk driver, and she had two daughters. It was the year that her oldest daughter became the homecoming queen, graduated high school, and there are so many things that she missed with her two children, and that her two children missed because she wasn't there. So again, I want to say thank you for everything that you have done and I have a certificate for you also.

*Applause*

**LEG. CALARCO:**

We just want to say congratulations. Thank you for doing such great work. The crime that you are addressing with the DWI's is one that breaks families, it ends lives and breaks families. You are doing great work. We appreciate it. I had a proclamation, I think it was sent along prior so you may already have it, so congratulations.

*Applause*

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I just want to thank Officer Saracino. Unfortunately, I just had to attend a funeral for a friend's mom, who was on her way to church at 3 o'clock in the afternoon on a Sunday, which is not the time of day you would think someone would be driving drunk, but unfortunately I think drunk driving knows no time limit. And I just -- I think it's important for us as we recognize this Officer for his fine work to note that every time you do make an arrest you are probably saving someone from at least injury and most likely someone from death. I thank you for your hard work. We don't take enough time to thank our officers for all the work that they do within our communities and the people that they protect. So thank you very much, Officer Saracino.

*Applause*

**LEG. ANKER:**

Last but not least, I just want to again thank you. Thirty-eight hundred people were pulled over for DWI, and if you think about the people that if you weren't on your job, you know, doing your job, making those, you know, arrests basically, all the people that would be suffering. I mean, again, we have -- and individuals here, the residents here, look out for the other people. If you see someone that should not be behind the wheel after they've drunk or, you know, have been to a party, say something, do something. But again, thank you so much for all the work that you do. Thank you very much.

*Applause*

*(Photograph taken)*

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

Okay. Congratulations. All right. I would like to invite Legislator Lindsay back to the podium. He'll be presenting a proclamation to the Community Ambulance Company for being named Suffolk EMS Agency of the Year.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I'm just asking if I can get the gentleman from Community Ambulance to come up while I go through this proclamation. In 2014, the Community Ambulance Company of Sayville answered 4300 calls for assistance, which is an amazing number. They serve a very broad, very wide range of communities of Sayville, West Sayville, Bayport, Bohemia and Oakdale. They have been doing this for over 60 years. The Community Ambulance Company was just named in 2014 the EMS Agency of the Year by the Suffolk County Regional EMS Council. The Community Ambulance members Laura Lopreto and Jennifer Hartmann received Basic Life Support Provider of the Year and Advanced Life Support Provider of the Year, respectively.

The criteria for EMS Agency of the Year states that to win the award an agency must "strive for consistency in EMS excellence and exhibit exemplary performance when providing prehospital emergency medical care." And Community Ambulance clearly met all of these qualifications in 2014 and that's why they're receiving this award today.

Recently, they opened a new headquarters centrally located in their district, the purpose of which to shorten their average response time. The new facility allows the company to expand its training program to include BLS and ALS level courses, as well as CPR for the general public. I recently attended a NARCAN training class which they held there, which we had over 40 people from within the community that came for this training. They also have expanded their coverage to include Cherry Grove with 24-hour advanced life support services. They actually have people housed in Cherry Grove for the summer. The success of this program started last year and it will continue again this year.

I'm very proud to say that I work very closely with Community Ambulance. They are always on the cutting edge. If there's a new life-saving technique or a new technology out there, they're the ones that are front and center with it. We can't do enough to help support them because of all the support that they do for our community.

So it's my honor to present them with this proclamation. I have the Chief here, Chris Gonzalez, and the First Assistant Chief, Jim MacDonnell. Or did I get that reversed? I also had to get this framed because they have a beautiful new building, so in order to put this on the wall and be something that's worthy of their new facility, it had to be in a nice frame. So, gentlemen, thank you very much for your service.

*Applause*

*(Photograph taken)*

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

Okay. Recently a distinguished physician was inducted as President of the Suffolk County Medical Society, and Presiding Officer Gregory will present a proclamation acknowledging that achievement.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you. It's a pleasure to stand before my colleagues and our audience here today to recognize Legislator Dr. Spencer, who was just made President of the Suffolk County Medical Association. I think Doc's a little surprised. We threw him off.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

*(Laughter)*. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Doc is obviously one of our colleagues. He is a physician, a very well established and prominent physician in the Suffolk County community, and to be elected to this position shows his great professionalism and accomplishments in the area, in the medical field. And we certainly wanted to take time out today to recognize him for his great accomplishment. Congratulations, Dr. Spencer.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Thank you.

*Applause*

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

Okay. Next I'd like to invite up to the podium Legislator Trotta. Kings Park High School Math Team has won a distinct honor, so I'll let you explain it. I think if we also have in the audience their advisor, Melissa Fink, and Superintendent Tim Egan. If they're present they're certainly welcome to come up.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

If you guys would come up, the Math Team. This is probably my favorite part of being a Legislator. I get to honor the people who honor our community and do a great job. And this is particularly good because some of these kids my wife taught in kindergarten.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

And now look at them. The Math Team won the Suffolk County Championship in Math. Zachary Marcone and Julian Ubriaco are the captains and they beat out every other team in Suffolk County. And as a side note, Zachary -- is it Zachary?

**MR. MARCONE:**

Or Zach.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Zach. He's going to a college. He got accepted to a few colleges. Let me go over them. Princeton, Yale, Berkley, Columbia, but he was wait listed for Harvard, so I'm a little disappointed in that.

*Applause*

**LEG. TROTТА:**

He also --

**MR. MARCONE:**

I wouldn't have gone anyway.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

That's good. He did -- he also -- the reason I'm pointing him out, he's an Intel Finalist, so that's quite an accomplishment. He was also named the 2015 Coca Cola Scholarship, winning a \$20,000 scholarship. He was selected among a pool of 103 applicants. He won Best Position Paper Award at an MIT conference, and he was named Young Scholar of Math by the Math Institute and Creative Problem Solving and Talented Students at SUNY Old Westbury.

Zach, you did a great job. We're very proud of you and we're proud of the entire Math Team. I think I speak on behalf of Dr. Egan and everyone in the school district. We're very, very proud of you. And Nassau apparently was afraid to go against you, that's why there was no Long Island Championship.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

So again, congratulations. Keep up the good work and make us proud. And most importantly, get great high paying jobs, come back here, make a lot of money and pay a lot of taxes, because we need it. Thank you.

*Applause*

**LEG. TROTTA:**

I have another one. I'm sure you can figure that out. Okay. I'd like to call Rebecca McNaughton up. Rebecca is in third grade and she entered the Pool Smart Poster Contest, and out of thousands of applications, I wish I could say she came in first, but she didn't, she came in second. Gianna, who you will meet in a little while, came in first. I just want to say congratulations. You did a great job and I want you to do it next year. Here's a copy of her poster just so that you see it. Congratulations.

*Applause*

And her teacher Mrs. Horowitz. Do you want to say a few words?

**MS. HOROWITZ:**

I'm very proud of Rebecca. I've been with her two years. She's been a hard worker all year. I'm glad that everyone gets to see what a wonderful student she is.

*Applause*

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Okay. Last but not least, I would like to ask Kelly Bossert to come up. Kelly had a very, very, very special kindergarten teacher, my wife. And, Mr. Rubin, please come up also. Mr. Rubin is the science guru at Fort Salonga Elementary School. Every year he is out at Brookhaven. My son, I think, came in second one year about 15 years ago, and he works very hard. When I go pick up stuff with my wife at the school at six or seven o'clock, Mr. Rubin's car is always still there. So we want to thank you.

Kelly's project, this is a very interesting project. She had heard that a house had burned down somewhere, and she wondered if the trees planted near the house would have some effect on putting the fire out or causing the fire to get worse. So she did a science project and determined that certain trees are better near a house than other trees. In doing that, she won first prize in the Brookhaven National Lab Science Fair. So on behalf of the 85,000 people who live in our district, I say congratulations.

*Applause*

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

All right. I think we're going to stay on that theme of the Brookhaven National Laboratory Science Fair winners. You heard from Legislator Trotta. I do believe, though, that Scott Bronson, who is the

manager for K-12 programs at Brookhaven National Laboratory Science Fair is here. Is that correct, Mr. Bronson? If you'll come forward and I think maybe stand over by the podium, and we have a number of Legislators who are going to honor representatives from their districts in various grades. So we're going to start with Legislator Calarco. This is kindergarten. And Legislator Calarco, if you'll step forward.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Good morning and thank you, everyone. I have our kindergarten winner, Justyn Harrison. Justyn, are you here? And I think Justyn's principal is here as well, Ms. Tilley? Come on up. Justyn's parents, everybody come on up, your family. Come on up, guys. I love to have everyone around there. So Justyn is our kindergarten winner. Come here, Justyn. Let's get you where everybody can see you. He had a great project. I really love this one as a dog owner myself.

He wanted to see if his dog had a favorite treat. He wanted to find out whether or not his dog actually can tell the difference between the treats, or if he just ate everything he could find, which is what my dog does. So what he devised -- Justyn, do you want to tell everyone about your project?

**MR. HARRISON:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. I'm going to let Justyn tell everyone about his project.

**MR. HARRISON:**

First we put up four different kind of treats and then like we tested out to see if dogs have favorite treats. So actually my Mom thought of that so -- because I wanted to do it about mammals, so that was actually a good idea, so I actually went with it.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

So Justyn, your dog -- you had a hypothesis, right? What did you think your dog was going to do?

**MR. HARRISON:**

I thought she -- she just eats everything she finds.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**LEG. CALARCO:**

You thought she would eat everything she finds. But what did you find out? You put out four different treats, right, and there was one that was cheese wrapped and what did you find out?

**MR. HARRISON:**

She actually -- the best was actually cheese wrapped and the other ones were actually not the favorite ones. So I think -- my mom said it was different stores. Three were the same store and one was the other store.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

All right. Very good. So what Justyn found was when he put out the four different treats the dog consistently went to the cheese wrapped treat and had a favorite. So he did a great project and determined the behavior of the animal, and we're very proud of you, Justyn. I have a proclamation here to congratulate you on your great efforts, and we look forward to a long, prosperous scientific career out of you, okay, because you're the future.

*Applause*

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

He is the future, but from this perspective I can't even see him because he is shorter than the podium. But not much longer, though. That was a treat. Congratulations.

*Applause*

And we also have the teacher here, Kaitlin Wolferd. Thank you, everyone. You have a great, great young man here.

One more round of applause for young Justyn. Science is growing in Suffolk County, that's for sure.

*Applause*

Next I would like to invite up Legislator Sarah Anker. This is for first grade, but she also will be taking care of a fifth grade winner as well. Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Okay. So we have Jennifer Tiskowitz. If Jennifer would come on up. Jennifer, come on up. I see her. So -- Jennifer, come on up. So we have Jennifer. Now, Jennifer participated in Brookhaven National Laboratory's Science Fair, and what she did, she worked on a craft project. She does a lot of crafts around her house, right, as we know a little bit about what you do, and how you decided your project, and she noticed that the sun was fading the crafts. Well, Jennifer wanted to see if different sprays around her house helped prevent the crafts from fading in the sun. She found something that worked pretty well. Would you like to tell us a little bit about your project?

**MS. TISKOWITZ:**

I figured out that the Pledge faded the most.

**LEG. ANKER:**

What else did you use?

**MS. TISKOWITZ:**

We used Mr. Clean spray and we just -- another one we put nothing on it and there was one more that I can't remember.

**LEG. ANKER:**

So what's your favorite craft to do?

**MS. TISKOWITZ:**

Paint.

**LEG. ANKER:**

And what's your favorite thing to paint? Well, Jennifer, thank you. Thank you so much. Let's give Jennifer a round of applause.

*Applause*

And I have a special proclamation for you and I will present this to you.

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

We'll take a quick photo and then bring the other individual up.

***(Photograph Taken)***

All right. I know Legislator Anker was fortunate to have two students from her district receive these awards, so you're back up.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Okay. So we have Jack Soldano. Is Jack here today? Come on up. Okay. Welcome, Jack. Welcome, congratulations. So again, Jack participated at Brookhaven National Lab's Science Fair. Now he worked on a composting project. Come on up, come close. We have Jack's mom and dad and some teachers from the Miller Place School District. That's the Laddie A. Decker Sound Beach School. We have the teacher, Ms. Kelly Volk. She's here today and the parents, Kristin and Steven Soldano. Okay, sorry.

All right. So we're going to talk about your project. Now, you had worked on a composting project and I love composting. Not only is it you're recycling materials, but you're helping the plants. I'm a big gardener. Can you tell us a little bit about -- you were surprised. You were thinking that it was going to go a different way, but you were surprised to find out the results. Tell me a little bit about your composting project.

**MR. SOLDANO:**

So the project was at home, so I have to take my compost bin from house, outside my house, from my kitchen all the way to my compost bin. It's a pain in the neck and it smells horrible, even worse than the rain. So when I was thinking does it really impact the growth of plants, does it really? Or is it kind of like just something people say. So I tested it with -- so we had three grasses and three pea plants. So the grasses had Town of Brookhaven compost, my compost from my house and topsoil, and we were seeing if it really does impact the growth of plants, the same thing with all three. If you don't water often, then, yes, you should use compost, but really it's water is what really impacts the plants. Too much water is what I got -- it grew pythium blight. It died. She thought it looked like cotton but I think it looks more like spider webs.

**LEG. ANKER:**

So what did you find out?

**MR. SOLDANO:**

It's water is what really impacts. Compost's like -- if you don't water often holds water. Like right now the one with no compost in it, completely dead. But the two composts have new growth.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Well, thank you. Thank you so much.

**MR. SOLDANO:**

You're welcome.

***Applause***

**LEG. ANKER:**

And what -- okay, so it sounds like you're going to go probably into a scientific career, right? What would you like to be when you grow up? What's your career goals?

**MR. SOLDANO:**

I actually want to go into Lego.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Lego. That is science. It's a creative way of science.

**MR. SOLDANO:**

You play with toys. You can't get better than that.

**LEG. ANKER:**

You can't get better than that. Let's give Jack a round of applause for all the work that he's done.

*Applause*

And we have a certificate for you. Come on up.

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

Another round of applause.

*Applause*

All right. So Jack was the fifth grade winner, so we're going back now to second grade. Back to second grade, it was a challenging year for some of us. Legislator Krupski, you're going to present to Mark Burns from the Baiting Hollow school, elementary school. I'd invite his teacher, Mrs. Kruger, and his and principal, Mr. David Enos, if they're available to join Legislator Krupski at the podium.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So Mark's a second grade student at Riley Avenue School in Riverhead. And a lot of the challenges we face in the County are environmental and a lot of the challenges we face here have to deal with public safety, and Mark's project dealt with both of them. And it was -- I think it was a pretty cutting edge experiment. Something that Kara Hahn was addressing two winters ago, and I think it's going to be near and dear to her heart. So, Mark, would you like to explain what your experiment was?

**MR. BURNS:**

We were trying to melt ice with pickle brine, alfalfa, beet juice, salt and calcium chloride. And pickle brine worked the best.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Did you use it on anything -- did you use anything besides those things? Did you do control, regular ice, to see what the difference was?

**MR. BURNS:**

Yes. Pickle brine is safer for the environment.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

And you're going to spray it next time you have ice on your steps or your driveway? You are going to use pickle brine on your steps next winter?

**MR. BURNS:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Very good. All right.

***Applause***

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

So Mark discovered that for melting ice pickle brine worked better than anything else they tried. So our Highway Department in the winter on the snowstorms are going to be using pickle brine and all of Suffolk will smell like a deli.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Which is probably not a bad thing.

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

It's not a bad idea.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So we're going to give him a proclamation for his work there. And these are -- I mean, it's so encouraging to see young people. These are the leaders of tomorrow and they're taking advantage of a great program that Brookhaven National Lab runs. We're really grateful for that. It gives these students, I think, an opportunity to see there's different opportunities for them as they grow older. So thank you to the lab for that.

***Applause***

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

All right. Why don't you all come forward and we'll take a photograph.

***(Photograph Taken)***

Okay. We're up to fourth grade. Ella Causin from Oakdale-Idle Hour Elementary School, which is part of I guess Connetquot Central School District. Also besides inviting Ella up, Mr. Brennan, who is her teacher may also be present. I would invite him up as well.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Thank you, Deputy Presiding Officer. I can tell you are not from the area. It's Connetquot school district.

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

How did I pronounce it?

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

It's all right. I'm very proud to present Ella Causin, she was our fourth grade student from Idle Hour Elementary School in Oakdale. She lives in a ranch house where the front porch has several steps that lead down to a small sidewalk attached to the driveway. When it snows, the steps and the sidewalk are very icy, and I'd like to have Ella describe her project and what her findings were.

**MS. CAUSIN:**

I wanted to find out what melted ice the quickest, so I took four different items: Salt, sand, kitty litter and an ice cube with nothing on it. And I timed how long each ice cube took to melt and the salt took the quickest. The sand and the kitty litter just insulated the ice cube.

***Applause***

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Thank you, Ella. We're going to have our Commissioner of Public Works here later. We'll give him

your findings and see if it can help next year with the winter.

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

So now we have salt and pickles. I think it's making us all hungry, but it's good to know. All right. If you all will come forward we'll take a quick photo.

*(Photograph Taken)*

Okay. We only have one more of the Brookhaven Science Competition awards, so we're up to sixth grade. Legislator Barraga has Spencer Asofsky from Bay Shore Middle School. I'd also like to invite his teacher, David Tomforde, up as well.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Good morning. Spencer is here this morning with parents and his grandparents. I'd like them to come up. Spencer is the winner of the Brookhaven National Lab Science Fair winner and his premise, his basic premise was does color affect a person's perspective on taste. Spencer has always been particular about the foods he eats because of their appearance, especially color. He decided that he wanted to study whether the color of a food or drink truly does affect a person's perspective on taste.

Spencer took four two liter bottles of lemon-lime seltzer and took their labels off so that they would all look the same. Using food coloring, he disguised the bottles by turning one purple, one red, one green and one yellow. He asked 20 people ranging in age from child to adult to participate in a taste test. He then asked them to associate the beverage to a flavor; grape, cherry, lemon, lime. Spencer's hypothesis was that color would indeed affect the person's perspective on taste. He proved this hypothesis to be true.

Results show that color did indeed affect how the subjects perceived the drinks to taste, as most of the participants chose the flavors of the drinks based on the color. As expected, all of the 20 subjects recorded that yellow tasted like lemon and green tasted like lime. Also, 14 people believed that red had the taste of cherry and purple tasted like grape. Were these Democrats?

*(\*Laughter\*)*

Interestingly, six people combined were not influenced by the change in color and recorded that red and purple tasted like lemon or lime, which was basically true to the original flavor of the seltzer.

What Spencer found interesting was that 80% of the subjects answered that the yellow beverage was their favorite because it tastes like lemon. The information that Spencer discovered from doing this experiment can be applied to everyday life. People often make quick choices throughout the day based on past experiences, not always on preference. It is important to be mindful when making any choice, especially when it's food, so that we are not fooled into making a wrong choice. Congratulations, Spencer.

*Applause*

*(Photograph Taken)*

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

All right. Come forward. We'll take a photograph. After this photograph if any of the Brookhaven Science Fair winners are still present, we're going to do a photograph with everybody out in the lobby. So after this photograph you can all go out and we'll take a photo. I think some of you may have exhibitions out in the lobby as well. Okay. So one more round of applause.

***Applause***

Okay. Once again, I'd like to ask all of the Brookhaven National Science Fair winners, National Laboratory Science Fair winners, to meet our Presiding Officer, DuWayne Gregory, out in the hall for a picture of everybody together. Okay. While that's put together, let me get the next thing in motion. I'd like to invite Legislator Cilmi forward. He'll be presenting a proclamation to the first place winner of the Be Pool Smart Competition. It's an educational campaign to promote pool safety.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Presiding Officer. I guess the lesson for the parents of young children in the room from Spencer's project is if you want to get your kids to eat broccoli, just color it brown for chocolate. That should work.

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

Well, it's an honor to be here today to recognize the winner of this year's Be Pool Smart Poster Contest. I'd like to ask Gianna Trager and mom and dad and her teacher and principal to join me at the podium. So every year when pool season comes and we look forward to jumping into the pools and jumping into the ocean and having a lot of fun, we all worry when we're going to see that first horrible article in Newsday about a child who unfortunately found his or her way into a pool and, you know, and there's a tragedy because of it.

So years ago the County Legislature here decided that we would try and do something about that problem, and so an educational campaign was devised whereby we would ask elementary school students throughout the County to make posters designed to teach us how to be safe in pools. And so that poster contest has gone on for some time, and I was fortunate last year to have the second place winner in that contest, and I'm very fortunate this year to have the first place winner in that contest.

Gianna Trager is a second grade student at Connetquot Elementary School in East Islip, and her teacher, Maria Marinelli, and principal, Debra Smith, are here with me. The fact that Gianna won the contest this year is really no surprise because Gianna has been entering art contests for some time. In fact, last year I'm told she won the Am Vets Post 18 poster contest called the Freedom Poster Contest. She came in second place last year and came in first place this year. So her art skills are just developing very, very nicely. And, you know, those -- whoever it is that creates acronyms in our world created the STEM acronym, right, science, technology, engineering and math, was very wise to change that acronym to STEAM, science, technology, engineering, art and math, because we recognize how important a part art plays in the education and development of our students and what great things art can do in our world. So let me show you all a copy of Gianna's poster. You will be as amazed as I was. It's very cool.

***Applause***

Now, not only does Gianna get to win and say that she won this contest, and I have a proclamation for you, Gianna. We took pictures before the meeting, by the way. But for those of you who want to get a closer look at Gianna's poster or to learn a little bit more about pool safety, every year the County produces thousands of Be Pool Smart pamphlets, which will be distributed to all the legislative offices and a variety of different places, and Gianna's poster will be front and center on the cover of that pamphlet. So, Gianna, congratulations to you. Great work. By the way, Gianna's dad is a Police Officer here in Suffolk County and Gianna's mom is a teacher, so two public servants and we couldn't be more proud. Thank you.

*Applause*

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

Thank you, Legislator Cilmi. All right. So at this point in our agenda we're past the point of Legislators that have proclamations to various notable representatives of our community. Next on the agenda is statements and presentations by village, town, State and Federal elected officials, and that will be followed by public portion. I know many of you are waiting for public portion.

So I'd like to invite up to address us Supervisor Anna Throne-Holst from the Town of Southampton.

**SUPERVISOR THRONE-HOLST:**

Good morning, Honorable Legislators. It's good to see all of you. I appreciate the opportunity to speak and I appreciate the opportunity to also hear about all of these great, smart kids that we have here on Long Island. That brings me to why I'm really here, and that is to speak -- I know you are going to be considering some of your capital projects and your 2016 budget. I want to thank all of you. My understanding is that the Riverside/Flanders traffic circle is back in the 2016 Capital Project plan, and I want to thank you for that and I want to draw the nexus between that project and all of these bright kids and their future and how important it is that they are able to stay in this area, and that we invest in infrastructure and other programs that make it possible for them to do that.

So the traffic circle, as many of you know, represents the gateway from points west to points both north and south on the two forks on the East End of Long Island. It has been a problem for many years. We in the Town of Southampton, partnering with all of you in the County, have put a lot of time and effort as well as dollars to looking at this area and developing revitalization plans for this area. This is an area that according to the last census and other studies that have been done, is now rated as the single most economically distressed district on Long Island. Let me repeat that. It is the single most economically distressed, according to the latest census, area of Long Island today.

It is an area that is hungry for revitalization, that is welcoming the revitalization and the economic development plans that we have worked jointly on. Those plans were unveiled just a couple of weeks ago. They're fantastic plans. They're mixed use plans. They will bring both housing, retail, affordable housing and job opportunities to an area that very badly needs it. As you know, these things are not easy to do in neighborhoods that are not welcoming this kind of effort. This is a neighborhood that is working with us with open arms, welcoming it, looking for it, clamoring for it.

If we send a message today to developers and private equity that is interested in investing in this area that we are not prepared to do the government part of investing in infrastructure here and making sure that traffic flow and things of that sort are seen to, I fear that we will scare away that private investment. It is crucial for the area. This is one of the most important development opportunities and revitalization opportunities for the area. So I thank you for putting it back in the 2016 budget and I trust that you will keep it there. Thank you very much.

*Applause*

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

Okay. Thank you, Supervisor Thorne-Holst. I have one other public official, Councilman Brad Bender, also from the Town of Southampton.

**MR. BENDER:**

Good morning, Presiding Officer, Legislators. Thank you very much. My name is Councilman Brad Bender with the Town of Southampton. Just to follow-up on Supervisor Thorne-Holst, I want to say that we're at a crossroads in the Riverside community. I know when you think about Southampton

you think about white sandy beaches, you think about mansions and summer fun and Maserati's and Lamborghini's. Well, that's not who we are. I live in a community that 15 to 20% of our residents live at or below the poverty level. I live next to a traffic circle that's been in failure for almost six years, if not longer.

I want to take this opportunity to first off thank the Capital Budget planning group for getting the monies back into the '16 budget for the traffic circle, but I also want to reach out to everyone and say let's keep this money where it is. Let's keep this project on the table. We've got a community that is shovel ready for major redevelopment, similar to what's going on in the Wyandanch area. We've been working for probably going on six, seven years locally with our Riverside Economic Development Steering Committee. We've been recently working with Renaissance Downtowns and coming up with form based code to really put this community back on track, and this traffic circle is one of the most integral pieces to this puzzle. Pushing it back off or defunding it would be a real hindrance to this community. Like I say, although when you think of Southampton you think of all this other thing, but also think of all the tax dollars that we provide the County and we certainly would like to see those tax dollars reinvested back into our community so that we continue to share those tax dollars with everyone.

Also, you have all received a letter from Councilwoman Scalera, who couldn't be here. I think this line that she wrote here, "The overall impact of this revitalization plan for this community is one of regional importance, addressing the provision of diversified housing options, responsible economic development and job creation for the entire East End." So it's a big piece of the pie for all of Suffolk County, and thank you for your time and thank you for keep this project together.

*Applause*

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

Okay. Thank you, Councilman Bender. We're going to move toward public portion. I'm sure you've noticed among us we have several of our future leaders sitting in the audience. I would like to invite actually Doc Spencer to introduce a group of kids so we can let them go back to school, and then we'll go to the regular ordered speakers list. Legislator Spencer.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Presiding Officer. This morning we are joined by members of the Fourth Grade Leadership Team from Washington Primary School, which is in Huntington Station. They contacted my legislative office and they invited me to come listen to an issue that was really important to them. And these young people, they went out into the community, they gathered support, they got petitions, and they wanted to come here and speak to us. So I applaud what they've been able to do. They're here with their teachers this morning. I'm going to ask if the members of the Fourth Grade Leadership Team from Washington Primary, would you guys stand for one moment, please, so all of the Legislators can see you here. Thank you.

*Applause*

**LEG. SPENCER:**

So they want to become part of the legislative process and they insisted on lobbying their administration, getting a school bus, coming here, and they would like to address us in the public portion. So the first speaker, and they're not all going to speak, but some of them will. So the first speaker is Sarah Krisch.

**MS. KRISCH:**

Good morning, Mr. Gregory, fellow Legislators, Clerks, and other members of the Suffolk County Legislature. My name is Sarah Krisch and I am a member of the Washington Primary School's

Leadership Team. On behalf of my team, I would like to thank you for allowing us to attend today's General Meeting, during which we will be given the opportunity to address the Legislature.

I would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the Legislator who represents the area where we live, also known as District 18, Dr. William Spencer. Our team would like to thank Legislator Spencer for taking the time from his busy schedule to visit our team, listen to our concerns and ultimately pledge his full support of our endeavor.

Before we explain why we are here today, I'd like to give you a brief history of Washington Primary's Leadership Team. But before we explain why we are here today, my fellow leaders, Anaya, Hazel and Gabriella would like to give a brief history of Washington Primary School's Leadership Team.

**MS. WATKIS:**

Good morning. My name is Anaya Watkis.

**MS. THOMSON:**

My name is Hazel Thomson.

**MS. FERREIRA:**

My name is Gabriella Ferreira and we would like to tell you about our wonderful team. The leadership team began three years ago as an idea developed by Ms. Quiles, a kindergarten teacher at our school, and Dr. Oz, the school psychologist. Dr. Oz has since moved on to a different school in our district, and Mrs. Joseph, a fourth grade teacher at our school, has taken her place. These adults strongly believe that in order for students to be successful in school, they needed to develop both academic and social/emotional skills.

This is not surprising, as researchers have found that children who demonstrate strong social/emotional skills were happier, more optimistic, and more resilient when faced with struggle, setbacks and disappointments than students with less developed skills in this domain. Research on social/emotional learning also showed that the development of these skills needs to start as early as possible. Thus, the idea of working with the young students in our school was born.

*Applause*

**MS. THOMSON:**

The team is made up of only fourth grade students who were asked to complete an application, have it signed by a parent or guardian, and upon this completion of this they were completed on to the team. In the previous two years the team had 53 and 58 members respectively, but this year the entire fourth grade class is participating, which speaks volumes for this program. Due to the large number of leaders, the group had to be into split in two, with each group meeting on alternate weeks during the lunch period and my classroom. Here kids -- the leadership curriculum is based on author and psychologist Shawn Cuddy's book with the same name and taught by Ms. Quieles and Mrs. Joseph.

Team members bring their lunch on Thursday afternoons and eagerly await the day's agenda, which is filled with role playing, leadership activities, stories and a lot of laughter. Viewed as an integral to learning of leadership, parents are sent a newsletter as each skill is taught. The newsletter offers suggestions for how they can foster the particular skill in their child at home.

*Applause*

**MS. WATKINS:**

Since practice is essential to any skill development, leadership team members ventured out into

both the school and local community to practice skilled leadership. We are indeed proud of the many activities that we have pursued in the past and continue to participate in now, which have included taking leadership roles in PTA sponsored Jump Rope for Heart event, Spring Basket Candy Collection Campaign to support the Helping Hand Rescue Mission, PTA sponsored Thanksgiving Food Drive, PTA sponsored Pasta Night, PTA sponsored Family Fun Night, PTA sponsored Multicultural Night, PTA sponsored Dedication of the Victoria Gaines Playground, kindergarten reading project aimed at building social/emotional skills in Washington Primary's kindergarten population, visits to the Caroline Nursing and Rehabilitation Center, Washington Primary's Beautification Project, landscaping and planting of flowers, working jointly with Huntington High School students and Ms. Camille Tedeschi on community projects, collecting of petition signatures, school beautification project, miscellaneous duties assigned to them throughout the year.

***Applause***

**MR. LUNA:**

And now I'm sure you want to know exactly why we are here today. My name is Pablo Luna and my fellow leader's name is Jonathan Vega. We will now provide you with that answer. Our school, Washington Primary, is located at 78 Whitson Road in Huntington Station, New York. At the very eastern end of Whitson Road, which is approximately a hundred feet from the school, it intersects at Park Avenue, an extremely busy through fare in Huntington Station.

Over the years there have been a number of motor vehicle accidents and at least one that involved a bus from our school at this extremely dangerous intersection. So this year the Washington Primary Leadership Team decided to petition both the Town of Huntington and the Suffolk County Legislature to have a traffic signal installed at the intersection of Whitson Road and Park Avenue. We feel that a traffic signal would not only benefit the students and families of Washington Primary School, but also the bus drivers and local residents who travel these roads on a daily basis.

***Applause***

**MR. VEGA:**

The petition, which you should have a copy of, has already been signed by well over 300 members of the Washington Primary family, as well as residents from the surrounding neighborhood, whose mailboxes were stuffed with information regarding the civic and neighbor. They were invited to visit the school and sign the petition, but if unable they were provided with a copy of the petition to sign and forward to the school. But before we present you with the signed petitions and letters, there are several leaders who would like to share their concerns with you.

***Applause***

**MR. RIOS:**

Hi. My name is Asyria Rios. I believe it is very important to have a traffic light at the corner of Whitson Road and Park Ave. There have been many accidents at Whitson Road and Park Ave. Our buses and even some of our teachers have been in accidents there. A time for buses and cars to turn on to Park Ave. I think if we had the traffic light it will help keep a lot of people safe.

***Applause***

**MS. HANNIGAN:**

Hi. I am Emma Hannigan. I am a fourth grader at Washington Primary School and a member of the Leadership Team. I am asking for a traffic light at the corner of Whitson Road and Park Avenue. It is very dangerous trying to walk across the street. Also, it is very dangerous trying to make a turn at the corner. I know this because I live on Whitson Road. There has also been bus accidents and

there are 400 kids at the school. Also, when you have an accident you have to pay to fix your car, and when you get into an accident you have to pay a premium on your insurance because it will go up. Also, the traffic light will be more effective than a stop sign. Without the stop light the buses have to go an alternative route which causes delays. With the alternate route it takes longer for kids to get home, and if buses get into accidents the school has to pay to fix the buses and kids could get hurt.

*Applause*

**MS. ADDEO:**

We need a traffic light at the corner of Whitson Road and Park Avenue to increase the safety of pedestrians and people driving in cars, until people in cars know when and when not to go.

*Applause*

**MR. REDICK:**

Good morning. My name is Josh Redick and I'm a part of a Leadership Team at Washington Primary School. I have been attending this school for over five years. For as long as I remember, going to and from school has always been very stressful for my mom, my bus drivers and the students. I even remember when my sister's bus got into an accident at the corner of school. It is dangerous and scary. There never seems to be a break in traffic to allow someone to cross.

I did some research as to what criteria -- installing a traffic light you need to meet one of these following: Having volume in four and eight hour pedestrians, rush hour congestion, school crossing hazard, traffic flowing problem, history of accidents. We meet all six. Please help us get a traffic light installed. Let us be proactive and do something now before it's too late and someone really gets hurt. Why does it seem that people only listen when it's too late. Thank you.

*Applause*

**MS. HEPWORTH:**

Dear Suffolk Legislators. Good morning. I'm Leigh Hepworth. I am a fourth grader at Washington Primary School in Huntington Station. I am on the Leadership Team. I think we should have a traffic light on the corner of Whitson Road and Park Avenue. One reason we would need a traffic light there is because kids would get home faster. A few times my mom has been waiting for a while for me to get home. The buses have to go the long way because of safety reasons. If we had a traffic light we would get home faster.

Another reason why we would need a traffic light is because of accidents. There has been a bus accident at that corner. The bus was coming from our school. It was trying to make a left turn to Park Avenue but another vehicle struck the bus. No one got hurt, but it was still dangerous. To prevent accidents like that we should have a traffic light. Thank you for taking your time listening to us. I hope you consider placing a traffic light on the corner of Whitson Road and Park Avenue. Sincerely, Leigh Hepworth.

*Applause*

**MR. SCHUELLER:**

Dear Suffolk County Legislators. My name is Mikah Schueller. I am nine years old and a member of the Leadership Team at Washington Primary. I would like to recommend the installation of a traffic light at the corner of Whitson Road and Park Avenue as it is very dangerous. Last year there was an accident involving a Huntington school bus and a car when a bus tried to make a left turn on to Park

Avenue from Whitson Road.

Another benefit of a traffic light would be to help the buses stay on schedule, as they wouldn't have to wait for an extended period of time for the traffic to clear or to have to travel a longer route to avoid the intersection. A traffic light can also help reduce the speed of vehicles traveling down Park Avenue. Most beneficial would be for the safety of people who walk or ride their bikes across Park Avenue to or from Whitson Road.

On March 25, 2015, the Leadership Team went door to door seeking signatures to petition for the recommended traffic light. Though there were some who declined, we were able to obtain 300 plus signatures.

To summarize, a traffic light would help bus drivers stay on schedule, help to reduce the speed of vehicles and to help pedestrians to safety cross intersections. Thank you for taking my recommendation into consideration. Sincerely, Mikah Schueller.

And now on behalf of Washington Primary School's Fourth Grade Leadership Team, I would like to present the Legislature with our signed petitions and letters.

***Applause***

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I'd like to thank my colleagues on the Legislature for listening to these young people. I am so proud of the Leadership Team. You guys really did a great job. You really took initiative and you came and spoke in front of all these people and you did a wonderful job. I appreciate everyone who is here and the support that you gave them. And we will work very hard to address this issue. Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer, for your indulgence. Thank you.

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

Get them back to school now.

***Applause***

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Excellent job, young people. You did a great job and not only in speaking, you're articulate, certainly more articulate than I am at certain times, but it's great that you're involved and you're coming out and advocating for your community and that's tremendous. Thank you so much for coming here today. At this moment, it's past 11. I'm going to make a motion to extend the public portion.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay.

**MR. LAUBE:**

*Seventeen. (Amended to 16 - Absent: Legislator Muratore - Not Present: Legislator Calarco).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I'm going to make an announcement. We have a ***C of N, IR 1512 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Charter Law to amend Local Law No. 32-2014 to accelerate the consolidation of financial management functions in the County Department of Audit and Control (Co. Exec.).***

We are going to have a public hearing at 2:30 this afternoon, so duly noted. We're going to get back to our cards. Next we are going to do Marlene Petrella and then on deck, Ben Zwirn. Okay. You can start, Ma'am.

**MS. PETRELLA:**

Okay. My name is Marlene Petrella. I have been disabled with cancer and so many rounds of chemo. A normal person could make this speech in three minutes. I need three minutes and 20 seconds. Is that okay? I can't read.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**MS. PETRELLA:**

Okay. My name is Marlene Petrella, and I agree with Steve Bellone. He's on the front page of Newsday, December 21st, 2011, calling the Suffolk County Police Department dysfunctional. In front of you is a redacted police report from 2006. I could not get a copy of this police report until I sued the County in 2012. Everything I tell you is upon information and belief.

I am a disabled cancer survivor and I'm a member of a protected class. The officer who wrote this report knew I was a cancer survivor with hindered verbal abilities. This officer allegedly put in a disparaging remark about me in a snap judgment in this field report, and I cannot get it removed. What I'm telling you is upon information and belief.

What kind of a Supervisor would sign-off on a report like this? It has become intra-agency material. Every officer I came in contact with has an opportunity to access this report. They either refuse to respond to me or take a complaint about a cop.

I'm going to tell you this. This is Lieutenant Spillane from Internal Affairs.

*(Played audio)*

I can't make a claim about a cop in this case or any other case.

I sued the cops and the County in 2012. I sued them, I don't have a lawsuit now, for violating the ADA and my civil rights. I spoke with three Legislators to help me and discuss police misconduct. So far they all dropped the ball and I don't know why. The officer who wrote the redacted report is office Charles K. Roe. He was sued by me in the year 2012. Why did he call my house in May, 2013, from the 5th Precinct? Did he go into the police data to get my number? Well, Internal Affairs refuses to investigate if he did, and Charles K. Roe was promoted in December, 2013, to a Detective. Nobody I sued was surely ever investigated, impossible.

I had to go to Human Rights to make a complaint on the cops, because Lieutenant O'Brien of the 5th Precinct told me I can't make a complaint without a lawyer. When I went back the next day to tell him he was wrong, he said to me, "Who the hell would want to talk to you". I was forced to go to Human Rights. All this includes me enduring an operation every six months to keep me alive and will continue forever.

You all have the glowing report from Internal Affairs that was sent to HR. It was signed by James O'Connell. The only problem is the Sergeant who wrote the report is one of the officers named in my lawsuit. This bring me to the second allegation. If you had a --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Ms. Petrella, please wrap up.

**MS. PETRELLA:**

I am wrapping up. I have like three more sentences.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Thank you.

**MS. PETRELLA:**

If you had a Supreme Court case in front of Judge Garguilo, you were transferred to Judge Rouse in January 2015. You have two dockets in front of you. All the cases were disposed of between March and May of 2015 by Judge Rouse. That is two to four months after he got it. All the cases were suing the County. That is my last paragraph.

Judge Rouse's sister, Patricia A. Rouse, is a County Attorney, a Senior County Attorney, I believe, and he is not disclosing this. We all have our lawsuits gone, all the people that you have, without any deposition. And I want to show you something, and I'm done. This is my lawsuit. This is the County Attorney's answer. There is no way, no way that this could have happened. I'm done.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you for your time. Ben Zwirn and then on deck Frederick Locker.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Tough day to follow all the speakers that we've had here today. With all the students that were here, being from Suffolk Community College, I should have brought some cards. We could have signed some kids up before they left because it goes by so fast.

But I'm here today to speak on two items that will come before you today. One is a grant application that we're asking you to address and to pass. It's 100% funded. It's over \$699,000 from the National Science Foundation to Suffolk Community College for a cyber security program, to establish an Associate's Degree in this new and growing technological field. So we didn't get it in before the Education Committee. We were waiting for a contract to come back from the National Science Foundation. At the last minute they said you're not going to need a contract so you can proceed. It's supposed to begin this week, so this afternoon when you get a chance, it will be under Local Law 40 the County Executive will present, and we're grateful for the County Exec's Office for their help in getting this done.

The other item that I'd like to talk about is the College's Capital Program. There is a budget amendment that will come before the General Legislature today. There were four projects in one of the Omnibus resolutions that cuts four of the capital projects in the College budget by anywhere from 5 to 10%. The total savings to the County would be about \$617,000, but in essence some of these projects will be eliminated with a 10% cut. All of these projects are matched with State money 50-50. So when you cut anything from a College project, the best news would be that the State would just reduce it by an equal amount. We have not had that conversation with the State, and actually the State can say *look, if you're not matching 50%, we're going to take that money and put it somewhere else*. Again, we haven't had that conversation. We're not looking forward to having it.

The projects have been approved by the State, had to go through a rigorous process there. They have gone through the Legislature, and we would hope that you would keep them in total and in full so we don't lose State aid on this and set a bad precedent going forward.

The Capital Budget is a planning document. You will always have to vote on each of these projects at a later time. If economic circumstances appear and you said you can't support it, then you have

an opportunity as we go forward. No more money is spent than is needed, and not one dollar is spent until it's passed by this Legislature, and only the amount that is needed to build the project is used. There is no leftover money. At the end of the year, if there is any money left over in any of the accounts, it goes to pay down debt service for the County. There's no money that's floating around that anybody could use for operating expenses.

So again, it's a planning document. These projects are very important to the College. We would ask you to keep them in total, and thank you very much.

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

Thank you, Mr. Zwirn. Next up is Frederick Locker followed by Brian Lowery.

**MR. LOCKER:**

Okay. Thank you for the opportunity to address the legislative body. My name is Frederick Locker, Rick Locker. I am Counsel to the Safe To Play Coalition. We're a not-for-profit organization. You can see us at -- without wasting any time you can visit [Safetoplaycoalition.org](http://Safetoplaycoalition.org). We're a coalition of thousands of manufacturers, retailers, distributors. We have a wide array of children's products, products that are used to care for and keep children safe. And although most people come before you to ask you to do something or anything, I'm here to ask you not to just do anything. And I'm really speaking about the legislation before the Health Committee called the Toxic Toy Act.

Now, no one is against toxic -- I mean, no one is for toxic toys. We are all for safety. The misconception that's at play here is that you can have and sell toys or other children's products that are toxic in Suffolk County. That is patently untrue. And I would posit that this body has been misled, because this is false, and the reality is just like you, I've sworn an oath to uphold the Constitution of New York State and the Constitution of the United States. And under the Supremacy Clause there exists a wide panoply and array of Federal legislation focused just on toys and children's projects. It's thousands of pages. You could read it at 16 CFR1000. Legislation passed under the Federal Hazardous Substance Act, the Consumer Product Safety Act, the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act, the Child Protection and Safety Act, the Hazardous Art Materials Act. Legislation has passed over the last 20 years.

This legislation bans from sale any children's product that presents an acute or chronic toxic hazard to children, and these regulations already govern these issues. So the question I have to ask is why? Why would this legislative body want to spend taxpayers money, and I'm one of the taxpayers in this County, to enforce a law that is unnecessary? And I have not yet heard a good answer for that. And I would -- I'm willing here just as I've sworn an oath to protect the U.S. constitution, I would swear to you if you were to get a board certified toxicologist from your Department of Health, from the County, from any one of the great educational institutions in the County, to say that toys present a toxic hazard to children, I would say those toys should be banned and must be banned under the Federal Law, but I'm here also to tell you that they don't. So thank you for your consideration.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Locker. Next up is Brian Lowery followed by Vince Taldone.

**MR. LOCKER:**

I just have one other comment. I mean, I think what I really would like --

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

You'll have to make it very brief because your time is up.

**MR. LOCKER:**

Just simply say something to Jack Saldano. If he'd like to arrange a tour of Lego, we'd be happy to accommodate him. And I'd like to quote Spencer, let's not be fooled into making wrong choices.

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

Okay. Thank you, sir.

**MR. LOWERY:**

Good morning. Brian Lowery, Oakdale, New York. I would like to draw your attention to Resolution 571-2012. It was a resolution that was supposed to enhance the safety and security lighting and electrical work at County parks, the Long Island Maritime Museum, the Boat Basin, the Meadow Edge Club and the Meadow Edge Clubhouse. About a year ago I noted that a contractor was installing designer type lamp posts at the golf course. I asked them about them. I asked him if they were suitable for backyard lighting, and he told me that I could not afford those lights. With that, I asked the administration office if they could provide me with information on it, and they told me to FOIL it. I come to find out that each of those lights cost \$10,000. This is a budget of 5,000 -- \$576,000 for 51 lights that were put in.

The resolution stated that these lights would be placed at the Boat Basin. No lights at the Boat Basin. The Long Island Maritime Museum. No lights the Long Island Maritime Museum. There's a greenhouse on this property. It's been vandalized numerous times, plants have been larcened out of them. Any lights there? No. No lights at that location. The County gas pumps, which are in the dark there. If you've ever tried to get gas there being Legislators driving County cars, you know there's no lighting there. Out of that \$576,000 budget, you think they'd put one light there. No light there.

We have -- I know two things about golf. It's the fastest dying sport in America, one golf course closes every 48 hours, and they don't play it at night. We got a half a million dollars worth of lights burning from dusk to dawn on a golf course.

I believe that this money was grossly misspent and I'm asking the Legislature to look into it and to find out how we got to that point and why weren't those funds used according to what the resolution was supposed to be used as. That's it.

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

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Lowery. Our next speaker is Vince Taldone followed by Douglas King.

**MR. TALDONE:**

Good morning, Presiding Officer Gregory, members of the Legislature. My name is Vince Taldone. I'm President of the Flanders, Riverside and Northampton Community Association, a community service group with over 140 paid members and several hundred e-mail contacts, who are all involved in the Riverside Redevelopment and Downtown Riverhead Redevelopment plan.

I'm here today to speak in favor of the Capital Program where you have maintained the Riverside traffic circle in the 2016 budget. I know other elected officials before me, Councilwoman Scalera's letter, all point out the urgency of this project and how it relates to the rest of the redevelopment plan. Riverside is, as was said, a distressed area. It reminds me of the days in Patchogue with the giant empty municipal lots, boarded up buildings. That community is thriving because of a huge amount of effort by local elected officials and this County Legislature. I'm thrilled to see it. We'd like to see that in Riverside as well, because back in 2004, when that parking lot was empty, I sat

there with my nephew, a Village Constable in Patchogue, and we said, you know, this could happen in downtown Riverside, Riverhead and in Patchogue as well. Sadly he was run over by a drunk driver, which that was brought to my attention by the cops earlier who were busting drunk drivers, and I applaud them. But he wanted to see that dream happen, he wanted to Patchogue booming and it is, and he wanted to downtown Riverhead, Riverside, being what it could be.

Well, ten years later downtown Riverside looks just about the same if not worse, but we have a huge grassroots effort underway, where people have come around from their skepticism thinking that government's not going to do anything for them. We have believers. We are all united and we want your support. We need your support. We can't move forward with the rest of the development next year if the traffic circle is not built.

Lastly, you know, that's really the key to, you know, my argument, which is that we have developers. We have private money waiting to be invested in Riverside, which will generate lots of cash for Suffolk County and the local community. None of that can happen until you know where the sidewalk is going to be. So the site plans will sit and wait an extra year or two if this traffic circle is not rebuilt, and rebuilt in 2016.

So I thank you again. I understand this is a very difficult fiscal time for Suffolk County, and there are many places that need your money, but I think this is one of those investments that you'll be proud of and you will see results within a few years that will truly make you proud of your positions and the work of the local governments, who have united and worked quite well together to make this happen and happen now. Thank you.

***Applause***

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

Okay. Thank you Mr. Taldone. Next up is Douglas King. Douglas will be followed by Siris Barrios.

**MR. KING:**

Good morning, Suffolk County Legislature. My name is Douglas King. I sit on the Suffolk County Disability Advisory Board. I'm the Legislative Chairperson for that committee. The reason why I'm here to talk to you today is IR 1484, which is going to be tabled to committee. I wanted to talk to you before it went to committee as a group.

One of the things I am suggesting is that when you guys get something that's for disabilities, please come to the Advisory Board first. There have been several resolutions that have come before this Legislature that were mistakes that should have gone to the Disability Advisory Board first, such as the SCAT buses, the 1500 Series SCAT buses, and several others.

I've also talked to several of you on both sides of the aisle where you've had disability issues going on with each and every one of your districts. And, again, I would strongly suggest that the Legislature make a committee that if a problem comes up on disabilities that you come to the Advisory Board first. Each and every one of you I've spoken to individually. You know how to get ahold of me, and that's just at suggestion that I am making. Thank you.

***Applause***

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

Thank you Mr. King. Siris Barrios is next and then Linda Testagrose.

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

**MR. BARRIOS:**

Good morning. My name is Siris Barrios, I'm the Community Liaison for Riverside We Discover. I'm here today to thank you for putting back the funding into 2016, the Working Committee for the Capital Budget for Project No. 557. You probably received, many of you in here, about 250 e-mails saying please put back the funding into 2'16. Many of you probably received a few e-mails in the last few hours saying thank you for putting back the funding into 2016. Well, I'm here today representing those residents that really want to see the Riverside traffic signal reconfigured. We knocked on over 500 doors in the last few months engaging residents of our revitalization, and honestly, what I got at the door, often was a lack of trust from government, a lack of belief that anything will happen. But we've got many people on board saying, I really believe this is going to happen, but the reconfiguration of the traffic circle is really key to this community and I'm just here to speak on behalf of those residents that couldn't be here. We have small delegation of residents that drove from the east and this morning we've been here since 9:30 and we just want to thank you and we want you to keep the funding in 2016 because it's vital for this community. Thank you very much.

*Applause*

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

Okay. Next is Linda Testagrose, followed by Roberta Chase Wilding.

**MS. TESTAGROSE:**

Good morning. My name is Linda Testagrose, I am a resident of Riverside. I live on Flanders Road. I've been actively involved with {FRINCA} and all the other local communities trying to improve our community. The funding for the Riverside traffic circle is key to the redevelopment of our area. We already pressed, we need jobs, we need your help and your help comes in the form of the traffic circle being improved. I'd appreciate it if you would keep it in the budget. Thank you for your time.

*Applause*

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

Okay, thank you. Next is Roberta Chase Wilding, followed by Theodora Cohen.

**MS. CHASE-WILDING:**

Good morning. Thank you so much for the opportunity to speak with you again today. My name is Bobbi Chase-Wilding, I'm the Deputy Director for Clean and Healthy New York, and I am here, so grateful to finally be here on the day that you're going to be voting on the Toxic-Free Toys Act. This is a huge issue and a very important piece of legislation to move and I want to thank Legislator Hahn for all of her work as the sponsor for this.

Toxic chemicals harm children's health. We have ample evidence of that, scientific studies that have shown that chemicals that are in our children's environment on a daily basis can affect their health, and the chemicals that are in the legislation that you are considering have a role in contributing to learning and developmental disabilities, cancer, heart disease, long-term infertility. The exposures children face can affect their health for their entire lives.

Furthermore, these toxic chemicals are, in fact, in children's products. And the declaration of the earlier speaker notwithstanding, we've done testing and found these chemicals in children's products for sale on store shelves here on Long Island. Further than that, Washington State has collected ample evidence from manufacturers reporting directly to them. In 2014 alone, I just want to remind you that over 11,000 products containing toxic chemicals were reported by manufacturers to Washington State. This is clearly a problem that needs a solution and the Toxic-Free Toys Act is it.

This is an issue that has broad support from families and community members here on Long Island. Recent polling data conducted this Spring showed that 58% of voters said it was very important, the issue of children's health, that they consider that to be a very important issue when thinking about what candidates they would vote for, focused on the Statewide Child-Safe Products Act; 82% of voters support that legislation here on Long Island, 82%. That's huge. And 59% of voters polled said that they would be likely to vote for a candidate that was actively working for that bill's passage.

This is an issue that's got resonance with your constituents. This is an issue that protects the children in your community. This is an issue that Suffolk County taking action, as you have in the past on so many other important pieces of legislation to protect your community, can make a real impact. I know that there are questions and concerns that were raised about the earlier version of this, and I know that Legislator Hahn worked hard to make sure that the current version of this bill has addressed concerns about -- that have been raised up in Albany so that the legality of it is much firmer in the law itself, although we're confident that the Albany County law is also legal.

So I just encourage you to vote yesterday, vote yes for your children, vote yes for their health and vote yes to make Suffolk County and New York State a stronger and healthier place for everybody. Thank you so much.

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

Okay. Thank you, Roberta. Next is Theodora Cohen, followed by Angela Huneault.

**MS. COHEN:**

Hello. I'm Theodora Cohen, I live in Riverhead, but I have a business in Riverside, and I want to thank you all for your support and approval of the budget for the 2016 monies for the traffic circle in Riverside. I have been involved in the community meetings in Riverside to create change because the area is severally depressed. My business is on Route 104 Riverly Avenue for the past seven years and I took a risk going there. It was the only affordable rent I could get and I opened up an antique consignment shop there.

I have witnessed many drug dealers, prostitutes going past my shop and also -- it didn't hurt my business too much, but it certainly bothered me. And I decided to take some action and got involved with several community groups in the past seven years at the Ludlum School and I saw that the residents of the area have really made an effort all of these years and this is the one time that I see the enthusiasm and the efforts of the Town of Southampton, the efforts of our Legislators and the efforts of the Renaissance Development Group that has been working with us for a year and have put together with all of us a vision to create enormous change in the area. The Town of Southampton and the Town of Riverhead have joined together in approving the Water Fire Project, for the Peconic River, which I believe is going to be a catalyst for change in the area. But mostly needed is the configuration of the traffic circle, because I will tell you that on Route 104, throughout the day there is traffic coming from the Hamptons that is backed all the way up past Pine Street every day in front of my shop. It's great advertising for my shop, but certainly that is the traffic that comes from the Hamptons that goes to Tanger. Also, if I try to avoid that and go down Pine down 24, the traffic is all backed up all the way up Route 24, and this is every day. So I believe that if something is done and the County Legislators support this effort, and there is a tremendous effort from the community, from the Town of Riverhead, the Town of Southampton to create change in this area because the circle is the gateway to the Hamptons. And people come from Tanger, they'll stop at Tanger, then they'll go out to the Hamptons and then you have this dilapidated area. I've seen the restaurants go out of business, I've seen the gas stations go out of business and it's not very appealing at all. If you head to the North Fork, you go into the beautiful farms, you're going out to all the wineries and then out to the Hamptons. So this is a catalyst for change on the East End, and

it's greatly needed, your support, to continue to support the work that needs to be done there.

The Renaissance Group, which was brought in by the Town of Southampton, has done enormous strides, has created, with the help of the community, visions for beautiful architecture, if you have the time to look it up on the website, their website, Riverside Rediscovered, you'll see the changes that are occurring.

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

Ms. Cohen, I'm sorry, your time is up.

**MS. COHEN:**

Am I taking too long?

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

Yes, your time is up. So if --

**MS. COHEN:**

Oh.

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

But thank you.

**MS. COHEN:**

Okay. So, but I did want to thank you again and encourage the support and that's it. Thank you.

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

Probable cause.

***Applause***

Okay. Our next speaker is Angela Huneault, followed by Chris Goken.

**MS. HUNEAULT:**

Hi. My name is Angela Huneault, I'm a homeowner in the Hamlet of Flanders, Town of Southampton. I'm also the Assistant Liaison for Riverside Rediscovered. I am here to thank you for your support of keeping the budget for the traffic circle in 2016.

The Capital Project is an essential part of our overall redevelopment 5557 is an essential part of our overall redevelopment of Riverside. It means so much to me and my family who have lived in this community for over 30 years. I am a mother of two young adults, 18 and 20, that have expressed to me that they will leave, there's nothing here for them to -- there's nothing in our particular area for them to stay and we're losing so many of our young people. I'm seeing my children's friends graduating from high school and leaving, and they know exactly what we are trying to do in the Riverside area. And they have both said to me they love the vision, they love what they're seeing, *Mom, I'll stay. I'll stay if it gets done.* It will get done when the circle gets done. So I am asking you, please, keep it in the budget for 2016 so that this can continue to be the area that all is going to want to come to, all is going to want to not leave and enjoy for future generations. So I say it is time for Riverside to be rediscovered. Thank you so much.

***Applause***

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

Okay. Chris Goken followed by Donna Cumella.

**MR. GOEKEN:**

Good morning. Christopher Goeken with the New York League of Conservation Voters. I'm here today to express our support for the Toxic Toy bill which you will be voting on later today which has been introduced and authored by Legislator Kara Hahn. What I wanted to spend my time today talking about is some of the discussions on the Albany County lawsuit and also what's happening in the New York State Legislature having to do with a similar bill.

So the Albany County lawsuit was filed -- it was a political stunt, basically, on behalf of the toy industry to try to scare the Westchester Legislature and scare you guys into passing this bill. As you know, I am an attorney, a lot of you guys are as well, and that lawsuit was filed way too prematurely. None of the claims were right because the regulations hadn't actually been drafted yet. How can you sue to stop a bill from being implemented before it's been implemented? So what happened there is that the toy industry kind of jumped the gun and filed that to get the headlines and to pressure you and the Westchester Legislature. The Westchester Legislature said, *Well, thank you very much, we're going to go forward with it and we really hope you guys do the same and heres why?* Their claims in the bill -- their claims against the Albany County bill have been addressed by Legislator Hahn in the amended version of the bill which is what's before you today. There were some claims having to do with Federal preemption, Legislator Hahn took a look at that, she took a look at the lawsuit in Albany and changed the bill here to address those concerns. So the bill you have now is cleaner, it's much clearer as to what the Department of Health is going to be doing, and it's been specifically retooled in light of the Albany County lawsuit.

One other thing I want to add about that is that there is a stay in Albany County and that was negotiated between the toy industry and the Albany County Attorney who I spoke with about this, and that was done so that Albany County didn't have to spend resources on fighting the lawsuit while they're also developing the regulations to enforce the act over the next six months. What the toy industry got out of that is not having to go before the Judge in July and admit, *Oh, we don't really have any harm because this law hasn't been enforced yet, which would have made them look pretty bad.* So that's the update on the Albany lawsuit.

I want to give you a quick update on what's going on in the State Legislature, and that is that the Statewide version of the bill, which is much more comprehensive than this, has great momentum and we're making great momentum up there. And you guys passing this bill today, the Suffolk County Legislature, joining the other counties and saying to the State, we believe it's really important to protect kids from toxic chemicals and we don't want to see mercury and cadmium and lead in children's products in Suffolk. That's the message that I urge you to send today to Albany, to the Albany Legislature, to the State Senate and to the State Assembly by passing the Toxic Toy bill here today. Thank you very much.

***Applause***

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

Okay, Donna Cumella is next, followed by Amanda Roth.

**MS. CUMELLA:**

Good morning, Presiding Officer DuWayne Gregory and the member of this Legislature. My name is Donna Cumella and I'm here as a concerned taxpayer urging this County legislature to intervene on our behalf and join in the efforts of our County Comptroller, John Kennedy, and Brookhaven Town Supervisor Ed Romaine with their fight against PSE&G's 4% rate increase over the next three years. This rate increase will effect approximately three million taxpayers of this County, an increase we cannot afford, and we need your sport and help to strengthen the fight against them.

I'm aware that our Presiding Officer, Honorable DuWayne Gregory, has, approximately about a month and a half ago, stated that this Legislature were talking about the joint efforts in the case against PSE&G, but that no decision has been rendered thus far. So today I'm asking that this Legislative body send a message to PSE&G that we cannot sustain this rate increase. The taxpayers of Suffolk County, myself included, cannot sustain these rising costs.

We are already struggling to make ends meet. We are already losing our children who are moving to other states. We cannot afford to live here because of the cost of living in our homes. So today I'm asking that you fight against PSE&G's rate increase of 4%, along with our County Comptroller John Kennedy and our Brookhaven Town Supervisor Ed Romaine to stop this.

Each year that increase will result in an increase of \$72 million, a total of \$216 million over the three-year period that they're asking for this increase. That's a quarter of a billion dollars. We can't afford to live here now; what is that going to do to us? So I'm asking for your support, for you to fight on our behalf and make that happen, that it doesn't increase the PSE&G rate to us, the taxpayer. Thank you.

***Applause***

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

Okay, thank you, Ms. Cumella. Amanda Roth is next, followed by Pauline Salotti.

**MS. ROTH:**

Good morning. My name is Amanda Roth, I remind you I live in Dix Hills with my husband, my son and my daughter and I'm back to speak before you on 1382, the Toxic-Free Toys Act, to stand up for this County's children. I'm a volunteer and a spokesperson with the Huntington Breast Cancer Action Coalition. Additionally, I have with me today a list of parents who also gave me permission to stand up for them. I've been only collecting names for a couple of days and my list continues to grow.

I understand that since I spoke here last that similar legislation has been introduced in Putnam and Dutchess Counties. I understand that there is a bill at the State level that 40 Senators cosigned, but clearly it is stuck in a resolving door. Unfortunately for our children, it doesn't look like it's going anywhere fast, and I must implore you not to wait. I understand that Albany County was slapped with a lawsuit to fight their newly enacted law and how a potential lawsuit could be a financial burden on this County. Believe me, I know, raising healthy kids is not cheap.

Suffolk County has proven itself a leader in children's health. You were the first County in 2009 to ban baby bottles made with BPA from being sold locally. And because you led the way for Schenectady, Albany and Rockland Counties, BPA was subsequently banned from baby bottles and sippy cups in New York State, and eventually in the U.S., because of this County. I read a New York Times article that San Francisco tried to ban BPA in children's products back in 2006, but backed off after a bill was challenged in court. Imagine if the potential threat of a lawsuit had deterred Suffolk County back in 2009. What would the future state of my children's health look like? My son was born in 2009 and drank from BPA free bottles and my daughter was born in 2007, drank from BPA-free cups thanks to the work done in this chamber. You and your predecessors saved them from long-term adverse health effects due to exposure to endocrine disrupters when they were tiny, helpless babies. The ban on BPA paved the way for another law here protecting us all from the health risks of exposure to BPA on paper receipts. Let's be honest with each other and with the residents of Suffolk County; if the Federal laws were stringent enough, we wouldn't be standing here today discussing any of this. There would not be toys on the market available for purchase containing mercury, cadmium, cobalt and antimony as shown in the reports from Long Island, Monroe County, Westchester, Albany, Erie and Onatanka Counties. And the same goes for the State

law; if it were in place, we wouldn't be standing here today, but it's not.

Sometimes we just need to stand up and do what is right. To waiver over a law that is sensible and as I understand has been proven enforceable at a reasonable cost to protect small defenseless children doesn't seem right. Stand up for what is right, stand up for this County's children. Other counties are watching Suffolk. You've been a leader before, don't wait and see, do and watch others follow your lead. Thank you.

***Applause***

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

All right, thank you, Ms. Roth. Next up is Pauline Salotti, followed by Joshua Klainberg.

**MS. SALOTTI:**

Good morning, Mr. Presiding Officer and Board of Legislators. I'm Pauline Salotti, I live in Patchogue, I host a radio show on WSB-FM and I appreciate the opportunity to speak before this board today as I urge you to vote in favor of the Toxic-Free Toys Act. First and again, thank you, Legislator Hahn, for introducing this bill, as your action here can change the way manufacturers make products, not just for New York but the entire nation. As you already know, heavy metals were found in products being sold here on Long Island and that is to answer the question of the speaker here before in favor of the corporate interests. Yes, why use taxpayer money to enforce the regulations?

To me that sounds, excuse me, like a joke.

So yes, they were found here. Cadmium, arsenic, lead, mercury, antimony and cobalt. The chemicals pose a threat to our children, not only because their brains are in development, and it is harder for their bodies to expel those heavy metals, but also kids, as we know, put things in their mouth. Now, my daughter is already 11-years old now and I wouldn't have to worry about her putting items of a jewelry making kit, for example, which was found to contain cadmium, antimony, arsenic, lead and mercury, for example, but the skin is the largest organ in our bodies and it may absorb those chemicals just as well.

Now, apparently the Toy Industry Association and American Chemistry council are doing all they can to derail this bill, which is sad and frustrating, though not surprising given the times that we live in where corporate interests and profits are often placed ahead of the interests and well being of individuals within the community. Now, please vote for the Toxic-Free Toys Act. Citizens have the right to find only safe products at every toy store, or anywhere for that matter. Thank you in advance for your support.

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

Thank you, Ms. Salotti. Joshua Kleinberg followed --

**MR. KLEINBERG:**

Yes. Hi. I'm Joshua Kleinberg, New York League of Conservation Voters Education Fund. Ben Zwirn accused me of being a toxic-toy lobbyist, I guess I chose the wrong color tie today (*laughter*). While the -- I was going to -- I had revised my remarks. I'm here to speak in favor of item number 1382, the Toxic-Free Toy Act, and while the Washington Primary Student Leadership Team was here, I had revised my remarks. I was going to ask them some questions, but I'll pose it to you all.

I was going to ask them if any of them had ever been in a restaurant or a movie theatre where there was smoking present, and I'm sure none of them would have raised their hand, and what I would have told them was because of the Suffolk County Legislature 20 years ago passing it an indoor smoking ban and subsequent measures on public health. And the reason why that was an important

thing to point out is a couple of different things. Going back in time machine, in my mind's eye I see Nora Bredes around here, I see Paul Tonna around here, I see the strong, bipartisan tradition of this Legislature in terms of public health, in terms of protecting our environment. And back then, back in the day -- although it was about a year prior of my working at the League of Conservation Voters, I wasn't around for that fight -- the fight back at that time was against big tobacco coming in with lawyers, with lobbyists, with publicists saying, This is not necessary, this is illegal, it's probably unconstitutional, etcetera, etcetera. And national organizations coming in for one small County. Why? Because -- well, because they knew that you all were onto something and that Suffolk County had the reputation that as Suffolk County goes, so does the State and perhaps even the nation. And timeless efforts have proven that when you all pass bills that are forward thinking on drinking water protection or public health, it gets noticed and that's important. And that's why we have members from the American Chemistry Council here, a national organization who spends, you know, tens of millions in dollars, coming to one little County, not a small County but a very significant County, but one County in all the State of America. Why? Because they understand that you all are doing something very important, very critical.

This fight is bigger than this County, but this fight cannot be won without the support of this County. The State is watching, other states are watching, the Federal government is watching. This has been an issue that's been long-standing in Washington for many, many years. And as you know, as County legislators, sometime to give the Federal government a kick to do the right thing, states have to act. But when States drag their feet, the Counties have to act; that's how democracy works. And we can't wait around for Federal action to be stalled any longer. You all are leaders in this fight. As my colleagues said prior, we are a pragmatic organization, we're not erratic. We're so pragmatic, maybe we're radical in that respect, but we're very pragmatic. We wouldn't put legislation before you that would be too much on one side and not taking things into effect in terms of economy and all that. We've worked with Legislator Hahn, we've worked with Doc Spencer and countless others who reworked this bill to make this a practical, reasonable measure. And we have been walking the streets and talking to voters about it, they're behind this and now they're going to be watching you tonight and hopefully, if not here in person, thanks for the information technology abilities, on-line tonight to watch you take yet another historic step in terms of protecting our children and protecting our environment. Thank you very much.

***Applause***

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

Thank you, Mr. Kleinberg; just in time with the clock. All right, Cesar Malaga is next, followed by Eric Alexander.

**MR. MALAGA:**

Good morning. My name is Cesar Malaga, I am the President of the Hispanic American Association. I have been attending these public meetings for over 40 years. I have never seen any of you who are elected here prior to any meetings, it's a surprise. I mean, none of you, except the Presiding Officer who has, you know, worked for previous administrators.

Now, let me, you know, start saying that do we have democracy in Suffolk County, and the simple answer is no. It's called control by the Democratic Chairman and the Republican Chairman who decide who should run and who should not run. I run for Suffolk County Legislator for the 14th district, I run three times; twice. Of course. I was rejected because of my signatures, others for other things. I sued the Board of Elections through the court system about the type of elections we have in Suffolk County. Of course I lost because the Judges are also part of the system, the Democrats or Republicans. And the last time I run, I run for the Green Party, I switched parties, and at that time, you know, there was no signature checking. My name was placed on the bottom of the ballot, so it was unjust.

Now, let me go to another thing about County budgets. Many of you approve things that we do not have the money for. Let me change it, the Police. The Police Benevolent Association, you know, gives you money for your campaigns. We have the highest paid Police Department in the world with good benefits. There's no work that you can get that money and benefits. I at one time here suggested, you know, why don't we hire former, you know, servicemen who are returning from Iraq or Afghanistan, probably we'll pay half of the salaries, we'll save money. Okay? And it didn't work.

Now, about your budget, the Legislators. In June 15th, 2012, Newsday had an article indicating a study I made about your expenses and how much money you make. As a part-time Legislator, you make between, what is it, 86,000 to 105, just looking back to 2008. And the expense, you have Aides, three, four, you have an office, people don't go there. Don't go there. There was a survey back in, you know, of how many people -- the New York Times and they said, "*No, no one comes here.*"

The other thing -- the last thing I want to discuss is LIPA.

*(Beeper Sounded)*

None of you really get involved in LIPA. You know, LIPA -- well, I used to attend the meetings with LILCo and then LIPA. Now --

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

Cesar, I'm sorry --

**MR. MALAGA:**

Just one second. Just one second.

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

Yeah, that's okay. If you could briefly finish up.

**MR. MALAGA:**

And we paid, you know, 3.7 billion. I mean, that's ridiculous. Well, I have a little bit more, but since you're timing me out, what can I do? Thank you.

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

I appreciate it. You'll be back, I'm sure, next time, and you can tell us more about your LIPA concerns.

All right, Eric Alexander, followed by Susan Tocci.

**MR. ALEXANDER:**

Members of the Suffolk Leg, I wanted to come down tonight -- Eric Alexander, Director of Vision Long Island. I wanted to come down today and support the Capital Budget which has a lot of excellent projects in this round and reflects the priorities of a lot of local communities that we've done work in and we certainly see a remerging.

Under sewers, there's Ronkonkoma Hub, there's Riverhead, there's Port Jeff, Huntington Station has a community project moving forward with renaissance, Feasibility for Central Islip Sewers, Kings Park, Smithtown sewers, and clearly the good work that's been done in the Forge River by Kate Browning for many years and leveraging significant dollars on the State level. And then also having infrastructure dollars tied to workforce housing is also key. And again, there are a lot of local

projects emerging out of communities, some of which you heard in Riverside. And on the transportation piece, again, the Riverside traffic circle, I know Jay Schneiderman has been dogging and making sure that's back in the budget and we're glad to see that and certainly our organization supports that. Improvements to Sagtikos that would support heartland redevelopment, paratransit buses, rails-to-trails, I know it's something Sarah Anker, Legislator Anker worked on many years and certainly the Rocky Point visioning that we were part of, that was a big priority.

So there's been a culmination of a lot of sewer and transportation infrastructure projects that have come forward and we're glad to see them in this budget. And I want to credit Rob Calarco and DuWayne Gregory for the Complete Streets Fund and we're glad to see that continue on in this budget. We need more of that, we do need DPW to be more sensitive to pedestrian amenities and Complete Streets and traffic calming, and that's a subject for another day.

So leveraging, why is this important? I want to commend Steve Bellone for his Connect Long Island Plan. You know, Route 110, County Road 97, other developments around the Island. Having a regional vision's important, more importantly, these plans coming from local communities. But what these types of -- what this type of budget does and what you're doing today in passing this is it leverages private investment, the multi-family housing that's coming and the mixed-use development and downtowns having the right infrastructure to match that is key.

On the public investment side, Federal and State dollars will come if you put up dollar and continuing these projects in the pipeline. And, you know, we came back from Dallas, Texas, our national conference where, again, hyper local projects matched by regional and State and Federal infrastructure is what's growing communities across the country. So you have those opportunities. We just came back from DC at Infrastructure Week where we know the Feds need to get the transportation dollars moving forward and to get a transportation bill. There's work to be done on that, but for today, you're doing your work appropriately. And certainly we can sit -- we know the State has \$550 million set aside for infrastructure projects for Long Island, some of these projects can be leveraged in those funds. There are other community planned projects that need to come into the budgets moving forward; again, a subject for another day, but I just wanted to say. Good job. Okay, thank you.

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

Okay. Next up is Susan Tocci, followed by Edward Ochler.

**MS. TOCCI:**

Good morning. My name is Susan Tocci, I'm here to thank you for the support on Capital 5557. I'm a resident of Flanders, as well as my family from many generations; unfortunately we have watched this area fall to disrepair. This is the first time that I have a little bit of home that we're going to see Riverside revitalized. I'm thankful that the County is doing its share for the revitalization of blighted areas of Riverside by providing the traffic circle reconstruction money in 2016. The project is needed now to enable the private sector to invest in developing the private properties along the circle which will create much needed jobs and tax revenues for our school. Please, keep the funding for this project in 2016. Thank you.

*Applause*

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

Okay. Next is Ed Oehler, followed by Chris Sheldon.

**MR. OEHLER:**

How you doing? Thank you. I'm here for this solar plant across Long Island. I live on Mark Drive, it's a residential neighborhood. And they proposed a solar plant in a wetland area, wooded. Most of

these solar plants have been researched and are put in municipalities. Why are they picking a watershed area full of trees to knock down, to put up 5,000 solar panels in a residential neighborhood in our backyards. We have 380 houses in this neighborhood, only thirteen were notified of this project going on. I went two blocks away, nobody even heard of this. You know, I'm under the understanding that this can be squashed right now.

We got petitions signed, a couple of hundred. We're going to follow into this, we're not going to let this, you know, keep going. We need support on this, because this is a residential neighborhood. This is not an industrial park. There's over 6,000 pieces of brown area that have been cleared already in Suffolk County that are being used for nothing that I've heard of that this plant can be put to. Now, take a wooded area and chop all these trees down, approximately six acres of wetlands. We're trying to get answers and so far we have not reached any answers.

Mr. Lindsay was good enough to inform us about this, it's been going on since December 13th, you know, 2013. We were just notified a couple of weeks ago of this, just thirteen houses out of a whole neighborhood. We need answers. And who can help us put a stop to this and find another area for this? We're not against progress, but it doesn't coincide with our neighborhood. Holbrook's a beautiful neighborhood. These are all beautiful houses, residential, and now they're going to come in -- they actually came in the other day and started knocking trees down without any permits and we were told they were not going to touch this area for at least thirty or sixty days; all of a sudden we see a bulldozer just come in knocking down trees. They were stopped by Islip without the right stuff, right permits, everything else like that. We need answers. I appreciate your time.

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

Thank you, Sir. All right, next up is Chris Sheldon followed by Edward Ochler, or Oehler.

**MR. OEHLER:**

*(Inaudible).*

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

Mr. Oehler, you had two cards for some reason. Okay, thank you, sir. It's just Chris Sheldon is our last speaker. All Legislators please report back to the horseshoe. Thank you.

**MR. SHELDON:**

Now it's afternoon; good afternoon. My name is Chris Sheldon, I am a member of the Riverside Economic Development Committee. I'm here to support your support for our efforts with the traffic circle in Riverside. I don't know if you realize this, but that traffic circle has five roads that lead into it, most circles have four. It requires reconfiguration for safety reasons and for traffic flow. There will be now two lanes in the traffic circle, so that will help speed up the traffic.

The traffic circle, it's my understanding, was built in the 1930s, and all of the roads leading up to it were dirt roads turned into concrete. It's time for improvement. The population has increased, the Hamptons have become more popular, the North Fork is more popular. We need to move the traffic through our area so that the locals can get around. Downtown Riverhead is doing its best to improve itself and they need downtown Riverside to do the same.

One other thing is this. It's my understanding that wherever the County Seal is where the County Seat is, and that's with the Clerk's Office and that's in Riverside, Folks. So this is officially the County Seat of Suffolk County and it's important that we can get traffic in and out in a smart way. So thank you very much. It's the gateway to the East End and we hope that you appreciate that and help us restore the traffic circle. Thank you.

***Applause***

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

All right. That is the last speaker card I have. Is there anyone else who didn't fill out a card who wishes to be heard? Sir, if you'll come up, identify yourself for our record.

**MR. BARZ:**

Yes, good morning, Legislator. My name is Ron Barz, a past Chief, the Hauppauge Fire Department Commissioner, an instructor at the Fire Academy and presently serving on the Board of Directors for the Suffolk County Fire Academy.

I'm here to speak about your proposal for a 10% cut to FRES. As you realize, through the years training has become harder and harder for us. Right now the State of New York, through PESH and OSHA, has put out a Best Practice Guideline. This guideline pertains to interior, exterior firefighters, chauffeurs and line officers. This is going to be put a bigger burden upon the account -- sorry, upon the academy to run. This is one of another mandates that they have put down upon us and the only way we have it is through you. I would ask you not to do -- to cut FRES.

And also on the radios, we talk about -- everybody knows Motorola has gone out of the radio business as far as contingent on the low band. We are asking you not to cut that also because with the radio system we have, this would cause a greater problem with FRES taking this, and intercommunications could be maintained between different fire organizations in this County. As you know, in 1995 we had the wild fires, every year since then we've had major fires in this County. Fire departments do have separate radio systems where they cannot talk to one another. FRES has the communications equipment to make this possible, so we can talk to each other. You have 110 fire departments and possible 105 different frequencies. If you make this cut, as it would be right now, anything east of 111 would not be able to communicate with each other again.

The other thing I would really like to talk about, and I know this has been before you, is the board-up. Regulating these people is a mandat I would say you have to take care of, for the simple reason -- as an ex-Chief and a coordinator for this County, I have had six of them locked up at fire scenes already for their interference with us, they're bothering the people. As a Chief, I was inside a house that was burning and they called up, *This is the Chief of the fire department, can I talk to you.* This is what these people do. They're nothing but vultures upon it, and they have to be regulated. If they're licensed, please license them to stop them from coming up to scenes and interfering with the fire service, interfering with us trying to do a job, taking people who are watching their homes burn down trying to get them to sign up a piece of paper to say they can board it up. This is totally, totally unacceptable. And when I passed one of them on the Sagtikos Parkway and he's driving a Bentley, something's really wrong. I'm driving a Ford Explorer, he's driving a Bentley Convertible. That's all I have to say. Thank you very much.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, thank you. That's all the cards that I have. Is there anyone else that would like to speak that hasn't filled out a card and spoken? Please come forward.

**MR. ROSARIO:**

Mr. Presiding Officer, Members of the Legislature, I wasn't going to speak, but I guess part of me is always perturbed when I hear our industry put down in negative terms. I do represent corporate -- for the record, my name is Steven Rosario, I'm with the American Chemistry Council. And yes, I do represent any number of corporations, but those corporations are made up of human beings; mother and fathers, many of whom work here on Long Island and I have had the pleasure of meeting in my 23 plus years representing the industry. And I can't get them to come to Legislative meetings because they're working; they're making a livelihood for their children and for their grandchildren. And when they're not working, they're involved in Little League, Girl Scouts or any other number of community organizations. So I just remind you that when you hear the proponents talk about big,

bad old American Chemistry Council, remember, I'm representing a lot of mothers and fathers.

The second point I'd like to make is that if any of you had fruit this morning, and I know I try and have every morning, all of you ate chemicals this morning. Because if you go back to your chemistry, there are naturally-occurring chemicals and there is this high school teacher that has actually put posters together on all the chemicals that are in fruits. And you know, we're all interested in the safety of our children and in the safety of our products, and many of the proponents argued that the County and the states had to get involved because the Feds weren't doing anything, and you've heard me speak that the Feds finally are, after many, many, many years. As a matter of fact, the House bill is scheduled for floor debate on June 23rd after multiple hearings in marking up the bill. So I'm surprised that the proponents never talk about that, and we think that the Senate bill will probably be brought to the floor in June as well.

The last comment that I'd like to make is my wife's family has had a home out here since 1947, so I've been coming to Suffolk County for 33 years because that's how long I've been married, and now we have the home that used to belong my mother-in-law. And when I'm out here, I hear a lot of pleas, you heard it this afternoon from parents who say that their kids can't live on Long Island anymore. I can't tell you, if I had children, if they could afford to live on Long Island. I live in Upstate, New York, which is also getting more and more expensive, and I raise that because eventually children do have to find jobs. And in this particular case, when a County --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Mr. Rosario?

**MR. ROSARIO:**

-- or a State makes a product -- I'm wrapping up, Mr. Gregory. Make a safe product less competitive, it raises a question of companies as to why should I be on Long Island, why should I be in New York. So the question you all have to answer, I think, before you vote, and I'm sure the proposal will pass, is in light of the Federal action and in light of the lawsuit, does it really make true sense to move this proposal forward? Thank you very much. As always, I appreciate the time.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you. Okay. Is there anyone else? Okay. I make a motion to -- can I have all Legislators to the horseshoe to close the public portion?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. I'll make a motion to close the Public Portion. Second by Legislator Cilmi.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen (*AMENDED VOTE: Fifteen - Not Present: Legislators Calarco & D'Amaro - Absent: Legislator Muratore*).

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right, we have several resolutions that we have to get to, take out of order, I'm going to do them now for time consideration.

We have a CN.

**MS. HORST:**

We have Sara Lansdale coming in from across the street to talk to you about the CN, so if you can skip over that for just a few minutes, she's on her way.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. We have eight minutes.

**MS. HORST:**

She should be here any minute.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right, we'll skip that. All right, we're going to go to *Home Rule Message No. 1-2015* -- I'll make a motion to take it out of order, let me read it -- second by Legislator Schneiderman -- *Requesting New York State Legislature to amend the General Municipal Law, in relation to Adopting Local Laws to regulate taxicabs and limousines in the County of Suffolk (Senate Bill No. S.5263 and Assembly Bill No. A.7426).*

**MR. NOLAN:**

It's in the folder.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I'm sorry, it's in the manila folder, if you look at it -- look for it.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Which one?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

It's the Home Rule Message No. 1. Okay? All right, we have the motion and the second by Legislator Cilmi --

**MR. LAUBE:**

Who's the second?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Excuse me, Schneiderman. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions to take out of order.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. I'll make a motion, second by Legislator Schneiderman to approve. The Home Rule Message is before us. Anybody on the motion?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Can someone explain?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I think we have Counsel to explain. It's a technical correction.

**MR. NOLAN:**

This is requested by the State, it's a technical correction, reflects a technical correction to the State authorizing legislation regarding limousine or taxis; simply that we act here by Local Law rather than ordinance, and that's the change to the State bill. That's it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Anyone else? Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Mr. Clerk, please note my recusal on the record, please.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Sixteen (Recused: Legislator Lindsay - Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, I'll make a motion to take Home Rule Message No. 2 out of order.

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

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Seconded by Legislator Schneiderman, it's ***Requesting the State of New York to amend the tax law to extend the additional one-percent sales and compensating use tax rate (Senate Bill S.5671/Assembly Bill A.7863) (County Executive)***. Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. I make a motion to approve. Second by Legislator Schneiderman. Anyone on the motion?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Is there going to be any discussion on reapportionment of this money or how the money is spent currently? I mean, this is something that I never voted on. I'm trying to find the date on this when it was passed; 2009 it was amended. It was increased, I think substantially, in 2009.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Is -- this is not the Hotel/Motel Tax.

**MR. NOLAN:**

One percent sales tax additional.

**LEG. CILMI:**

That's Home Rule No. 3.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. I stand corrected. I had one underneath the other.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right, hold your powder (*laughter*). All right. We have a motion and a second to approve. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. I make a motion to take **Home Rule Message No. 3-2015** out of order. Second by Legislator Schneiderman. It is **Requesting the New York State Legislature to authorize Suffolk County to extend a temporary Hotel/Motel Tax (County Executive)**. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

To take it out of order, yes. I'll make a motion to approve. Second by Legislator Schneiderman. On the --

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

No, I don't want to second that.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

No? Okay, all right. Do I have a second? Do I have a second?

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

*(Laughter)*. All right, second by Legislator Lindsay. On the motion, we have several people. Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. You're saying now I can fire away? Okay, thank you. All right, so there's been a lot of discussion about the way -- and I think I did find in 2009 it was increased substantially and I know I affects a lot of the businesses on the East End who pay -- you know, have to collect it for the County and then it's distributed through various ways, more or less throughout the County. And I think because of the way it's -- first of all, the amount itself, there was great concern that it would be increased, I hope that's not the case. And the way it's distributed I think should be debated here and discussed and not just -- if this is just to reauthorize it as is, you know, I don't really want to support that. I'd rather see this discussed in a more open fashion than five minutes before lunch so that we can really get into the way it's been distributed.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Well, this is a two-year extender of the current 3%. You know, this is a Home Rule Message reflecting what the State Senate and State Assembly have done with two weeks or less than two weeks left for them to have a session. If we don't extend it this year, it expires; I don't think anyone wants that. So given that, is there anyone else?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Can't they add -- just to answer that. Can't they reauthorize this in the Fall? They have to extend

it, they only have how many days now?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

They can, but they aren't scheduled to meet in the Fall. Their session ends June 30th, or whatever it is. They have no scheduled plans to come back in the Fall.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I mean, there's a lot of concern that this Hotel/Motel Tax is collected in the East and spent in the West. And I -- you know, I didn't think without having a real open discussion about that, you're never going to dispel that notion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. Legislator Cilmi?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yeah, the question here is does the legislation that we're supporting, I guess this question is to Counsel; does the legislation that we're supporting here allow the County to determine the proportions which are, you know, where we dole this money out, or are we fixed in that?

**MR. NOLAN:**

No, we're going to be still guided and bound by what's in the State legislation.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And the State legislation indicates what those proportions are?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yes, it does.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I'm with Legislator Krupski. A number of us spent some time the other day with a small group of folks from the hotel and motel industry and, you know, we talked about concerns and among them was the amount of money that we spend here in Suffolk County on marketing Suffolk County, in addition to the value of the marketing dollars that we spend here in Suffolk County through the Long Island Convention and Visitors Bureau. So I think, as Legislator Krupski suggests, that the time is right to reevaluate the proportions of that money that's collected. We collect roughly \$9 million a year, we've collected more than \$40 million since the tax was increased. We have seen that the increase in tax, interestingly, has not led to a decrease in business in hotels and motels throughout Suffolk County, it's actually somewhat increased over that time. But nevertheless, we have to make sure that the dollars that we're collecting are spent in the most judicious way and the most beneficial way possible, and I don't -- I'm not convinced that we're doing that right now. So I echo Legislator Krupski's question in that, you know, can't we take this up again or can't the State legislature take this up again when they reconvene later in the year?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I certainly can't control their agenda, but, you know, this is -- you know, this is not the Suffolk County Delegation that's going to be -- ask every Legislator, Assembly Member from across the State to come in to deal with a Suffolk County specific issue, and I don't think the majority of people would agree with that. So, you know, that's just the nature of State legislation. You know, it's not a statewide proposal, it's Suffolk County specific, and every Legislator from every County throughout the State is going to have to come in the off-session to agree to extend what has already been in place for, what, at least three to five years?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Longer, about five or six years --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Five or six years?

**MR. NOLAN:**

-- with the current structure, yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So we run the risk of someone from Onondaga County saying, No, I don't want -- if Suffolk County doesn't have the foresight to vote in their best interest, I'm not going to agree to come back in September or October or whenever to agree to do something that they don't see is in their own best interest. I think it's a risk. Because, you know, December 31st this expires, so we run the risk of losing millions of revenue, potential revenue. It's an extender of what we have. We're not adding additional taxes, we're not -- there's no shift in the structure of the allocations. It is what we have.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So let me ask -- if I may, let me ask a follow up question, then. Is there a way that we can extend this as is or support the Home Rule Message and as such extending as is now, but requests that the State Legislature amend the distribution of the tax when they reconvene; is that something that's possible?

**MR. NOLAN:**

I mean, the State could -- we could pass this and later they could pass a bill changing the allocation or give us the authority to change the allocation, but I'm pretty sure it's going to take some time and doing in order to get people up there to agree what that allocation will be and people down here to agree what the changes would be.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Well, if --

**MR. NOLAN:**

But nothing stops the State from acting after we authorize the 3% tax under the current allocation.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So if our Suffolk County delegation, both in the Assembly and the Senate, let's say, got together and we convened sort of a working group, I'm not suggesting that we necessarily do that through the County Legislature, but maybe we should. But we convened a working group with industry people as well and agreed on some, you know, reconfiguration of those -- of that allocation. You know, I would imagine that at that point, if the County delegation is supportive of a change and this is specifically for Suffolk County, that the rest of the State Legislature would go along with it; I would think that that would happen. And I'm not -- you know, again, this is -- I'm suggesting that we do this after passing this Home Rule Message, so.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. I have Jay.

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

Yeah, I'll defer for a moment to Jon Schneider from the Executive's Office who probably will say what I'm about to say anyway. So go ahead.

**MR. SCHNEIDER:**

Sure. So just to be clear on the timing here, the State Legislature is currently scheduled to go out of session on June 18th. Our next meeting is June 16th, so if this Home Rule Message is not passed today, we run -- in the -- with the hopes that we can bring our State Delegation back to the table and craft a whole new piece of legislation, we are running the risk -- I would go beyond we are running the risk, we are running the probability that we will not have an extender this year.

So normally this tax is extended in five-year increments. What we're looking to do, quite frankly, and this goes along the lines I think of what a lot of you are saying, is this is a two-year extender. And quite frankly, the thinking that went into that and, you know, the County Executive had spoken with some folks in our State Delegation, is we agree that there is a need to look at the whole -- at the entirety of the program, look at how it's allocated and make sure that essentially we are getting the best bang for our buck. So I think we are certainly very open to that conversation based upon the, you know, talks with members of our State Delegation, I believe they are open to that conversation as well. So in other words, you know, the safest, best course of action would be to pass this today, essentially just extend our existing tax, our existing allocations as is, and then yes, there is, you know, then plenty of time and will to resolve all outstanding issues.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

And have lunch.

**MR. SCHNEIDER:**

And have lunch.

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

So back to me for a second. So, you know, I've never really been a fan of the hotel tax. It originally was three-quarters of one percent, but it was all supposedly to promote tourism, then it went up to a total of -- I think it's 3%, so it was a big jump, and there has been some talk about increasing it more. But, you know, I didn't support that initially. I think the last time it came up I supported the reauthorization because the County had become so dependent upon it and we're in that situation now. So, you know, at least a third of the nine million or \$10 million that the Hotel Tax generates is helping the County's General Fund, plus another roughly million that goes to Vanderbilt for its operations. We can't afford at this point to let it, and that's unfortunate. But we are dependent upon those revenues. So at minimum, I think we ought to allow them to extend it for two years while we figure out the problems with this tax and maybe make it do more of what it was intended to do. But I don't think we have a choice in terms of not passing this Home Rule Message.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Hahn? I have a list.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yeah, I think everything I was going to say has been said, basically. I mean, I think -- my understanding is that the discussions had begun, you know, on how to rethink this, but it just -- we weren't able to get to where we want to be so there's a shorter extender to give us the opportunity to have those discussions and get to a place where everybody agrees. So, you know, as said before, I think we have to do this now.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Spencer?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Everything was already stated. I'm good.

**P.O. GREGORY:**  
Legislator Krupski?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. I was writing my thoughts down and now I don't have to. This is something that I've brought up in the past, this is something that people from my district have asked me about, because it is a great concern. And the reallocation of the money I think would be something that we really should look into. And because I've asked for that, I don't -- if we don't have to have a decision by the 17th and we can make a decision by the 16th, I don't -- at a General Meeting in Riverhead, and actually you can have input from people in Riverhead before we make that decision. I think that we should work on -- there's no reason we shouldn't work on talking about reallocation.

It might not -- I do recognize that all the votes, all the things that I propose here don't always go my way, I understand that, but I think this is very important and I think it deserves, you know, a little more attention. I mean, it's an important tax that's levied on one industry, it benefits the County, everyone County-wide, and it also benefits like kind of a private business, and I think we should talk about it. I don't think we should vote until the 16th.

**P.O. GREGORY:**  
Okay. Legislator McCaffrey.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes, I agree with Legislator Krupski. You know, this is -- I mean, this is five minutes before we're breaking for lunch we're being asked to make this decision, gun-to-our-head, we need to do this. I mean, this is something that we should've known about, had a chance to talk about and discuss. I know we've got some real concerns out there concerning this whole new dynamic with this Airbnb and in terms of enforcing that and penalties for those people that don't comply with the rules and regulations. I agree with Legislator Krupski, that we could, at the very least, put this off until our next meeting, we have a chance to at least talk about it in committee and come back with something that we all feel more comfortable with other than at the eleventh hour having to do this. We still have time to do this next meeting.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Look, you know, there's no guns to anyone's head. I think all weapons were left at the door. You know, this is something that it was almost, you know, that has been unanimously supported in the past.

We were told that we had to try to get it done by five o'clock today, so we were asked to take it out of order and that's why we took it out of order. As stated by the Administration, the 16th is probably a little too late, but we can certainly -- we'll have to put it off if you want. Hold on, I do have two other speakers. Legislator Barraga and Trotta.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

I can understand the frustration with reference to taking a look at a reallocation of the 3%, but time is an element here. I think you should just support the extender and get it done at the State level. I don't think when you're discussing a reallocation of the 3% you're going to solve anything in two weeks. I've had groups approach me that they're looking for a piece of that 3%, and you may find yourself in a situation, if you really want to sit down over the next months after this passes and you get it to your extender, you may want to increase it from three to 4%.

I mean, I've got a regional airport in Suffolk County, McArthur Airport, and they face -- it's a regional airport, it benefits the east and west, they have some serious challenges with reference to being able to market the airport and the feeling on the part of some, and I think the Supervisor of

the Town of Islip, is that maybe we should get a piece of that at 3%, going directly to the airport. I am sure there are five or six other groups that fall into the same line, wanting a piece of the 3% or extending it from three to four to 5%. So it's not going to be decided in the next two weeks. Do the extender and get it passed in the State for two years and then we sit down, we'll have a talk, a serious talk about what we want to do as far as a reallocation or increasing it from three to four to 5%.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. HAHN:**

I was just under the impression, and I thought Legislator Barraga would address this, you know, I don't think that us talking about this now and then passing something on the 16th would get Albany to move in two days. Like I just -- it's not -- right, Tom? I mean, it's just not happening.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Right, not going to happen.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Like we -- Jon, can you speak to that point, please?

**MR. SCHNEIDER:**

Just to clarify that point. What we are talking about is a Home Rule Message for a piece of legislation that is being carried by Senator LaValle and Englebright. We, we did not -- did not write that piece of legislation, so we -- all we can do is pass a Home Rule Message for that which is, not that which we wish would be. So what I'm saying is there is a piece of legislation that is ready to go in Albany that will simply extend the tax that we rely upon for two years and give us the -- and then give us a time. By the way, to work together with our State Delegation, they have to actually draft and pass legislation up there on then some other allocation as we would see fit. But again, certainly with the timeline that we have available to us, that is not a realistic goal. What is very realistic is to pass this Home Rule today, work with our State delegation, work with members of this body, our State delegation, relevant industries on what we would like to see and then let's see if we could put together the coalition to make it happen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Krupski, and then we're going to call the vote.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I really think that that's kind of the other way around looking at it. I really think that we need to tell the State we're collecting it in Suffolk County, we need to tell the State how we want to see it allocated and not the other way around.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, Mr. Clerk, we -- Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Why -- you know, why wasn't this done last month or the month before or in February?

**MR. SCHNEIDER:**

The legislation was just introduced. The legislation was literally introduced yesterday, Legislator.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

The State legislation?

**MR. SCHNEIDER:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So we waited until what they did.

**MR. SCHNEIDER:**

Yes. The way this works is that they -- that they introduced a piece of legislation up in Albany and then we pass a Home Rule Message to support that when it affects Suffolk County. So the actual legislation that is in question here was introduced yesterday.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

That was my question.

**MR. SCHNEIDER:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I mean, it wasn't done in February and we just got around to it now.

**MR. SCHNEIDER:**

Correct.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. I'm sorry?

**LEG. CILMI:**

If I may. Have there been discussions, maybe to Mr. Schneider or the Presiding Officer. Have there been discussions dating prior to when this was just introduced yesterday about the allocation of the money or any other potential changes to this tax?

**MR. SCHNEIDER:**

I am -- I could tell you that we have -- that we were looking for less than -- for as short an extension as possible to allow for all of these discussions to be had. Because the County Executive shares the interest that many of you are raising around this table to do that, and a two-year -- normally this is a five-year extender, all I can tell you is that a two-year extender is what came back, that allows for the possibility of having this conversation much sooner than would otherwise be the case.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And the County Executive asked for less than two years as an extender.

**MR. SCHNEIDER:**

The County Executive was looking for the minimal possible extender possible and a two-year piece of legislation is what was introduced.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And when did those conversations begin?

**MR. SCHNEIDER:**

I don't have the answer to that question.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Mr. Presiding Officer, do you happen to know?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I -- we have been in discussions with some of the members of the Assembly dating January, February? It's been a few months, a couple months. Certainly this session, earlier in this session.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And have you been party to those conversations, some of them?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Have you -- I mean, found you found a willingness to sort listen to concerns about the allocation or other concerns with respect to this?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Absolutely. As Jon Schneider mentioned, there was a willingness to have a shorter extension and, you know, the State Legislature, being its own body, is going to do what they can get their entire body to agree with and this is what they came back with, a two-year extender. Legislator Kennedy, then Legislator D'Amaro, then --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No, my question was just answered.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Just very briefly, I want to just make the point that this legislation was not the brain child of the County. This legislation was the brain child of State representatives -- Senator LaValle, Assemblyman Englebright -- and it sets priorities that were not set by us. So, you know, we have -- the reason why it's probably a two-year extender, that was probably already a concession given by the State, because this is not so much about priorities here in the County, I think it's more about what the State priorities were. Through the good work of the Presiding Officer and the County Executive and we have reasonable State representatives that are willing to sit at the table and talk, but it's not like you're going to walk into this room and make demands and say, *This is coming from Suffolk County, this is the way it's going to be.* That's not going to happen.

This is State legislation. And I think that the more we continue this discussion, I think the more we're putting that at risk. I think we should have that discussion. I agree with Legislator Cilmi that we need to revisit these priorities and Legislator Krupski, but this is not the time. And certainly in the next two weeks we are not going to make demands on these State representatives and tell them, *It's our way or no way;* that's just not going to happen. This is about their priorities.

So I would encourage everyone to let's vote it today, we'll take the two years and we'll sit down and we'll talk about it and see what we can convince them or ask them to do for us in working with us. But it's not going to be like we're going to make that demand, it's just not going to happen that way.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay? All right, Mr. Clerk, we have a motion and a second.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Yes, we do.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Opposed.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Sixteen (Opposed: Legislator Krupski - Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, it is 12:45, we are going to recess for lunch. Thank you.

*(\*The meeting was recessed at 12:45 P.M. \*)*

*(\*The meeting was reconvened at 2:33 P.M. \*)*

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

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, Mr. Clerk.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Good afternoon, Mr. Presiding Officer.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Please do the roll call.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sure do.

*(\*Roll was called by Mr. Richberg -  
Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature\*)*

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Here.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Here.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

*(Absent).*

**LEG. HAHN:**

Present.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Here.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Present.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Here.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Here.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Here.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Here.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Wow, sorry. Barraga, I apologize.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Barraga.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Barraga.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Barraga's the other guy.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**MR. LAUBE:**

I'm the one that says Barraga.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

I know, I'm worried.

*(\*Roll call Continued\*)*

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Here.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Here.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Here.

**LEG. STERN:**

Here.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Here.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Here.

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

Here.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Here.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

There's a lot of base in the 18th.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yeah. All right, we have a couple of public hearings. Actually, ***Public Hearing 2015-2016 Suffolk Community College Budget***. I don't have any cards. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak on the College Budget, please come forward. Okay. Not seeing any, I make a motion to close.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, next ***Public Hearing is IR 1118-15 - A Local Law amending Chapter 563 of the Suffolk County Code to modify the Laws Relating to Home Furnishings and Dealers in Second-hand Articles (County Executive)***.

I don't have any cards on this public hearing as well. Anyone in the audience who would like to speak, please come forward.

**MS. HORST:**

If you could just recess this for one more cycle.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right, I make a motion to recess. Second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Fifteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn & Stern - Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, ***(Public Hearing on) IR 1260-15 - A Local Law to regulate "Board Up" Businesses in***

**Suffolk County (Browning).** I have several cards, the first being Michael Cox.

**MR. COX:**

Mr. Presiding Officer, Members of the Legislature, thank you for allowing me to speak on this resolution again. Once again, I am here in opposition to the resolution, but I would thank Ms. Browning for amending the biggest problem in the resolution as it was written, and that was the list that was to be maintained by FRES of board-up companies. However, again, I go back to the issue of the necessity of this law, the necessity versus the compelling public interest and the cost basis and whether this law, as written, meets that compelling public interest in the least restrictive fashion to commerce.

A reading of the law demonstrates that the Legislature determines that the purpose of this law is to protect the consumer, provide the minimum consumer protection measures. However, the earlier Legislative intents, nowhere in there does it say that the consumer has not been protected. Merely it says that this industry, which I believe we all agree is very limited companies, four to six as reflected in the new financial impact statement, I believe we've accepted -- the Legislature has accepted that proposition. There are four to six companies that operate here, but the Legislature finds and determines that they operate free of regulation. Well, while that may be true in a public interest, from public regulation, it is not true in the private sector. This industry is maintained and regulated by the insurance companies. These insurance companies protect their clients, their insureds. They have a united interest with their insureds to make sure that they are paying the proper amount and getting their clients the proper services. And as indicated by my client, Mr. Negrón, his company does not contract directly with consumers. His company contracts with the insurance agency or through a third party that has been previously contracted by the insurance agency.

So again, I don't see a supporting basis for this law -- for this resolution except for the fact that this board finds that there is no public regulation. I believe that's a bit myopic, and I also believe it's a bit of a nanny-state that we're so cognizant of now. You know, I was fortunate enough to show up at the committee meeting on May 27th, County Executive Bellone had a wonderful presentation how -- regarding the combination of the Treasurer's Department and the Comptroller's Office and how that would save the County taxpayers a tremendous amount of money in both efficiencies and in getting rid of duplication and removal of staff. This law doesn't do that; this law does the opposite. I mean, we look at the original financial impact statement and we see that the Department of Labor has indicated it would cost about \$250,000 to maintain -- to implement this law in a five-year basis.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Mr. Cox, your time is up, but Legislator Lindsay does have a question for you.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Good afternoon. Just to set the record straight, the Department of Consumer Affairs made an adjustment that there is no financial impact. They're not going to have to hire any additional staff based upon the fact that it's just a registration form.

**MR. COX:**

Well, that's a little bit conclusionary because it made the same -- using the same data, the same argument, it said it needed an additional person.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

But --

**MR. COX:**

I don't know where the difference came.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

But they came back and said they did an error not realizing how many companies there were out there, and just for the sake of having someone have a license doesn't mean that they have to go out and hire all this new staff. So if we take that argument off the board --

**MR. COX:**

I don't know if I can take that argument off the board, Legislator Lindsay, because I didn't see why there was -- they didn't explain how they made that adjustment, that determination in the first place.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Let's just use simple logic. We talked in here in committee during several public hearings about how many board-up company firms there are in the County; there's not hundreds of them, there's not thousands of them, you can probably count them on two hands. So, you know, just logically speaking, would the County need to hire a mass amount of new staff to regulate a dozen companies?

**MR. COX:**

I don't know, but that goes to --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Well, I do know, we don't; we don't have to hire anymore staff.

**MR. COX:**

They said it originally, but that goes to the -- the Legislative Intent didn't change. It doesn't say that the Legislature finds that a couple of companies or four companies operate in Suffolk County, it still says that the Legislature finds that numerous companies operate in Suffolk County without a license. So on one hand we're changing the dynamic, on the other hand we're not for the Legislative purpose. Are we just changing things -- did the Budget Office just change this so that this law doesn't have a financial impact? I don't know. And you know --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I do know that they didn't.

**MR. COX:**

I'm sorry.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

You know, they did not do that. You know, I don't see how your client, who I know you're trying to represent, is harmed by just having to register with the Department of Consumer Affairs. I don't see how that's onerous, I don't see how that's a nanny-state. It gives the residents of Suffolk County the ability to have some kind of recourse if there is an issue with any particular contractor. For your client, I think it levels the playing field. It doesn't allow for someone to come in and work under the radar without having the proper insurance and licensing and all the things that I'm sure he does so diligently. I just don't see how this is harmful.

**MR. COX:**

There are four companies that we're dealing with, but we're allowing every other home improvement contractor to come in and to be added to a registry. I have to --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

So we're increasing competition for your client, but --

**MR. COX:**

But --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I mean, that's the environment we live in. It's a free market society, so why -- I understand you're trying to fight for your client, but for the residents who we represent, more competition is better for them.

**MR. COX:**

Nowhere in this resolution has it been shown that the residents, any resident has been comprised, any resident hasn't been protected.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

On the contrary, we had people in from the fire departments that were saying there were issues where they had people that were in this business who were not representing themselves in a very judicious way and acting in the best interest of the homeowners.

**MR. COX:**

We've got anecdotal evidence -- anecdotal statements. We haven't had --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I understand. This isn't a Court of Law, though, where we need to have factual evidence and so forth. I mean, I trust the members of our emergency service units that came in and testified that this was a necessity, in their opinion.

**MR. COX:**

With all due respect, the basis of the legislation --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

If we could keep the dialogue to just questions.

**MR. COX:**

The basis for this legislation can't be a pretext. The pretext is the platitude that we want to protect the consumer; that's great. The platitude is that we want the firemen to act without any distraction, that's a great platitude. But there is no content to this legislation that says -- nowhere in this legislation did the Legislature find as a compelling interest that the consumers have been damaged or endangered or that they have been compromised because there's no regulation over the four companies that operate in Suffolk County, nor was there any testimony that the fire department has been denied their ability to fight fires or protect people.

And then if we go further into the legislation, there are definitions here that don't even apply to this law. For example, the definition of unconscionable trade practices doesn't apply to my client when he shows up at a fire, it only applies when the Executive declares a State of Emergency. So there are issues with this law that need to be addressed that were -- I had three minutes the last time, or five minutes and then I answered questions, so the primary goal at that point was to address the list that FRES was going to give out. But that didn't correct all the other defects in this law, and this should go back to committee and the committee should work on this law before it just gets passed because we want to pass a law without any compelling public interest.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

It's not -- and I respectfully disagree, but I'll yield and go back to the Presiding Officer.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Cox. Next I have Mr. Negron.

**MR. NEGRON:**

I'm going to rest my case.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

No? Okay. All right. Next, Mr. Peter Cincotta.

**MR. CINCOTTA:**

Good afternoon, everyone. Mr. Presiding Officer, Members of the Legislature, my name is Peter Cincotta, I'm a 33-year member of the Selden Fire Department. I'm also here in front of you today representing the Suffolk County Volunteer Firemens Association as their President.

The 33 years that I've been a member of the fire service in Suffolk County, I have seen where these board-up companies -- and again, they are there to do the right thing, the right thing by the homeowner, the right thing as far as public safety. Once you have a burned-out building and you have a burned-out shell, it is an unsafe environment. So they are there for a good purpose, they are there purposefully.

The problem that the fire service sees with this and why we've brought it up, we've brought it to your attention, is because there's a point of fact where they're interfering with the fire fighting aspect, the control, the containment and the suppression of the fire or the emergency. They're not and no one is supposed to be coming under the line without checking in, without talking to command, without letting someone know that they're on the emergency scene. And being able to stage with us and being able to then, when we're done with our operations -- and at some point, if it doesn't become an arson investigation, where now you've got people that are interfering and compromising possibly a crime scene -- then they have their job to do and we actually get out of their way.

So that's really the question. The question is they're interfering, they're stopping and they're distracting the fire suppression or whatever else the emergency might be at this particular incident or this particular scene. There have also been numerous conversations where they actually block the road and they block our ability to get into the scene; that's a problem, too. We don't know who they are. They could be subcontracted or employees of the four companies, but they have some of them pull up in vans, pick-up trucks with no labeling, no names and no license. So who are they, who are these people? We don't know and we have no way of finding out because there's no labeling on their vehicle sometimes. We have ID cards, we have identification, everybody knows who we are, and if you ask I could show it to you. All we're looking for is who these people are and if they're interfering, we want to be able to follow it up and even let their bosses know that these aren't the proper people maybe that you want representing your good company.

I don't think any contractor who's already not in this business is going to start because of a Legislative law that's been passed. I feel that if they're not into this already, they're certainly not going to get into it. I give them a lot of credit for what they do, the hours that they do it, and sometimes the weather conditions that they do it in, to make a resident safe, protect what needs to be protected and people get back to what they need to do. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right, thank you. Okay, next person, Edward Springer. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Peter? We have -- Legislator McCaffrey has a question for you.

**MR. CINCOTTA:**

See, I waited this time, I waited. Yes, sir?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Hey, Pete. How are you?

**MR. CINCOTTA:**

Good. Good afternoon.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Good afternoon to you. So you think that the licensing aspect of it will cover this, will add some kind of law and order; is that what the gist of it is? At least -- your big concern is knowing who's on the fire scene, because you don't know if they're strangers and you need to account for anybody that's under that tape there, right, on the fire scene?

**MR. CINCOTTA:**

Correct.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Is that your biggest concern, identifying the people, setting up some protocol that when they're on the fire scene they need to see a chief or somebody on there to make sure that they're there and they stay where they're supposed to be until you need them to come and do their job; is that fair to say?

**MR. CINCOTTA:**

Yes, sir.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

And you think the legislation as we're proposing now addresses that issue?

**MR. CINCOTTA:**

I think it would be a start. I think people certainly need to act accordingly and that's an individual, but I think it would give us a proper recourse and certainly a better way to follow-up if there is an issue with a board-up company or their representatives. Right now a white panel van could pull up where two guys get out and say they're representing a board-up company.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Right.

**MR. CINCOTTA:**

I don't know that. They might do a great job, I don't know that, though. And if they get in our way, how would we be able to follow it up?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

The biggest thing is for you to be able to identify the people on the fire scene because -- showing that they're licensed by Suffolk County to perform the work and to make sure that they check in with whoever is in charge at that scene at the fire, right?

**MR. CINCOTTA:**

Yes, sir.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Okay. Thank you.

**MR. CINCOTTA:**

You're welcome.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, thank you. All right, Mr. Springer, now you can come up.

**CHIEF SPRINGER:**

Good afternoon. My name's Ed Springer, Chief Fire Marshal of Suffolk County, also I have 43 years in the fire service, volunteer. And there has been many, many issues with the board-up companies over the past years. We're not asking even them to be licensed. If you look at it, it's -- they're only registering with the Consumer Affairs, they're not even going to be licensed. So there's even less of a burden on these companies.

It's a matter of identifying those vehicles as they approach, someone having an identification card so they could -- you know, the incident commander or whoever may be in charge can look at that card to make sure that they are a legitimate company working for a legitimate company with the card. But again, this has been brought on by the fire service, the fire -- town -- County Fire Chiefs, the County districts. It hasn't been us or any one individual. Kate Browning, we met with all the Fire Marshals within the towns, so it has been talked about. And there are a number of problems that exist and continue to exist with the board-up companies. I'm not saying that it is all the time, but it would be nice to be able to identify a company by the name on the truck, it's not even a license, it's just a registration that they have that they're registered with Consumer Affairs. And again, I think the support would be great for the fire service to have this bill passed.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Great. Thank you, Chief Springer.

**CHIEF SPRINGER:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. That's all the cards I have on IR 1260. Is there anyone else that would like to speak? Please come forward. Okay.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Motion to close.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion to close by Legislator Browning. Second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Sixteen (Not Present: Legislator Hahn - Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, the Public Hearing is closed.

***(Public Hearing on) IR 1512-15 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Charter Law to amend Local Law No. 32-2014 to accelerate the consolidation of financial management functions***

**in the County Department of Audit and Control (County Executive).** I don't have any cards on this Public Hearing. It was posted this morning, it's going to be a C of N later on in the agenda. Is there anyone that would like to speak on this matter? Please come forward.

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

Motion to close.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

If not, okay, motion to close by Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Sixteen (Not Present: Legislator Hahn - Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, the Public Hearing is closed.

Okay, I make a motion to set the following Public Hearings, setting the date for the following Public Hearings of June 16th, 2015, 6:30 PM at the Maxine Postal Auditorium, Riverhead, NY: IR 1447, IR 1451. I have a second by Legislator Schneiderman. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Sixteen (VOTE AMENDED TO 15 - Not Present: Legislators Browning & Hahn - Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, we're going to get back to the agenda. There were several other --

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Mr. Presiding Officer? Could I make a motion to reconsider Home Rule Message No. 2?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Krupski wants to make a motion to reconsider **Home Rule Message No. 2**, and that is -- it's **Requesting the State of New York to amend the tax law to extend the additional one-percent sales and compensating use tax rate (Senate Bill S.5671/Assembly Bill A.7863)**. Is there a second?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

*(Inaudible).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Is there a second? Who was that?

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

I'll second for the purpose of --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Schneiderman. Second to the benefit of East End collaboration and cooperation. Okay.

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? The motion is before us.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Fifteen (Not Present: Legislators Browning & Hahn - Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I would like to thank everyone for their indulgence. There's something that I missed before on this Home Rule Message, it is -- if you look at the last page on lines 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22, it references the revenue sharing with the East End departments. And I think -- I would like to appeal to the State, the language should state that those PDMOs outside the districts are where the revenue sharing should be distributed to and you should be -- it should use a population-based formula, and it doesn't state that. And I think it would be clearer and easier every year when we do the budget, at the very least, if it had that language in it.

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

Just on the motion. So, I mean, I agree with you, Legislator Krupski. I've been asking our State delegation to add that sort of language, and this is something they reauthorize I believe every year. But if we don't get the 1%, it would short our general budget by, Robert, what, 300 million plus dollars, right? So it's a quarter of all the sales tax we bring in. So we can't not do it, but I do think down the road, since they're going to reauthorize this every year, that we do fix that so that it's a fair-base formula, it may be subject to the State Comptroller or population-base or other formula, fair formula. Typically, when an area shares sales tax, it is subject to the State Comptroller, and it's usually a population-based formula. But this should be specified but it's not.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. So I'll make a motion to approve.

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

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. I'll make a motion to take ***IR 1515-15*** - Accepting and appropriating -- out of order, which is ***Accepting and appropriating a grant award from the National Science Foundation, for an Advanced Technological Education Program entitled "Leading Innovation through Green High-Tech Engineering, Sustainability and Security" (LIGHTES2), 100% reimbursed by Federal funds at Suffolk County Community College (County Executive)***. I'll make the motion. Second by Legislator Anker.

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

To take it out of order.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yeah, to take it out of order. It's in the manilla folder. Okay, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, I'll make a motion to approve.

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

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Schneiderman. Did everyone have a chance to look at it?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Is this the National Science Foundation?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

This, yes.

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

It's 100% reimbursed.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. If you look in your red folders, we've got a request to take IR **1522** out of order.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***Accepting Federal Department of the Interior Grant Program funds, amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds in connection with the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) Hurricane Sandy Coastal Resiliency via Integrated Salt Marsh Management grant (CP 8710)(County Executive).***

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second. Motion by Legislator McCaffrey. All in -- to take out of order. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, I make a motion to approve.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator McCaffrey. Anyone on the motion?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Can we get some answers from the Administration as to, you know, the location of this project, where the money and how the money is going to be spent?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Yes. So it's a grant for \$1.3 million and the locations are yet to be determined. They will be prioritized based on criteria established in the Vector Control, the County's Vector Control plan.

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

This is all reimbursable, right? We're going to layout the 1.1, that's why we have to bond, and then we get the money back.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

That's right, and then we are matching it with \$688,849 of in-kind staff time and equipment that the County owns.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Okay. Are there -- some of the preamble there, there'll be money for personnel for travel and whatnot. Where did I see that? And there'll be -- contractors will be hired?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

That's right. There would be \$549,979 for contractors.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

And non-for-profit groups; what will they do?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

That's included in there. That includes groups, for instance, The Nature Conservancy, the Stony Brook University and the Corps Network, and Frank will explain what their roles are with the project.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

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

Just one correction; I said 1.1, it's 1.3, roughly.

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Yes, it's 1.3.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Anyone else?

**MR. CASTELLI:**

Frank Castelli, Economic Development and Planning. The not-for-profits that will be getting some of this funding are going to be working on -- for instance, TNC is going to be working on an overall regional coordination of wetland restoration. That's why we -- part of the requirement of the grant was that we establish a regional plan so that these restorations are consistent with other wetlands restorations that are going to be done throughout the northeast of middle Atlantic states. We also are going to be contracting with Stony Brook University to be doing some of the pre and post project monitoring, which is another important aspect of the project. And with the Corps Network, which is a wonderful organization that hires former service people, that they are going to be helping with some of the monitoring also.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Monitoring on plant success and densities?

**MR. CASTELLI:**

Exactly, plant success, density, other parameters in the marsh like poor water and sediment, different chemical analysis, PH, all things that are important in the function of the marsh.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Is it County-wide or is it Great South Bay or is it Peconic Bay.

**MR. CASTELLI:**

No, this --

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Or is this -- I'm sorry. Or is this the -- is Vector Control going to make those decisions?

**MR. CASTELLI:**

Well, you know, it's not just Vector Control. I mean, they will be coordinating with our department and also with other people. The restoration -- this grant was specifically for Sandy resiliency, Sandy relief money, and the marshes that are going to be restored are all along the south shore. Not the Peconic Estuary, not the North Shore, it's all along the South Shore, from the western areas of the County near Gilgo Beach through Gardiners County Park in Bay Shore and all the way out east of Oakdale and Sayville, but they will be the -- while the sites haven't been chosen yet, the proposed sites are all along the South Shore for the purpose of building higher functioning wetlands for storms, mainly for storm surge resiliency.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

They have had, Vector Control has had success in rebuilding some of these marshes and designing them so they don't have to treat them for mosquitos. Are they going to keep -- is that going to be one of the parameters where they reconstruct some of these places?

**MR. CASTELLI:**

Yes, that's one of the very important parameters. The Vector Control people have a lot of success at the Wertheim Federal Preserve in Shirley and they're going to be definitely using a lot of the same open integrated marsh management procedures and methods that were successful there. And one of the benefits, as you stated, would be a reduction in the necessity of using Vector Control pesticides.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Are you going to be doing like actual physical work, or is this just a study?

**MR. CASTELLI:**

No, this is primarily actual implementation. We're going to be working on the marsh.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

What are you going to do to the marsh?

**MR. CASTELLI:**

The integrated marsh management is a process where the activity of the tidal flow is bolstered so that you get better tidal flow in and out of the marsh. You have -- because of that, you have more opportunities for other species such as fish and birds.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Are you going to dredge, are you going to plant flowers, are you going to plant grass?

**MR. CASTELLI:**

We're going to be -- part of it would be reestablishing native marsh vegetation, and the advantages of improving the habitat is that when you get the fish in there and you get the birds, you also -- the fish eat the mosquito larvae and consequently cut down on the necessity.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Are we going to have a problem with the nitrogen? Because, you know, the stuff died for a reason, so are we going to plant all this and then it's going to die because our nitrogen levels are too high?

**MR. CASTELLI:**

No, the -- hopefully, once the marsh is restored it will actually serve to mitigate the nitrogen and that you have a -- you have a healthy plant columnization there that will help uptake some of the nitrogen. It's all part of the overall ecological health of the marsh. These procedures have been tried in other places and they have been successful and we are lucky enough to have the Federal government --

**LEG. TROTTA:**

When are you going to start on this project?

**MR. CASTELLI:**

Excuse me?

**LEG. TROTTA:**

When are you going to start on this project?

**MR. CASTELLI:**

Well, the grant, we're hoping -- well, we need to get this contract signed today and it's for -- it's a two year, all the work has to be done within two years and the contract is going to be dated back to April, 2015. So we have until April of 2017 to get all the work done, so we're going to be starting as soon as possible. As soon as -- you know, probably before the end of this year.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

But you haven't even picked where you're going to do it yet.

**MR. CASTELLI:**

No, that prioritization -- I mean, there's been some thought put into it, but that hasn't been finalized yet.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

All right.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right, so Mr. Clerk, we have a motion and a second?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Yes, we do, Mr. Presiding Officer.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**MR. CASTELLI:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, ***IR 1522A, Bond Resolution, (Bond Resolution of the County Of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$1,310,000 bonds to finance the cost of the Coastal Resiliency via integrated Salt Marsh Management Project (CP 8710.147,.414), same motion, same second.***

Roll call.

***(\*Roll was called by Mr. Richberg - Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature\*)***

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

*(Not Present).*

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

*(Absent).*

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Sixteen (Not Present: Legislator Spencer - Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. I make a motion to accept the **Consent Calendar**.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sorry, I missed the motion and the second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Myself and Legislator Schneiderman.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, **Tabled Resolutions:**

***IR 1175-15 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law to protect privacy in Suffolk County (Muratore).*** I make a --

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

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion to table by Legislator Schneiderman. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

I'm sorry, what bill? I missed the bill number.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

1175.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Thank you. *Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Next bill, ***IR 1189-15 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law amending Article XXXV of the Suffolk County Administrative Code to establish a pool of qualified real estate brokers and consultants in the Division Of Real Property Acquisition And Management (County Executive).***

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Motion to table.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion to table by Legislator D'Amaro. Second by Legislator Hahn. Anyone else? Okay, I see someone getting up.

**MR. SANTERAMO:**

We have Jill Rosen-Nikoloff here to answer any questions that anyone may have about this bill.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right, anyone have any questions?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Good afternoon. I'm terribly sorry I wasn't able to be here at the last meeting to address your questions, but hopefully I can do so today. So I also believe that a memo was sent around to all the Legislators that address certain of the questions that were raised on the record.

So basically this seeks to establish a pool of qualified real estate brokers and consultants for the Department of Economic Development and Planning, as well as the entire County, to assist with specialized real estate transactions on an as-needed basis. The companies would be -- have been publicly solicited, they're then reviewed and qualified and rated by the Department of Economic Development, and then the resulting companies would be submitted to the Legislature for approval.

In the past, the County has retained a single real estate consulting firm, it was Newmark Knight. The contract that we had with them has expired, and so this is a procedure that would replace them as a contracted consultant, but instead of a single consultant we would have a pool and then as services are needed we would be able to conduct something of a mini-bid to get the best price for that particular transaction.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So if I may, so in the past we have gone -- we've done an RFP process, we've had a single proposer or a firm that's done this service, and I think it was Newmark Knight --

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Correct.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

-- who's done it in the past. So now you want to go to a pool, so there was an RFP -- so this is like -- it's almost like a pre-qualification process, if you will, that pre-qualified and then at a later date when there is a need you kind of have them go through another procurement process to select the best person from within this pool?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Exactly.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. And that's like standard practice in the State and others have done it; I just want to understand.

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

It's the process that we followed, yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

We have done, yeah, and I've heard of it. Okay. Legislator Kennedy. We have a list, it looks like. Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I just want to ask, the RFP was already put out for this? Because I've gotten phone calls since the last meeting of people that are interested in applying. So is it already out, the RFP?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

The RFP was issued.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

When?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

The end of last year.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Oh.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Did I see your hand, Legislator Trotta?

**LEG. TROTTA:**

*(Shook head no).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Someone over here. Okay, Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Legislator Kennedy, you just made my point. That's exactly one of my points on this bill, is there's no need for a list. There are probably hundreds or tens of -- a number of firms operating in Suffolk County that are qualified to do this work. They can be determined on an as-needed basis. I don't agree with the single firm either, the Newmark contract; I don't think that was the way to go. But now we have an opportunity to open it up to competition for all and these are businesses that are working within Suffolk County. They should have the opportunity, on a case-by-case business, as a need arises within the County to ask to be considered. And I agree with you and that question is extremely telling.

The second point I want to make is that this bill does not establish a list. This bill does not even come close to establishing a list. What this bill does is it rubber stamps a list that's going to be determined later on, not by you, not by us, not by the County Executive, with you by a Commissioner. I don't think that's appropriate. I don't think that's the way to go. You know, I don't even know the names of the firms, I don't know what their qualifications are. This is just saying, Give me the authority to go out and, using my criteria, pick who I want to put on a list that, by the way, you can only revisit ones every three years. I just think its bad government. I would not support this.

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

May I address that?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Thank you, Legislator D'Amaro. This was publicly procured, according to standard operating --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Excuse me. I'm really not here to have a debate. I just think it's out of order. I mean, if someone wants to hear the answer, that's fine, but?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So has this gone through a public procurement process and what is that process? Was that process?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Yes, it went through a public procurement process; through standard operating procedures of the County; it was issued by the Suffolk County Purchasing Division; it was advertised in the papers, I believe posted on the website. And, you know, 76 people downloaded that RFP, 76 entities downloaded the RFP; that's a good number of people who didn't just click on the site to see what it was about, but went through the trouble of having the RFP sent to them. Of those 76, five

companies responded. And I believe it's the nature of the services, you know, it's comprehensive services required from a full service practice group that has varied expertise that we can rely upon as needed. It's not designed for your local Remax agent around the corner; it's for people who have broad-based practice groups and expertise that we go to as needed.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So explain to me, if you can, what you see the benefit is of going to this new approach.

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Well, first of all, it gives us options, right. So, I mean, the thing about an RFP, and as we were reviewing the RFP, you know, with -- in connection with the five responses, we were looking at the financial -- the pricing structures that were being provided and they were all over the map. And the RFP would kind of require us to lock in to a price, and it occurred to the people on the committee, why would we want to be in that position since we don't really know exactly what we're going to be utilizing them for? Wouldn't it be smarter for us to qualify them based upon the overall particulars of the companies, and then as the County determines what the needs are, we then go to them and say, *Give us your price for this transaction*. We might even be able to be in a position of establishing a flat fee.

In addition, to go out every time we need services is costly and time consuming. You've got to advertise; it's a time consuming process, so.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So tell me, how do you go through a process where you are pre-qualifying someone when you don't necessarily know what you're going to be using that service for; how do you determine that pre-qualification?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Well, you look at a number of factors. Their history, their client base, their staffing, their practice groups, their financials, whether there's any conflicts of interest, whether they have a Long Island. You know, these are national firms, you want to make sure that they have a Long Island presence and that they know about Suffolk County. You also look for whether or not they have municipal experience, that's very important. So those are the major categories that we -- that the group looked at.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Now, when you -- because I would imagine that going through this process every single time, we need -- I guess -- well, let me back up. So how many times do you anticipate over the next several years that we'll need this service? How often do we need this service?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

That's difficult for me to say, Presiding Officer.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

How often in the past have we needed this service?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

I don't -- I'm not sure. I know, for example, that we utilized Newmark Knight in connection with the sale of the Yaphank property; we utilized them in connection with the sale and the lease-back of the Dennison Building; we utilized them in connection with space management issues from time to time, and I believe in connection with certain analysis done for Gabreski Airport.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

And the study that they did.

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Yeah.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Right. So I guess an argument could be made that this will shorten that process on an individual basis? Because then you have to -- whatever, you know, acquisition or use we want to use them for, then on top of that you have to add an RFP process for every individual instance, which could be 60 to 90-days?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Precisely, yeah.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So that's --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Or a waiver.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Or a waiver.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Which is way less than 60 to 90-days.

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Right, but we like --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

But generally I think waivers are done if there is a unique circumstance where there isn't another service available. It shouldn't be used for routine -- I think that's one of the seven requirements or whatever it is.

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Yeah, it's not my first choice in terms of process.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Right. I did see another -- Legislator Trotta?

**LEG. TROTTA:**

What type of things are you -- I mean, you're talking like in broad generality. What specifically will these people be doing?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Well, they would be for specialized services. I mean, we have on staff certain qualifications with respect to real estate transactions. These would be more exceptional transactions. I don't have anything in particular that the County intends to use them for, but we do, I know, have several economic development initiatives and we would like to have these companies in place to assist us when we are ready to engage a company to assist.

So for example, let's say, you know, we have in our inventory 25 properties in the North Bellport

area situated around the train station, and the requests have been made not to sell them at auction, that we should look at them for more broader-based transit-oriented development and economic development. Well, then we need -- if that's the case, we probably need an outside professional to come in and assist us with an assessment of the best practices and uses for those properties; that's a situation. Gabreski Airport, that's a big economic development hub for us. There are situations where we might need --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Let's go back to the other one, the Bellport one. Now you're going to hire --

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Just an example, Sir. It's just --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

What are you going to --

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

It's a purely hypothetical example.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

What is the company going to do in that example? What kind of -- it's a real estate company is going to do what? You're going to hire them to do what?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Appraise them.

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Everything from market analysis to space asset consolidation to financial modeling.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

What's a space access -- what dose that mean?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Well, whether it makes sense to merge properties as opposed to selling them individually; what's the best uses for them; should they be leased; what are the adjacent uses being made; what's the zoning; how do you -- what are the best practices for that? It's not a single -- it's not an assessment of a single site, it's a broader-based review.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Of properties that we own? We own that many properties near each other where --

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Sometimes, yes.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

-- we would hire someone to see --

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

It's possible. As I said, I was hesitant to throw out -- it's a hypothetical, but that's the type of thing that you would go to a large company for.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

It's not a specific example, it's just like out there. There's no like, Oh, we need them to do this.

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Well, the County needs outside real estate services from time to time, just like we had under contract Newmark Knight. So as those needs arise, you need to have something in place. So it's a question of, you know, replacing the existing contract through I think a situation that provides us with more options. It doesn't necessarily mean that you need to have a specific need at this moment, that need could arise next week.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

And it might not arise for six months.

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Right, and realize it's not in my division, nor is it simply the Department of Economic Development. It's the entire County that would utilize these professionals; the Department of Law, DPW, wherever real estate needs rise in connection with an analysis the County has to make. It just gives us options and resources available to us. It doesn't cost us anything until, you know, we pay them.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

How much did we spend on this kind of stuff last year?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

I do not know, Sir.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Does anybody know?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Look at the Newmark contract.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

I don't have a number, but we utilize Newmark --

**MS. MAHONEY:**

Can you please state your name?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Oh, I'm sorry. Joanne Minieri.

**MS. MAHONEY:**

Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

I don't have a number, but we utilized Newmark to assist in some of the lease negotiations on the health centers this year.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

So we hire this company to help us with the lease negotiations?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

They acted as brokers and represented the County, yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Don't we have a County Attorney for that?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Yes, we do. But a broker is a little bit -- has a different skill-set. They assisted us in negotiating very detailed components of a lease, the dollar per square foot, the tenant work improvement, the term of the lease, you know, some very technical data in connection with the landlord/tenant relationship.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

How much did we spend on that?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

I don't have that number off the top of my head, but I'm sure the Budget Office, we can get that for you. That was pursuant to the exclusive arrangement that was previously in place.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

And you mentioned the Dennison Building; they appraised the Dennison Building, is that what it is?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

They were involved with the sale and leaseback, but their exact role in it I'm not sure.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Okay.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Spencer.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Jill, Joanne, thank you so much. With the Newmark contract that we had before, was there a retainer agreement that they received payment? Regardless of if we utilized them, was there a base retainer and then if we utilized their services, was there -- then we did it on a per diem basis? How did that contract work?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

I don't believe there was a retainer, it was a per transaction basis.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

It was.

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Based upon a set fee in the contract.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

A set fee per transaction? How would that set fee work?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Right. So as I recall, it was -- if it was, you know, straight brokering assistance, it would be a percentage up to a certain dollar value and then a different percentage between another certain dollar value, so that was for brokerage. And then for other transactional services, I believe it was an hourly basis.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

So as I look at this, and sometimes we have complex real estate issues, is my understanding, and that we need outside assistance, and so now the Newmark contract has expired. This list that you have, there are five companies that qualified as far as after the RFP?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Correct.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

So when we utilize these companies, if something comes up, we're not having to go through a formal RFP. Do we let those five companies competitively bid internally or do we rotate them, or do we choose the one that has the best skill-set for the job? How do we make the determination which company we use?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

It would be the latter. We would choose three, four, five out of the total list depending on the transaction and ask them to submit their best pricing, and then we would select most likely the low bidder out of them, but not always.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

So I see the benefit here that now when we have something that we need, we don't have to go through a complete RFP process, but we've already pre-qualified these companies as having the skill-set necessary to handle the complex transaction or help that we might need. So it saves us time. But still, the fact that there is more than one company, we still have a chance to get the best price; is that correct?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Precisely. Thank you.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Okay. So with the Newmark contract, if there was an issue that came up and they were utilized, were you able to utilize them without approval of this Legislature, or when -- I remember, for instance, we had to vote on -- no, you were able to get an appraisal for the Foley -- did Newmark do that appraisal, or was that another company? But in any case, I guess my question relates to does going through that process circumvent this Legislature in any way that would be, if we went into a formal RFP, or we're just cutting red tape? I mean, are we losing any of our power or our ability to be able to have oversight over these transactions?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Right. No; in fact, it gives you more oversight because the list is approved by you.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No, it's not.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

So I guess my one --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

We don't even have the list yet.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

You know, my concern is hearing that it happened, it feels almost like we're coming at it after the fact, but I understand what you're trying to do and it makes sense. I mean, I wish we had a chance to maybe look at this before the RFP. But in any case, it seems like it makes sense, what you're trying to do is save us time to be more effective, to make it more competitive.

How did the three-year number come about? Because the other issue there would be knowing that

there are companies that are coming in and out of Suffolk County that may want to be involved that now would be precluded from being involved in this process. Three years, I don't know, maybe is a short time, maybe it's a long time. Obviously we don't want to look at the list every too often because it defeats the purpose, but three years, my question would be if another qualified player came on the scene that wanted to get involved in Suffolk County and these complex real estate transactions, is there some mechanism where they could be included or part of this list?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Well, this -- no, because this would establish them as our qualified companies for three years and that is consistent with what this Legislature has approved for other service professionals we have.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Okay. So that's the traditional length of these types of contracts.

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

So if we can potentially save time, have a competitive process that's pre-screened but we don't take away our job as Legislators to have oversight, you know, it seems like something that I could support. I guess I'm sort of stuck on I don't know why the RFP went out at the end of the year. It was almost like it was -- was there initially the thought that you wouldn't need approval from the Legislature to do this? Why do the RFP and do this and then come back and ask us to do this legislation? It seems like we would pass this, then have an RFP to pre-screen. Is there anyone that could, you know, just maybe answer my curiosity regarding the process? I think that may be where some of the suspicion is coming from.

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

That's a good question. I can't address formally the RFP process, but in my conversations with the Purchasing Division, you know, as a matter of routine they could issue an RFP and they would go through the process and enter into a contract at a set price with a determined company following the evaluation. And I'm not -- I don't think that that gets approved by the Leg; does it? Does anybody from Law know? I'm not sure. But this situation changed that and that's why we stopped the process from going forward. We then -- in order to establish a pool so that we could have options, we had to then amend Article 35 of the code to allow it, so that's why we stopped it. It first had to come here for Legislative approval to allow the pool, and then the next step will be to come back the next session with the five companies where we'll go over their qualifications and why we selected them for approval.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Well, when I look at this, you know, just thinking with my colleagues, if now we have companies that have been pre-screened, allow us to more quickly address these complex real estate transactions with a list of pre-screened companies, but we still have options to be able to maybe get the best price. But besides the RFP already going out, it seems like a reasonable plan, so I don't know what I'm missing or what I'm not understanding as we continue this debate. But it sounds reasonable and, you know, I'm leaning towards supporting it.

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

I'll make a motion to approve, Doc, if you want to second.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I'll second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Where did he go? Legislator Stern was next. Legislator Krupski.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Stern's there.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Oh, you were hiding behind McCaffrey. I didn't see you.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes, I was hiding him.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

*(Laughter)* All right, Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. We had Newmark and Knight for how long, do you recall?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Several years.

**LEG. STERN:**

Several years, I remember that, but you don't recall how many?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

No.

**LEG. STERN:**

Did you say that there were over 70 that had at least shown a meaningful inquiry as to whether or not they were interested in the RFP?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Yeah, they actually requested the RFP.

**LEG. STERN:**

They requested to be part of the RFP but never formally responded to the RFP.

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Right.

**LEG. STERN:**

How many companies responded?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Five.

**LEG. STERN:**

Five companies responded. Was Newmark Knight one of them?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

And are they now -- so they are on your list of five, because I'm assuming that if five responded and your list is five, so are you essentially saying that everybody who responded is essentially on the list?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

One could deduce that, yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

All right. So what kind of a process, then, what kind of a vetting process really was there? I mean, there were five that responded, five are on the list. Was there -- was there a number going into the process that you had in your mind? Was the list going to consist of five? Was it going to consist of ten but you only received responses from five of them? Tell me about the process and how these five happened to be the only ones that ended up responding, when Legislator D'Amaro I think correctly points out that there are numerous, you know, well respected, well established real estate companies that offer, you know, various services in Suffolk County and on Long Island. Seventy showed interest but only five responded; how did that go?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

No, we had no preconceived notion as to the number of companies or who would respond. I mean, we generally think from our experience who are the larger companies with the varying practice groups that might be interested with municipal experience -- County, Federal, State -- who would have the staff and expertise to respond. So you could kind of take off your head maybe the top three that you think would respond, but we did not know everybody that would.

I think that if you look at the requirements of the RFP, it's quite extensive. So it really does, by the nature of it, narrow down the companies that are capable of doing this kind of thing, and that's probably why, although you had 76 people who saw it and so said, *Oh my, that seems like a good opportunity*, once they sorted through the particulars of it said, *We cannot handle this*, you know. So I don't know that there are many more full-service real estate firms that can do this kind of thing in this area for Suffolk County. I don't know that there's much more of a field for that.

**LEG. STERN:**

I'm assuming that these are companies that have vast experience operating in Suffolk County. Are they Suffolk County based?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Yes, that was something that we looked for.

**LEG. STERN:**

So all five are --

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Have Suffolk County offices.

**LEG. STERN:**

-- are based in -- okay, very good. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you? So you did -- one of my questions was answered, you did provide an example of the

last time we used one of these companies. But one of the examples that you used was Bellport and if the County owned parcels there, and the County would facilitate redevelopment of an area. Wouldn't the County in that -- instead of going to a real estate agent, wouldn't the County go to the township and say, *What are your goals here? Do you have a master plan? What's going to fit into the area? Is it housing, is it industry?* Wouldn't you kind of start with the towns first?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Yes, yes. I mean, we have real estate experience on staff and it's certain that we would work with the town initially, but at a certain point you might want to bring in an outside consultant to take the transaction to the point that you want it to go. And once again, that was simply a hypothetical situation.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

No, I understand. But, I mean, it's good to have an example to talk about, because I don't know in Bellport, so to me it's a good, neutral example. But what do you mean to the next level? I didn't get that part.

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

To finalize whatever the need is for the County. Whether it's a financial modeling for it or a best practices report for the area, whatever that might be.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

And what about -- I mean, we do have a design and construction division in DPW. You can answer that or Commissioner Anderson; what role do they playing in this sort of arena where instead of hiring an outside firm, you do some of this work in-house.

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

It would depend on the need, but to the extent that DPW had expertise that we could rely upon and utilize we would, as we do on many of our transactions.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yeah. So I'm listening to this. I don't debate the need for real estate professionals and experts on projects, we need that. But I do have a problem with when a project comes up, that we don't have an -- businesses within the County don't have an opportunity to compete for that business two years from now. Two years from now. So each one of you, if you have an engineering or a real estate company or a title company or whatever other ridiculous lists we've made in the past, I mean, go back to all your businesses in your districts and tell them, *Oh no. No, you've got to wait another 29 months before you can even be considered to work within the County and for the County government that represents you.* I mean, to me, there's just no need for this. You can talk all you want about efficiency. We are not here necessarily to put efficiency first in some circumstances. This is about fairness, a level playing field, access by business to their County government, the right to compete, the right to get the best price, the right to fit the right consultant to the right needs of a particular project. These are not necessarily considerations of efficiency, but these are valid considerations. There's just no need to have a list.

If we don't approve this today, what happens? Does the County government come to a grinding halt? No. No. When a big project comes up and we need this expertise that only five people in Suffolk County are qualified to do, we're going to put that out as part of the bid or a separate RFP or whatever they do and we're going to get the best qualified firm, everyone has a right to compete, everyone has a right to consider the merits of the particular project that's going on and we're going to get the right person for the right job. Lists are not the way you should go in government, especially lists that get stale very quickly.

A couple of years from now, you're still not going to tell anyone else they can bid on these projects. You're still not going to be able to tell any company, legitimate firm in the County that they can do work for the County and compete like the guy who got approved two years ago who, by the way, when they got approved, the three people that were the experts might have already left or retired. We're not going to check that, we're not going to know. It's not good government. This is not the way to go.

You know, this whole mini RFP concept. So we're going to pick five firms, five firms out of 1.6 million people in Suffolk County and all the businesses we have; no, we're going to go to those five firms and say, *Hey, have a little RFP. Let's all start a bidding war.* That's baloney. That's baloney. You're not going to get the best price for County taxpayers. You're going to be going to the same five firms every time for three years. What about the other 25 firms out there that could have given you a better price? *Oh, sorry, I can't consider them because you weren't on the list.* It's not efficient. It's not appropriate. It's not good government, it's definitely not the way to go.

We have an RFP process, it exists in government for a reason. The reason is that on a case-by-case-by-case basis, you don't want favoritism, you want everyone competing on a level playing field, and that's exactly why you want to avoid doing a list today.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Schneiderman.

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

You know, I'm hearing what you're saying, Legislator D'Amaro, and I want to agree other than I'm dealing with the fact that for all these years we've had one firm, Newmark Knight Lewis; I didn't agree with that either.

I mean, let's think about -- when you say the best price, I'm not sure that's really an adequate description of what they do. So we've used them for a number of things, but let's look at the real estate functions we do. So maybe we have County surplus property that, you know, they might analyze, like we did in the past with BOMARC and the Yaphank properties and they did reports, and we may try to have them find perspective buyers like we did with Foley which failed. But, you know, to reach out, we have leases at Gabreski Airport which, you know, suddenly there's a lot of interest in the small amount of remaining land that we have there, but it's a good idea to try to see who's out there, to reach out, find the best price and the best fit. I think those are good services.

I don't know in this RFP whether they set a fixed commission rate, if they're finding buyers or if we're paying them for their time and advertising and those kinds of things, I'd have to look at it. But on its face, I mean, I hear what you're saying, that the three-year period may be too long, that maybe we ought to tighten this up, do it every year, do it every two years, 18 months, whatever makes sense. But to me, it sure sounds like a step in a better direction than where we're currently at.

And although you say, yeah, we could pick any real estate broker; that's true, I suppose even with

appraisers we could pick any real estate appraiser. But we want to kind of vet them carefully to make sure that we have the very best. So, you know, the fact that they're going through this vetting process I think is a good step. And it was an open vetting process. If you want to reopen it so that they could have more people, more firms. We do have a lot of great real estate firms; I wouldn't object to that. But the direction that they're going seems to be by the book, seems to make sense.

So those are really the only concerns, are the length of time that this list stays kind of stale and whether they open it up or not, open it up and allow more people into this current list. And maybe I'll let Jill Rosen-Nikoloff respond to that, and maybe you can increase our comfort level. Would you be willing to shorten the three-year period to a two-year period?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

The three years seems to be appropriate and it's consistent with other professionals that we've retained. You know, you have to have a period of time where -- first of all, you know, it's not going to be a full three years. If this passes today, hopefully, we then have to come back to get the list approved, we then have to have contracts signed up, they'll have to go through Law, they'll have to be sent out and signed up. So it's not as if day one we've got these companies with a full three-year. You know, and then you want a period of time to establish relationships with the people who are on your list, possibly bring them in, advise them as to the projects and economic development initiatives that the County is pursuing, get them familiar with it, and then utilize them during the course of that three year, and then prior to the expiration of the three years, when you have to start that RFP process at that time. So, you know, three years is not as long as it sounds.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Oh, now three years is not three years.

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

What are some of the ways that we're going to be using these companies? And also, is it on a fixed commission or a time basis, consulting fees; how are we paying them?

**DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Well, it would be -- as I said, for each transaction we would ask bids to be provided to us with respect to pricing, and depending on that transaction, you know, it would either be a percentage or an hourly fee. Or perhaps in certain circumstances it would make sense to request a flat fee as opposed to the RFP process which would have locked us in and not given us any discretion.

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

Okay, I have no further questions.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Just if I could, Jay, just to respond.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

You know, so you're talking about shortening the time period, let's say. So you're acknowledging the fact that it is possible that the company picked may not be appropriate; you know, we need to revise or review qualifications. You're making my point, maybe to a lesser degree.

It just seems to me that if you're doing a major project in the County and you want to do it right the first time, it would seem to me that it's more responsible to ensure that you're getting exactly the right company you need to do it at that time with their personnel, who's available, how current -- you know, maybe the company, after two years, you know, was subject to five disciplinary proceedings; how are you going to know?

So my point is that, you know, would it be more efficient to have a list and say, *Everyone else, no, you can't be considered?* Sure. But you're not going to fit the right company to the project. You're not giving everyone a fair chance, you're never going to have the certainty that you're getting really the expertise that you've bargained for. I mean, I don't want to repeat all the arguments I made. It just seems to me it's a needless exercise to have a list when the way the County and government does business is we do RFPs, and the purpose of an RFP is to ensure that you're getting the right company for the right job. That's why we do this, and all this does is circumvent that process. How could you possibly even put it forward?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

If I may, Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I understand where you're coming from and your concern. Myself, having a procurement background, you know, there are times -- you know, it's not an easy process, it's not an overnight process to do an RFP. I think this is actually more transparent, gives more opportunity for people, because in a normal circumstance, without these lists, you have -- you're tied to one corporation that's doing it for a number of years as opposed to a list of corporations who have the opportunity to gain work with the County or whatever the municipality is. So I think it's moving in the right direction as opposed to having -- you know, we do our -- I don't even know how many RFPs we do a year. I mean, the State does it, we go off State lists where there's some company in, you know, Westchester that wants to do a certain -- you know, for our audio/visual equipment, that was off a State list. You know, there's lists, that's just a standard practice that's done and it's usually one company. So I think having five companies or more than one company on a list to do a service I think is -- actually, to your point -- it's opening up the process to more people as opposed to limiting the process to one company for three years.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I don't agree with the one company either.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And, you know, two wrongs don't make a right, obviously. In my opinion, if you want to do what's best for County residents and you want to get them the best company for a particular project, you're better off not having a list. It's just you open up the competition to all -- it's not fair -- it's not even fair to businesses in Suffolk County. You know, there are so many engineering firms, so many real estate companies, so many title companies. I mean, just to -- you know, because you happen to hear about the RFP when it came out the first time and you happen to get put on that list, stifles competition. The very next day, the day after you approved the list you've stifled competition for the next three years. I don't think there's a need to do it. You know, maybe if the State of New York has to buy 500 million paper clips all at the same time, they need to have a list of paper clip

companies, but we don't have that need. Newmark was used on major real estate transactions they were important to all of us. They were important, big, well-debated transactions. How do I know that two years down the road that company was qualified to even chime in on that? Maybe the guy that was experienced in an appraising, for example, the nursing home someone brought up, maybe that guy left sixteen months ago. How do I know? I don't know.

There's no need for this. There's no need to have an established list. And by the way, when you're asked to approve that list, you're not going to be able to say who's on it and who's not. That's all going to be vetted for you; *we're going to hold your hand, we're going to show you who the best people are.* I mean, come on. You know what? Do the RFP when the major need arises, do the RFP, get the best company out there, let all Suffolk County businesses compete for it and let the best firm win. But to do this in and approve it for three years in advance, again, I just think it's not good government.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right, Mr. Clerk, we have a tabling motion and a motion to approve.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Yes, we do.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, tabling motion goes first. Roll call.

*(\*Roll was called by Mr. Richberg -  
Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature\*)*

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes to table.

**LEG. HAHN:**

*(Not Present).*

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes to table.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

*(Not Present).*

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes to table.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

No.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

No.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

No.

**LEG. ANKER:**

No.

**LEG. HAHN:**

*(Not Present).*

**LEG. MURATORE:**

*(Absent).*

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yeah.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

No.

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

Yes to table.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Fourteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, motion is tabled.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Thirteen (AMENDED VOTE: 12 - Opposed: P.O. Gregory and Legislators Martinez, Lindsay, Calarco & Anker).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. Mr. Tsunis, I know you've been waiting, sorry.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Wait. Your count can't be right.

**LEG. CILMI:**

We have 17 here and there were four nos to table, right?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

I said 13.

**MR. LAUBE:**

We just corrected 13.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right, IR -- next resolution, *IR 1208-15 - Authorizing execution of agreement by the Administrative Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 14 Parkland and Bayport Meadow Estates (IS-1636)(County Executive)*.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Motion to approve.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion to approve by Legislator Lindsay.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Calarco. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. I had a request to take IR 1428 --

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore)*.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

-- out of order on page six in EPA, *1428-15 - Appointing Michael White as a member of the Long Island Regional Planning Council (County Executive)*. Motion by Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

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

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Schneiderman to take out of order. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Same motion, same second to approve.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore)*.

**MR. LAUBE:**

What bill number was this?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

1328. All right, Mr. White is here. I believe he did not make committee.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Correct, we had discharged without recommendation. He was unable to attend the committee, but he was willing to come before the full Legislature, so we are excited to have him in front of all 18 of us, not just the committee. So thank you for being here, thank you for your willingness to serve on the other side of this prestigious board. So if you want to tell us -- usually what we do in committee is we ask you to just tell a little bit about yourself and why you want to serve in this capacity for the people of Suffolk County.

**MR. WHITE:**

Absolutely, and thank you for the privilege of being on the agenda today and the opportunity to speak. And I apologize for not making the committee, but it's always a great experience to come before the Legislature. I've been here a number of times before. A little bit about myself. I started off as a research scientist. I have worked for the government and Suffolk County as well as the Town of Huntington. I have been a practicing environmental attorney for some 21 years now. Before coming back into the private practice approximately five years ago, and I indeed was the Executive Director of the Long Island Regional Planning Council when both Counties undertook a renovation of the Long Island Regional Planning Board to form the Council. So this opportunity to come back and serve as a member of the Council and again get the Council back on track, I think to really move the agenda of both counties, particularly from Suffolk County's standpoint; I've been a resident of Suffolk County for almost my whole life, I grew up in Nassau County but I've lived in Suffolk for quite some time now.

I see that there's an opportunity to come back and serve on the Regional Planning Council and I would ask for your approval. It is more than ever the time for what we call when we renovated the Council for a new regionalism, for not only Nassau and Suffolk County but also for our great neighbor to the west, New York City, if not the northeast corridor, to be addressing some of the issues that we're all facing today. And while we are an Island and we face the circumstances of being on Island of various cost and so forth, that connectivity of off-Island and to the rest of the State of New York and, again, the northeast and the continent is extremely important.

I think it's important to move from the sustainability vision and the action plan that we drew up several years back to what I call from a science perspective, because I did start as a research scientist, sort of an ecosystem-based management approach. A more than ever integrated approach to systems management so we understand the linkages of our behavior, the natural environment, so we can get to the issues of addressing our coastal water quality, our drinking water quality, our land use planning, the carrying capacity of Long Island and Nassau and Suffolk County, as well as issues of energy planning and indeed unequal education and sustaining the cost of education and providing education.

And the third element that I see as a really important piece of the agenda and the vision going forward for the Regional Planning Council is to reinvigorate and recreate the synergy of the tremendous not-for-profits that work all around Long Island and the State of New York with government and with business. I think that continuing three-pronged effort is extremely important for our agenda.

So I certainly have a lot more to say about a number of the issues and I look forward to getting to work with the Council and moving the Council forward, and of course maintaining a great contact with everyone of the Legislators. And in addition to today, I will always be open for meeting and discussion as a member of the Council.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

DuWayne?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I saw a hand. Legislator D'Amaro?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yeah, I just want to say thank you. Mike, nice to see you.

**MR. WHITE:**

Nice to see you.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And just speaking for myself and I'm sure for others here, we appreciate your willingness to serve. You bring an awful lot to the table, a lot of experience in the private sector, public sector, and I think you would be a major asset. So thanks again.

**MR. WHITE:**

Thank you very much.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I appreciate it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Spencer.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I am really impressed with your background, your credentials, you've been actually a personal friend for a long time. But the fact that you were an Executive Director in the past of the Regional Planning Council and then you went on as far as just with your experience with the New York League of Conservation Voters, being a managing partner, you're someone that's extremely bright, intelligent, but also passionate about Long Island and has weighed in on a lot of issues. You're someone that has a comprehensive understanding from just being able to do planning from all aspects of economic environment -- I mean economic development, protecting the environment. And I couldn't think of a better person to have on that. I'm really humbled by your consideration to serve. I think this Legislature and Suffolk County would be very fortunate to have you on the Planning Council. So thank you very much, Michael. It's nice to see you again.

**MR. WHITE:**

Thank you so much for the kind words.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Anyone else? I, too, want to thank you, Michael, for not only your willingness to serve on the Council, but your commitment to serve in many capacities throughout the -- in the County and throughout the region. And you're certainly a person of extensive expertise and your opinion and commitment is very much valued.

**MR. WHITE:**

Thank you so much.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Great. Thank you. Legislator Schneiderman?

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

Mike, I've known you for a long time, too, in many different capacities. But, you know, you formerly were a head of that organization I believe, too, right?

**MR. WHITE:**

Yes.

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

The Long Island Regional Planning Council.

**MR. WHITE:**

Yes.

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

So it's great to have you as a member. I certainly support you being there and your breadth of knowledge about planning, so you certainly have my support.

**MR. WHITE:**

Thank you, Legislator Schneiderman.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Mr. Clerk, please list me as a cosponsor.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Me, too.

**MR. WHITE:**

Thank you so much.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. Okay, we're going to finish up the Tabled Resolutions, then we'll go to the Capital Budget.

***IR 1271 - Approving form of proposition, establishment of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 26 - Melville Huntington (Sponsor: Presiding Officer Gregory).***

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Who was that?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Tabled Resolutions.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Did someone say motion?

**MS. MAHONEY:**

D'Amaro.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Oh, D'Amaro? Oh, Legislator D'Amaro said motion to approve.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Hold on, hold on.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right? 1271.

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion to table.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Oh, motion to table. Okay.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I'm sorry.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Someone said motion.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I was on the wrong bill.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Oh, okay. All right. Motion to table by Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Litigation is still ongoing, we're waiting to hear from Counsel when there's some development. So, at this point, I offer a motion to table.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Motion to table by Legislator Stern, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Sixteen (Not Present: Legislator Hahn - Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**(\*The following was taken and transcribed by  
Lucia Braaten - Court Stenographer\*)**

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. *Procedural Motion Number 10 - Setting the public hearings for proposed transition of Riverhead Health Center to FQHC status and operation by Hudson River Healthcare, Inc. (Sponsor: Pres. Off. Gregory).*

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Excuse me. Mr. Presiding Officer, please note my recusal for the record. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

There was a revised copy put out earlier today.

**CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:**

Motion to table.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Browning, second by -- who was that? Legislator McCaffrey. Motion by Legislator Spencer to approve, I'll second. Tabling motion goes first.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I think it's very clear my position on the privatization. I've received the information so far on the Amityville Health Center. I have not received anything yet with regards to the Riverhead Health Center. I've asked for the information with regards to the employees, how many there are, what their titles are. So I'm still waiting for the Riverhead information, and also what openings and positions there are currently within the County for those people to be moved to. I have not yet received that information. And again, I am opposed to the privatization of the Riverhead Health Center and I will continue to oppose it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator McCaffrey.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Yes. I believe that we still need to give some more time to the new leadership at the AME who just walked into this, and here we are privatizing the health center that we own, probably one of the biggest ones we had, one of the biggest impact on our employees here in Suffolk County in the privatization of these health centers. And I believe that we could still take the time to table this, at least for another cycle.

I understand they met with the County Executive's Office, but I don't believe that they walked away with anything that they felt was giving them any kind of assurances or that they could base any decisions on.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Spencer.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I think that we've started on this process. It's been a priority over the last three years. We found Hudson River, although no organization is perfect -- we just see that the landscape is changing in health care. We've been compassionate, we've made tough decisions. But my concern when I look at this, and, you know, the last time we did table it, because I really think it's important to make sure that our AME officers have a chance to speak to each of us, but I know, I've been making

preparations. I think that I don't take the ICD-10 transition lightly. We are one of the last places of civilized medicine that hasn't adopted this standard, and those that haven't made that transition will be denied payment. And it's not a matter that you can look at some books and just start coding after October the 10th. It seems that simple. We've been preparing for this for years. There is a major time issue to do this. It's not the first time that we've looked at the health centers. We've transitioned County-employed health centers before.

I feel it's very important to let the County employees know where they're going, to not send them places that are a long distance away, and we have the commitment from the Administration to do that. We have the no-layoff contract in our AME. So, you know, I do feel that this is something that's timely and we need to move forward with it. So that's why I've made the approval motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

You know, I said it the last time, I'm really tired of the "we have no-layoff clause," because the fact of the matter is come the expiration of this contract, there could be a layoff. And so I think this is a lame comment to continually say "no layoff". You have not gotten one iota of information from the Health Department or from our -- from the Administration as to where these people will go. You have nothing.

You're making a determination, you're making a decision to privatize and to tell these County workers, "Well, you have a no-layoff clause." I'm sorry, that's a lame excuse, a really lame excuse. And to tell them that this is the right thing to do, I'm sorry, it's not. You are not been given yet to date the correct information as to where any of those employees are going to go.

And as far as I'm concerned, if you all want to support the privatization and say "no layoff clause, no layoff clause," well, guess what, I think you don't care. I really don't think you care enough about the people who have spent years in this County, and let me explain to you why, because John J. Foley workers, many of them -- one came to my office needing help for Medicaid for her two-year-old daughter who needed surgery, because now she's on Social Services, okay? So let's talk about all of our County workers and what we're doing to them. Think about it before you start doing this, because the bottom line is there'll be more of them. They get sent out, many of them will wind up without a job. They lose their health benefits, they lose their retirement, because maybe some of them are six months short. Mrs. Holmes in Bellport, six months short of her retirement, and that's because we closed John J. Foley, okay? Let me tell you about each and every one of the ones that I know.

So stop doing blanket statements about what we're doing and why we should do this. And I think there's other alternatives can be done with the Riverhead Health Center so we can keep the County workers working, and at least progressively let them leave on their own terms and let Hudson River come in. But to make these -- I'm sorry, you're a doctor, you're a smart man, you know where this is going.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I am a smart man.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

You know the direction this will take.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Excuse me? I mean, you know, we can agree, but there's no need to be disagreeable. You have no

idea and you do not hold the corner in terms of compassion for our workers. You just called my statement blanket and lame, and you feel that your opinion is --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

It is.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Well, you know, Kate, I expect more from that, and I'm not going to get into a back-and-forth with you on the record. But, really, how dare you? You know, how dare you? You don't know anything about --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

How dare me? Because I talk to them more than you ever will.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Well, you know -- well, talk is one thing, Kate, but, you know, we make decisions here as a Legislature, and we've had a plan. And you don't know what I've done, you don't know what my background is, you don't know how much I've looked into this issue. And you could be sanctimonious if you'd like, but that's really not fair, and I don't appreciate you saying that on the record.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Well, you call it what you will. However, Dr. --

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Well --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Dr. Tomarken sat here and said --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. This is not productive.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Dr. Tomarken sat here, we asked him what his plan was. He could not give us a plan, and you know that.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. I thought I saw some other hands. No? Okay. So where are we, Mr. Clerk? We have a tabling and an approval motion?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Yes, we do.

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

If I could ask one question. I don't know if maybe somebody from the Administration could answer. And, you know, it doesn't take away the importance of having a public hearing on the idea of the conversion to the FQHC. But on several occasions, I have asked if we would explore a model, particularly with this facility that brought in Hudson River as an administrator, which, as I understand it, they have done in other locations with the County employees as their -- you know, employees where they were performing administration functions, where we still would be a Federally Qualified Health Care Facility. So has anybody looked into that? Because my early conversations with Tomarken, I was led to believe that that was something that was being considered.

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

We did take your question back to the Administration, and they said they did look at that, but the savings were not there for this particular center.

And I also just want to note the timeline. Even doing the public hearings with this timeline, you still wouldn't be voting on this until July 29th, which gives -- you know, the Administration has been talking to the Union. We're following the same procedure we did with every single health center, where we did the public hearings, then HRC and the Health Department came. But we're following the same exact procedure we've done every time, where once we have this moving, they then work with the employees. There's nothing that we're doing differently this time. But, again, we wouldn't be voting on this, even with the public hearings. Because of your schedule, we have -- this wouldn't be voted on until July 29th. And like I said, the Administration is working with the Union.

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

Lisa, if I could respond back, because, look, I understand that the savings might not be as large, because, you know, it's a different bargaining unit. The employees maybe are paid at a lower rate, or the benefit package isn't quite the same, but the idea between -- behind the FOHC model is that we would be able to access Federal dollars to run the health clinic. So suddenly we'd be able to provide a higher -- you know, greater level of services.

When you say the savings weren't there, are you saying the savings weren't as great as if we had them take over the whole facility? Because we might be willing to -- you know, to keep the County employees there. You know, maybe a slightly smaller savings would be acceptable to the body.

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

I did not get into it in that detail. I said that -- I was just told that was looked at and that it was not deemed a viable option. But I will -- because of the savings. But I -- we could take it back again. Again, we can still do that. You can still set the public hearings and we can still have those conversations.

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

Can I just get a clarification, that if we do the public hearings -- maybe, George, I don't know if you'll be able to answer this, would this tie us into one model in terms of the full conversion to Hudson River, or might this also allow in the public hearing us considering having them step in as an administrator of that facility?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Well, they've presented a plan and that's what we're holding the public hearing on. I think, ultimately, we could adopt a resolution that, you know, is not exactly what was in the original plan. So I think we'd be okay if, you know, there was a different model in terms of the employees, a slightly different model.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Lisa, I cannot go forward with this unless my peer gets answers to all the questions that she put. Why has the Health Department or the County Executive's Office not answered Kate Browning's letter?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

It's my understanding, and I have not had direct conversations, but when I said we're doing the

same exact procedure, in the past we didn't meet with employees and reassign them until the Legislature actually made the decision to move forward with them. The people are treating -- I mean, I think they're working through -- I don't think it's finalized yet. I think that's something they work -- I think that's a fluid thing. So to tell you today this is where X, Y and Z person is going, I don't think that that would be the same four months -- because right now we're looking at not doing this until the end of the year at this point.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. But, certainly, she could have been answered as to the positions that these current employees hold, correct?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

Correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

You could have answered half of it, or a third of it, or a part of it, but no response shows no interest to me.

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

And I apologize. I don't think it was a lack of interest, I think -- I mean, I'll find out why she didn't get every single question answered, but.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Barraga.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Last session we had on this particular subject, it was suggested that the Administration meet with AME. You've indicated apparently for several meetings. Can you expound on them a little bit?

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

It's my understanding there was two meetings. And again, I'm not privy to every meeting our Chief Deputy has, but I know he had one meeting. And the issue was that it had already been pre-set up. It was the day after, two days after the meeting where you asked us to meet with them. It was already set up prior to that. And it's my understanding that they did meet with the Chief Deputy in the Health Department as well. I'm not in those meetings, I'm not privy to those conversations, but I do know that they're meeting. I think they also at some point were talking to the P.O. I think -- I mean, we are trying do this in good faith. We are trying to work with the Union to make sure -- I mean, they're our employees, too. They're -- it's a mutual concern for the employees.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

And if I may, I spoke to Mr. Macri. He didn't have any objection moving forward with the public hearing. He did want to have, you know, some more, I guess, definition as to where each person would be placed. But as far as moving forward, he didn't have an objection with that.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Mr. Macri doesn't represent them until what, July?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Well, you know, I've heard his name touted about a few times to give them the opportunity to -- the new leadership to get -- for them to come in and, you know, represent their -- the interests of their members. They have stated they've been meeting with the Administration. I spoke to him, I think it was last Wednesday, I think. He seemed to be -- he was okay with it. He said he would like to know, you know, what definition -- where -- you know, more detailed plan as to where they were

going to be, but he wasn't opposed to moving forward with the public hearings. I'm sure he'll let me know and others know if I'm speaking out of turn. Okay. Legislator McCaffrey.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Only that, you know, I just went back and forth with him on text messages and I asked him how that meeting went, and he basically said that -- he said it went nowhere, you know, which led me to believe that it was not very helpful or fruitful at all, you know, and that was the meeting that you spoke about, not the one he had with you. I'm talking about the one that he had with the Administration that you referenced that was scheduled right after our meeting. So it seems as though they still have more questions than answers.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. So we have a tabling motion? A tabling motion?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Yes, we do.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Tabling motion goes first. Roll call.

*(Roll Called by Mr. Richberg, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature)*

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

No.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

(Not present)

**MR. LAUBE:**

He's recused.

**LEG. STERN:**

No.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Yes, table.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I recuse.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes to table.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

No.

**LEG. CILMI:**

No to table.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

No.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

No.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

No.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

(Absent)

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

No.

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

No to table.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

No to table.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Six. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Motion to approve.

*(Roll Called by Mr. Richberg, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature)*

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

No.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

No.

**LEG. HAHN:**

No.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

(Absent)

**LEG. BROWNING:**

No.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eleven. (Not present: Leg. Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. Robert, you ready? Dr. Lipp, excuse me. Right now we're going to address the Capital Program, 2016-2018 Capital Program and Budget. Robert, can you give a queek -- queek, oh, gees. Quick overview.

**MR. LIPP:**

My understanding is there's been an amendment.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**MR. LIPP:**

So should I be addressing it at this point, or should we have some sort of protocol with George as to what the process is?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Right now, we just have -- we have the Omnibus, which I think you were going to give an overview of. There may be amendments on the floor to the Omnibus. So maybe the overview first, and then if there are amendments to be made, they'll be made and we'll vote on those and then vote on the Omnibus.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Wait, what? Is there an amendment to the amendment?

**MR. NOLAN:**

There may be amendments that are permissible on the floor to any of the budget amendments. So Robert was mentioning there may be amendments to some of the budget amendments that are before you. He was saying, "Should I give an overview of the Omnibus first?" I think he should. And then if after that there are amendments offered to the Omnibus, we take them up at that time.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So nothing's been amended as yet?

**MR. NOLAN:**

No.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay.

**MR. LIPP:**

Correct. Okay. So what you may see up on the board, which was something that I e-mailed to the Legislators I believe on Sunday, so the big -- what you see here are groupings of different sources of funding, and the dollars represent the current Omnibus changes to the proposed Capital Program, so these are just the changes. So you see in terms of General Fund, there was an increase of 9.875 million in 2016 without going over specifics yet. And probably the biggest number overall in the budget in terms of modifications or changes was an increase of 25 million, the yellow number, for sewer bonds in 2016. That relates to Ronkonkoma Hub.

What happened there is there is there's currently sewer serial bonds in 2015 adopted budget that initially the County Executive planned to put across a resolution. But at the Working Group meetings, the -- Gil Anderson, Head of DPW, said that they didn't believe that they would be able to get status as a County sewer district this year. So, therefore, the sewer bonds would not work this year. And they requested that instead, we put 25 million in sewer bonds in 2016. So it's the biggest item of all the amendments here and it relates to Ronkonkoma Hub. I will take questions, if there are, before I go on. Okay since you're not being recognized, I will just go on then.

(Laughter)

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

All right. We have questions on that specific point?

**MR. LIPP:**

Oh, you do?

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

No, no, I'm asking.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I do.

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

Because I know we're going to have lots of questions about various things, but just specifically on the 25 million sewer bonds for Ronkonkoma Hub; is that the question?

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Yes.

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

Okay.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So we're adding 25 million in sewer bonds?

**MR. LIPP:**

Correct.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So that's 25 million more that we're going to be borrowing.

**MR. LIPP:**

Correct.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

That's not good.

**MR. LIPP:**

Well, yes. Okay. So another way to look at it is the original plan is we would be borrowing that or appropriating those funds this year. It's just that since it's not formed as part of a sewer district yet, the Ronkonkoma Hub, it really couldn't be sewer serial bonds, it would have to be regular serial bonds, which is referred to as B money. Sewer serial bonds is X money.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So who would be paying those back?

**MR. LIPP:**

Well, the point to be made is whether it was in 2015. Once again, there are different ways to look at this. Whether it was in 2015 or 2016, if the money is going to -- if the bonds are going to be issued, either way, you'll have that cost, it's just that it will be a year later.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

But if they're not sewer bonds -- sewer bonds, the people in the sewer district would pay back.

**MR. LIPP:**

Correct.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

The regular bond, the whole County would pay back.

**MR. LIPP:**

Correct.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So we would be having people not benefitting from the sewers paying back the sewer bond.

**MR. LIPP:**

No, this -- what we're saying here is that both the current adopted Capital Program 2015, which we cannot amend, has the 25 million in serial bonds, but it's not part of a sewer district yet. And the thought process was, by the Working Group per Gil Anderson, that they would have sufficient time to have part of the sewer district next year, and, therefore, it would -- it would work as sewer serial bonds.

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

So for sewer serial bonds for '16, rather than General Fund bonds this year?

**MR. LIPP:**

No, there were sewer serial bonds both years, it's just that you cannot --

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

Right, okay.

**MR. LIPP:**

-- appropriate the money because it's not a district yet.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So the entire County would not be paying it back, just the sewer district?

**MR. LIPP:**

Correct.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

He says yes, you're nodding your head no.

**MR. LIPP:**

He's nodding his head yes.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Yes, okay.

**MR. LIPP:**

Yeah, yeah, right. I'm pulling the string behind him, though. That was my fault. I went like this (demonstrating) by accident, I meant to go like this (demonstrating).

**LEG. TROTТА:**

All right. So the people of the sewer district ultimately will be paying those back, not the other taxpayers?

**MR. LIPP:**

Correct. There are lots of unanswered questions and details that need to be worked out during the year, which I try not to get --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Can this be added to the Southwest Sewer District, since it ultimately connects to it?

**MR. LIPP:**

That is the plan.

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

So let's just keep moving. We have a lot to cover. Is there any other specific questions on this Ronkonkoma Hub project? All right. Robert, back to you.

**MR. LIPP:**

Okay. I'm going to -- and in order to try to be as efficient as possible and not bore you to tears, I'm sure I don't do that, but what you -- what you have in front of you here, which is just a -- you know, admittedly, the whole thing isn't on screen, because you definitely wouldn't see a thing if I did it that way. But what we did here is we looked at just the County general, if you will, impact on the budget, the idea being, okay, Federal, State Aid, those are monies that will not be a financial impact on the County's budget, and the serial bonds, the X -- the sewer serial bonds, the X money, that those are for dedicated sources, and we have money to pay for that sort of stuff more readily. So it's looking at the B money, is the perhaps proper focus in that sense.

So if you see here, these are the dollar increases to the proposed program for each of the years, 2016, '17, '18 and SY. SY, or subsequent years, is typically viewed as two years of the five-year program. And so the question is, well, we are advancing almost 10 million in 2016. And, oh, yeah, by the way, 2016 is by far and away the most important concern, because next year when you're appropriating and authorizing the funding by resolution, you can only vote on this, on the 2016 budget. You can't -- you can't appropriate the funding for the other years, okay, unless you have an offset, of course, then you can do that.

So the question is, well, what is contributing to this? And what we did is we viewed it as well, and one way to look at it is by type of change, and that is did we add money, did we advance money to do something more quickly? Did we actually decrease? Did we defer, which meant that we pushed it to an outer year, or was it just a change in the funding source.

So, as you could see here, the big ticket item is over \$10 million in advancing funds. And what we have for that is -- well, I don't have the current detail up for the advancing of the funds, I have the sort of modified, if you will. I would need a minute to locate that file, but -- well, maybe I should try to locate it.

Okay. So here on the board -- I was nimble enough to do it -- for the current Omnibus, you could see what the big ticket items are. The first one is energy conservation at various County facilities, 2.96 million was added. It was viewed that these projects pay for themselves to do insulation, to do windows, solar perhaps, whatever needs to be done. We have a pretty good track record of either lowering utility costs or cost avoidance to prohibit or to minimize increases in utility costs. So it was felt that this project would sort of pay for itself, if you will. So 2.96 million were added to the -- to 2016, were advanced actually. The overall project was almost the same. We took money out of subsequent years for that.

The last item that you see on the board is intersection improvements on County Road 94. The way it was -- what we did is we sort of advanced the money, the 4 million, into 2016. The Working Group's argument was that there was money in the budget there for land acquisition, and it was felt that we already had whatever land acquisition we need to, and, therefore, it was believed by the Working Group that that project could move forward in 2016. So, therefore, the monies were advanced for that purpose.

There were also improvements of two-and-a-half million dollars to County Center. The electrical

system there was -- is like 60 years old, and it has a risk of failing, and it was felt that that would not be a good idea. So they wanted to minimize the risk and advance the money.

I will stop now, if you will, and take questions.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Any questions? I see Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Thank you, and yes. I wanted to first thank the Working Group who got together and met over several days to try to hammer out a budget amendment that met all of the needs of the County, and certainly to Budget Review, who worked with us quite a bit. And to the Presiding Officer, who decided to do it in a public process and our various Commissioners who sat in through many of those meetings, including Commissioner Anderson, I think we came up with a very good product, although I think there are some additional tweaks that we could make to improve the product. When I brought it back to my caucus, there were a number of questions and some additional projects we wanted to take a look at. And what I'd like to do, if it's okay with the Chair, is to make a couple of proposals for amendments to the Omnibudget -- Omnibus Resolution Number One.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I'll second the motion.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. So I think I need a -- I've got about five or six projects I'd like to tweak a little bit here, and I think we need to do those one at a time; is that correct, George?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yup.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. So the first amendment I'd like to make to the Working Group project is for *Capital Project 1643*. I would like to remove that item from the Work Group resolution, which would leave the money, 2.5 million, for that project in 2017, as proposed by the County Executive.

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

I will second that. I second that amendment. The HVAC system.

**MR. LIPP:**

So we have a version of this up on the board.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Can I just ask just a quick question? You can't do it now, Robert, but if we could somehow technologically figure out how to connect our laptops to what you -- what those of you at that table are presenting on your computers in the future, so that we can click into the various presentations that you're making and easily read them, because --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

We're old and blind.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yeah, we're old and blind at this point and there's no way I can read that, and it seems to me to be simple enough just to be able to put it on our computers. Just that's for the future. I appreciate it.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yeah. Rob, you can blow it up on that screen.

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

Legislator Calarco, that is the HVAC system?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Correct. This is some work to be done at the Riverhead Center. It's the health center and some other facilities there. This is a project that the County Executive proposed in 2017. It is something that our Department of Public Works, while they feel it is a needed project, that we can get by until 2017, as they stated to the County Executive, and it's something that we felt -- I'd like to make the amendment to leave that in '17 as proposed.

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

I second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Any discussion on the motion?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes, I have some discussion. So how exactly is this working there? Who -- because this is an amendment that's -- the amendment that you're amending is cosponsored by "X" number of Legislators. Who gets to the -- who gets to vote on the amendment to the amendment, the Legislators that are cosponsoring or --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

We vote on this as a whole.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So we're just voting on -- so what are we exactly voting on then at this point, just removing this item from the Working Group's amendment?

**MR. NOLAN:**

What we're doing is we are voting to amend Budget Amendment Number One. And, apparently, there's five or six proposed amendments to that resolution. We're going to vote on them one by one, and when we're done with those, then we will vote on Budget Amendment Number One up or down as amended.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. It seems strange, but okay. We're amending an amendment that hasn't been approved yet, but okay.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

We've done it in the past, considered amendments. All right. So we have a motion and a second to make an amendment to Budget Amendment Number One by deleting or removing I.R. 1643.

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

Deferring.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Deferring, excuse me.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

We are removing that from Budget Amendment Number One, and as a result, it will leave that project in the budget as proposed by the County Executive.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right. Just on that note, if I may be recognized, Legislator Calarco, that -- or to BRO, this -- by taking it out of Budget Amendment Number One, the project is still a viable project, but it's going back to the County Executive recommended for this particular line.

**MR. LIPP:**

Exactly.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. My next proposed amendment is for *Capital Project 1664*. This is energy conservation at various County facilities. I know that this is a good project and worthwhile, and one that adds -- you know, does pay itself back over time. But what we are looking to do is mitigate the payment over the course of time in terms of implementing that program, similar to -- you know, you don't replace all your light bulbs at once, you replace them as those incandescent bulbs go. And what we would like to do is reduce this line by -- to make an amendment to have the line reflect \$2 million worth of investments in '16, '17, '18, and I believe subsequent years.

**MR. LIPP:**

So you could see, if you look up on the screen, the second-to-last column is the proposed or recommended program. And what Legislator Calarco is recommending is 2 million in each year, as opposed to zero, 2.025, 2.025 and etcetera.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

So it reflects a roughly equal investment to energy conservation projects over the course of the Capital Budget five-year plan, but it's spreading them out over the course of the five years, so you would have 2 million invested in '16, '17, '18, and then in subsequent years.

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

And, Legislator Calarco, the current Omni has what, 2.96?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

The current Omni had increased 2016 to 2.96, and then had 2 million each year subsequent, thereafter. This would reduce that 2016 number by an additional 960,000.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator D'Amaro?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes. And I just want to say that I was not on this particular Working Group, but I do appreciate that amendment being offered, because I think it's a good approach. We're still funding a very worthwhile project, but, at the same time, I think we're spreading it out more appropriately, given the fact that we want to avoid increasing debt, you know, too high. So I think this strikes a good balance, I think it's a good amendment.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yeah, to Dr. Lipp. Wasn't this the one thing that actually paid for itself?

**MR. LIPP:**

Well, depends on whose analysis you're looking at, but we believed so, yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Whose analysis said it wasn't paying for itself?

**MR. LIPP:**

I'm not aware of anyone's analysis specifically. I know that the in-house analysis we did showed that to be the case, but there -- apparently, there is, you know, some difference of opinion, because it is admittedly hard to do a calculation. You have to make some assumptions.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Well, I was here for that and I sat through that, and that was the one thing I actually felt comfortable with, where they said that -- you know, because we do this and we're going to save "X" amount of dollars. And I think if I remember correctly, it actually -- the debt service was less than what we'd be saving every year. So, actually, in a weird way, we're actually going to make money on this. Am I wrong; did I get that?

**MR. LIPP:**

You got it, that was the gist of it.

**LEG. CILMI:**

You're right.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

So I got it right?

**MR. LIPP:**

Correct.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

So -- but it's a question of getting the projects done in a timely fashion. We actually have \$1.8 million worth of money sitting in this Capital Budget line right now that's already been appropriated. So it's great to say that there's four-and-a-half million dollars or \$2.9 million worth of projects we should do energy conservation, but if we're not able to actually get the work done, because of workload situations, then all we're doing is putting money in the budget that we're not going to be able to actually accomplish. So there's no point in increasing our Capital Budget and planning on spending money that we aren't going to be able to get the work done on.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

I couldn't agree more, but if we can get the work done, we might as well have the money, because it's free.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I'm glad you agree with me.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

It's free. And then if we don't use the money, guess what, we have it left over, and we didn't spend it, and we didn't borrow for it. So I think this is -- if this is what you're telling me, and we have to go by what you said, this is going to pay for itself. So why would we cut something that pays for itself? You know, I'm the most conservative guy here. If you're telling me as the expert that this is going to pay for itself, it costs us nothing --

**MR. LIPP:**

We're just providing the recommendations. We had 41 recommendations that weren't all taken up.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Is this the -- would it be safe to say this is the only one out of all those recommendations that actually said it would pay for itself?

**MR. LIPP:**

I believe so.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

So here we are, the one thing that's actually going to make us money and save money, and we're not going to -- we're going to cut it?

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

That's debatable. They can see that point, because we have money in here in the budget, all up and down the budget that's Federal funded or it's State funded, that's investment that we get return on.

**MR. LIPP:**

There is also --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

So everybody can see that point.

**MR. LIPP:**

Yeah, we advance a lot of stuff also. You're right, that it was a little -- you know, a little limited, my response. We also have a fair amount of money that's advanced, because if we didn't advance it, we felt it would be significant cost increases and/or risks we would take that could generate a lot more cost increase.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Lindsay.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I think just further to Legislator Trotta's point, and I agree with him, you know, any projects that we have that are funded either from another source or have a return on them that are so high that we should include. But if we don't have the time to implement those projects, I think it makes sense to push them off. Why borrow the money until we need it? So, you know, although I favor his opinion here and agree with him, I think we should hold off on borrowing the money until we actually have

time to implement the --

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Well, we wouldn't be borrowing unless we need it, right?

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

But why put it in the budget and why have it sitting there as a -- in our pipeline until we actually need to allocate it? You know, we know we can't allocate it in 2016. Why have it sitting in our pipeline and on our books and --

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Well, if you're not spending it, it doesn't matter, and it's just less money we'd spend somewhere else.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

So then -- okay. But then why would we take other things out of the budget that we know we're not going to be able to spend as well, or that are going to be funded by other sources?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. We do have a list. Are you done, Legislator Lindsay?

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. Legislator Schneiderman.

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

To respond to Legislator Trotta, it's really a question of where you draw the line. So the County Executive put zero in for 2016. The Omni Working Group pushed it up to I think 2.96 million with the theory that you're talking about, but you could have put it at 4 million, you could have put it at 5 million, and maybe it would have paid for itself, we don't know. The question is where do you feel a comfort level? So by your theory, you might as well make it 5 million or 6 million, because it might pay for itself, but I don't see you proposing that. So the County Executive proposed zero. We added \$2 million, knowing that, yeah, we might get attacked for adding to the debt. But we will make that argument that this is a cost savings energy conservation program. So it's really where you set that mark. And I think what Legislator Trotta -- what Legislator Calarco was saying is \$2 million every year for the next four years is a -- that's an \$8 million investment, is significant. So unless you're proposing raising it, I think that 2 million is fine. It's 2 million more than the County Executive budgeted.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yeah. Pretty much Legislator Schneiderman made the point that I wanted to make, that -- excuse me -- that this is funding that traditionally the Legislature has had a keen eye on. We've provided funding for this. And, again, we're trying to strike a balance between how much debt are we going to incur, or how much are we going to at least authorize, while at the same time having energy efficiency programs continue. And I think that the 2.9, I know when I took a look at this outside the Working Group, that I thought that was a little high, and I think this strikes a much better balance, so I would support this amendment.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. We have a motion and a second. Oh, we don't? Okay.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

No. I made a motion.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Calarco, second by Legislator Lindsay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Opposed.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Opposed.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fifteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. My next proposed amendment --

**LEG. CILMI:**

To clarify, that -- I'm sorry. Just to clarify, that took out roughly a million dollars out of the Working Group's --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Correct.

**LEG. CILMI:**

-- 2016 additions.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

2016, correct. My next proposed amendment is for *Capital Project Number 1796*, improvements to the Suffolk County Farm. We are working on a resolution now that we'll lay on the table today to find the funding in 2015 to move this forward. This is something that wanted to -- that we looked to bring forward so that we can offer to do our Visitor Center at the Suffolk County Farm in conjunction with an effort by the State to build a State Taste of NY facility that they are looking to build at the same location in Yaphank on the Expressway. I think our best way to leverage that ability to have those two projects move forward at the same time is to show the State a real commitment by having the money available to do that in '15. They want to build in '16. Just putting the money in '16 doesn't necessarily do it. By moving it forward to '15, we really show them that we're committed to this project.

And so what I would like to do is make a motion to amend the Working Group proposal to remove 1.3 million from 1796 in construction funds in totality as we will look to appropriate those funds this year.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Second.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Second that.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator -- okay, Legislator Browning. It is her District. Sorry.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

That's all right.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay? All in --

**MR. NOLAN:**

I just want to be clear on it. There was money advanced from '17 to '16. I believe the money --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

The proposed budget has the money in '17. The Working Group put the money in '16. My recommendation is to amend the resolution to remove the 1.3 million construction all together, as it's no longer needed in this Capital Program, we're going to do this year.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. My next proposed amendment is for *Capital Project 5014*, strengthening and improving County Roads. What I would like to amend -- recommend is to amend this line by taking 615,000 in serial money and \$307,500 in Federal Aid money and move those from 2016 into 2017. This is not one that the Working Group addressed originally, so this would be an amendment to the proposed budget.

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

Again, the argument is that the Public Works Department probably --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Public Works is -- certainly, if you look through the Budget Review's recommendations throughout this budget, they mention in several occasions workload, and capacity, and ability for Public Works to get these various projects done. They are certainly backlogged. As we all know, they are short on employees. So what this does is recognizes that. And it's, you know, unfortunate that we have to prioritize, but we will be prioritizing which roads we need to do. This is not any one particular roadway, but, rather, it is various County roads, and DPW will have to, you know, prioritize things in their workload.

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

Basically, it's a 10% reduction in the available funds in that line.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Roughly, yes. But since it's got the match, we -- and we're moving into '17, we want to move the Federal money as well as the B money.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. CILMI:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right.

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

I'll second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Well, we have a motion by Legislator Calarco; second by?

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

I'll second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes. So, I'm sorry, Legislator Calarco. Could you -- I was busy looking for it on my list here and I didn't find it, and you said that it wasn't on here.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

It was not originally in the Working Group.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Could you just repeat what you propose?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yup. It's 5014, which is strengthening and improving County roads. It would be -- we would be deferring 615,000 in serial money, and another 307,500; 307,500 in Federal Aid monies into 2017, so that the money is still reflected in the budget. We know we need to get this work done, it's just a matter of being able to accommodate that work, similar to actually, you know, being able to get the energy conservation project.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So it was in 2016 in the proposed budget, and your suggestion is to --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Reduce the line.

**LEG. CILMI:**

In 2017.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yeah. It's not eliminating the line, the line is a \$6 million line. It's reducing it by that -- those figures.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. So it was in the 2016 for 6 million?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

For 6 million.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And you're suggesting to --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Reduce it by 600.

**LEG. CILMI:**

-- take a million out of it and move it into '17?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Correct, roughly thereabouts. What was -- Budget Review, it's in for 6 million, but is that 6 million all serial money? 5014.

**MR. LIPP:**

All right. So in the program is 4 million in serial bonds, 2 million in aid.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

So we'll be reducing it by 615 in serial bonds, and 307,500 in aid?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Make sure.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yeah. Dr. Lipp, you have those numbers?

**MR. LIPP:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. So I made the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. My next proposed amendment is a real simple one. This is for **Project 5538**, improvements to County Road 13, Clinton Avenue, Fifth Avenue, Crooked Hill Road. It is currently reflected in the budget as \$8 million in 2016 in B money and serial money. What that doesn't appropriately address is the fact that 2.5 million of that is coming in as State Aid and will be grant-funded monies. So I'd like to make an amendment to the budget to reflect that line as being 5.5 million in serial bonds, and \$2.5 million in other, so it correctly reflects where those monies are coming from. That 2.5 million won't be paid for by Suffolk County taxpayers.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I'll second that motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Motion by Legislator Calarco, second by Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And again, that's 5538 you said?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

5538.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Which, again, is not on your original list?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

It is not part of the Working Group.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. Please just reiterate, then, what the impact to 2016.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

So what it does is just correct the actual dollar figures. Currently, the project's in as \$8 million in serial bonds. What is accurate, and I have confirmed this with DPW this morning, is that 2.5 million of that is actually coming in as State Aid. So it will correct the budget to reflect that 5.5 million will be paid for by Suffolk County through serial bonds, and 2.5 of that project will be paid for through State Aid.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So it doesn't change the 2016 number at all?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

It doesn't change the 2016 number in terms of how much the project will receive.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

It does change the 2016 number in terms of how much in serial bonds the County is going to be liable for.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Robert, you have all that?

**MR. LIPP:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. We have a motion and a second.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Again, this is a project I will continue to say, in my opinion, a gift to the developer. Take a look at Tanger in Deer Park and the reconstruction of the roads around the Tanger Mall. This, I believe, is we are putting way too much money into a project that I believe should be paid for by the developer. So, in my opinion, this is -- continues to be a gift. And while I appreciate that you have amended this to reduce the 2016 cost, I think this is something -- and, Gil, I did ask for some information. I was told, Rob, at the last meeting, the last Working Group meeting, you mentioned that the developer was going to repay whatever the County pays. I've asked for that in writing. I said I want to see in writing the commitment by that developer to refund the cost, and I have not yet seen that. So, again, this is a project I'll continue to oppose. I know it's grouped in with everything else. I don't want to oppose. You know, I do support the budget as it is, but this is one project that I think needs to be seriously scaled back.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator McCaffrey.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Yeah. I agree with Legislator Browning. I will fully support any improvements needed at Crooked Hill Road. I've been on that road, I know there are some issues on there, but I cannot be supportive of using County money to be able to fund this development by a developer there. And unless we have some certainty and some guarantees as to what he's going reimburse in those costs, I have a difficult time appropriating all that money. And I would like to see a scaled-down version that reflects what our needs are, which is to fix Crooked Hill Road, and not an expansion for further development by a developer.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Well, without getting into a debate over whether or not -- what parts of this road project are needed, this is certainly south of that proposed development, all this is doing is fixing the budget so it properly reflects the cost, the dollar amounts in terms of who's paying what. And, certainly, I think part of that 2.5 million is coming because of the investment the State sees that needs to be made to this road.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Yeah. Is this -- where is this in relation to the Heartland thing they want to build? Is it right outside by the College there?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yeah.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

To Gil Anderson. Over here, I moved, I couldn't sit.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Oh, there you are.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Are they going to be paying -- what's my favorite term -- impact fees?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I will check on that. Right now, the developer obtained a grant through ESTC for 2.5 million towards the projects to offset the cost. He is paying 500,000 in the design for the overall project. The grant itself is for 2.5 million; 500,000 is for design costs, and another 200 -- I'm sorry, another 2 million is going towards the construction costs.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

For the roadways you're talking about?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So, I mean, but, as we know, the County charges impact fees. I mean, I had a Dunkin' Donuts, they were going to charge eighty -- \$28,000 for. So that got -- if a Dunkin' Donuts got charged 28,000, they would probably be charged 2.8 million based upon the traffic going in. Are they going to be charged that?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I would have to get you that information. I don't know off the top of my head the details on that. I would say that -- I don't know, I really don't even know. I'll get back to you.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

That's fair. Do they get any kind of tax abatements there? Are we --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I have no idea. Just to answer you, I think your earlier question about where it's located, it's -- this portion of the project goes from G Road, which is along the south side of Suffolk Community College. It goes all the way to the Expressway. So it crosses over Sagtikos, although it's not -- we're not doing -- touching the bridge.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

There's a flooding problem there. It always used to flood right there.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

It still floods there?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We've done some work in that area to remediate that. I haven't heard anything recently, but I can check.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

It used to flood really bad.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah, really bad.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

This is a question to Gil. Kate had asked for something I guess in writing about what the developer was going to pay. Is that his grant that he received that he's going to pay towards the project, or is it something in addition to the grant you just spoke of?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No. The grant is -- I have that documentation and I can forward it. I just haven't been in the office today, so I can forward the grant to you to see.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

You're welcome.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Just very quickly, and this is for everybody to review at some point if you were interested, but just to address some of the concerns very quickly. We're talking about 2016, and in 2016 you can see that there are certain elements of the overall project that are slated for 2016; that's County Road 7 to County Road 106, that's slated for 2016. And Brook Avenue to County Road 100 at the Long Island Railroad, Suffolk Avenue. Those are the two elements that must be addressed. Those are the two elements of the project that the Commissioner had spoken to when we had him at the public hearing talking about certain conditions of certain parts of the roadway that need to be addressed much sooner rather than later. Those are the elements that come under the budget that we're looking at here in the 2016 portion. And so if you're familiar with the area, if you know anything about the map and the specific portions of road, that they stand apart, they are separate on their own and are in need of work, regardless of anything else going on in the area.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. We have a motion and a second. Did you want to say something?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Yes, we do.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

I'm sorry. And just to reiterate what Legislator Stern was saying, this is also on the opposite side of the development, which is already taking place. And we also have -- not only do we have Suffolk Community College there, but we also have Brentwood schools, who use those roads, such as the Freshman Center and North Middle School who use those roads. So I think it's very important that we continue the project as it already started. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Motion and second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. And I have one last amendment that I would like to propose. It is two capital projects. 6411, infrastructure improvements for workforce housing, Connect Long Island. What I would like to propose is to amend the budget so that we would have \$4 million in 2016 and \$6 million in 2017.

While we recognize the need to have these projects, this money available for these important projects, I'm certainly one who will sit and talk to anybody about the great benefits that we attain by making investments into workforce housing projects. We also need to be recognized that there is a timeline of these projects being able to come forward and our ability to afford them. And what this does is simply defer \$1 million from 2016 into 2017, with the anticipation that it will be better aligned with our needs.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator -- motion by Legislator Calarco, second by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. Thank you very much. Those are all the amendments I have. And if I might ask, Dr. Lipp, maybe you guys could review those amendments and how they impact the product by the Working Group and what the impact on the proposed budget would be.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Well, why don't we --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Bottom-line dollars, I guess.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Why don't you offer a motion.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. I'd like to make a motion to adopt Budget Amendment Number One as amended.

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

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. CILMI:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion.

**LEG. CILMI:**

If I could just ask -- ask Robert, my quick calculation is just under \$7 million of a reduction to what was originally the Working Group's amendment. So then it's just over \$2 million or so of an addition to the County Executive's proposed?

**MR. LIPP:**

Okay. So what you see, or perhaps not?

**LEG. CILMI:**

I can't see.

**MR. LIPP:**

Yeah.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I can't see. You're going to have to summarize it for me, Robert, I just can't read that.

**MR. LIPP:**

Okay. So it's broken down. The first few rows are 2016 and 2017, 2018, SY, and then the last two blocks have added the three-year program, '16, '17, '18, and the last blocks include subsequent years.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So for purposes of my question, I just want to know is 2016.

**MR. LIPP:**

Okay. So the first column has 2016 -- I'm sorry, the first row, and the bond money is no change from the proposed program.

**LEG. CILMI:**

What do you mean, the bond money?

**MR. LIPP:**

Okay. The serial bonds or B money source of financing, even though numbers were jiggered around from one project to another, and that is there's no change from the proposed Capital Program.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. So the -- so let me just reiterate that. So Budget Amendment Number One adds zero -- zero B money to the proposed Capital Program?

**MR. LIPP:**

The amended Budget Amendment Number One, not the original one.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right, right.

**MR. LIPP:**

Okay. I just make to make sure we're talking the same thing.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I understand. So the original Budget Amendment Number One added close to \$10 million to the original.

**MR. LIPP:**

8.875 million.

**LEG. CILMI:**

8.875 million. And the amended version, which we're voting on now, would add zero.

**MR. LIPP:**

Correct.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay.

**MR. LIPP:**

And the other sources of financing -- so that the one we were just talking about with the zero I highlighted in yellow. And then the other biggest increase is \$25 million, and that's what we were talking about before with the Ronkonkoma Hub. It was -- it is in the 2015 adopted Capital Program as X money, or sewer serial bonds. But they won't be able to appropriate that because there's no sewer district there. They believe that there will be a sewer district some time next year, and, therefore, at that time, they'll be able to appropriate it as sewer bonds. And you'll have a bite at the apple next year when -- if and when that resolution comes forward.

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

That it reduces the 2015 by 25 million.

**MR. LIPP:**

We can't change --

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

Sewer bonds.

**MR. LIPP:**

-- the 2015 budget. We're here to change only the proposed '16, '17, '18 and SY.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. So we have a motion and a second. Oh, I'm sorry, Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. I think -- I thought there was some discussion about Capital Project Number 1755, and that I would like a discussion. We did take a lot of the -- and I voted again the amendment to the amendment to reduce the energy conservation at various County facilities. And I would like to use, if anyone would indulge me, some of the 1755 to add back to the energy conservation at various County facilities.

**MR. LIPP:**

So --

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I don't know if anybody has an appetite for that. I will make a motion to take \$900,000 out of 1755 to restore the energy conservation at various County facilities.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

There's not in there.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I thought there was one-point --

**MR. LIPP:**

No. So in the current version or amended version of Budget Amendment Number One, 1755 has a half a million dollars in it. And the -- and the proposed budget, which is what is being amended, has zero in it.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I'll withdraw my motion.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Budget Number One passes as amended.

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

We voted on the Omnibus.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Voted on the amended.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Amended. Budget Number One as amended.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Oh, as amended.

**LEG. CILMI:**

As amended.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

You voted for a \$20 million increase.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

Okay. All right. So next is Budget Amendment Two.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Wait. I want to vote no for the first budget.

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

You need a motion to reconsider.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So Legislator Trotta wants to mark his vote in the negative for reducing the budget.

**LEG. CILMI:**

If technically we need a motion to reconsider, I'd be happy to make that motion to reconsider, just to --

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

We haven't moved on to the next one yet.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Give it the no.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Give him the no? All right. Sixteen, 16 on the last one. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Budget Amendment Number Two.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes. May I?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes, what? (Laughter)

**LEG. CILMI:**

I would -- and I beg your sort of indulgence here, because this amending on the floor is a little new to me, but --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

We've done it before.

**LEG. CILMI:**

But, nevertheless, I would like to propose some amendments to Budget Amendment Number Two, and the first of which would be to remove Capital Project 5014 from our -- from Amendment Number Two, because that budget -- that capital project was included in Budget Amendment Number One, and if we didn't take that out of there, it would render Budget Amendment Number Two moot or conflicting, right?

**MR. LIPP:**

No, you --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Benny's shaking his head no.

**MR. LIPP:**

You're moving in the same direction as --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Oh, we're moving in the same direction, so it doesn't matter. Okay. Never mind, then.

**MR. LIPP:**

Just for the record, we took a look at Budget Amendment Number Two to see if there would be any conflicts if with the amended --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right.

**MR. LIPP:**

-- Budget Amendment One and we didn't see any.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay, good. So, in that case -- in that case, I would like to make a motion to eliminate from Budget Amendment Number Two Capital Projects Number 1710, 3060, 3244, 3405.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Wait, wait. You have to do them one at a time.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Why?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Because that's how -- we can't -- we have to consider them individually.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Why? Do we have to?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

That's what Counsel is advising me, yes.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Consider amendments --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay.

**MR. NOLAN:**

We always consider amendments one at a time, just like we did the first one.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. So let's do one at a time. Let's consider, then, Project Number 3060, 3060. Forget about 1710; 3060 first. All right? And basically what we're doing here is we're looking at some of the public safety related projects based on testimony from Ron Barz this morning. So we want to remove 3060 from the capital project.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. So let me understand. So you want to remove \$10,000 for -- reduce it -- excuse me, reduce it --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Reduce our reduction, right.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

By \$10,000?

**LEG. CILMI:**

So it leaves -- it basically leaves it as -- leaves that project as proposed in the budget.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

But minus 10,000.

**LEG. CILMI:**

No, no. It leaves that project as proposed in the budget. So if you just cross that whole line out on your --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Am I looking at the wrong --

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

Do you have a second?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yeah, yeah.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Yes, I second it.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So there'd be no reduction in that project in the budget?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So -- well, let me understand why you think this is necessary. How did you come to the conclusion that this is necessary? And did you speak to the Department, the respective Department?

**LEG. CILMI:**

No, it's not -- they're not -- we're removing the cut. So, in effect, we're not cutting.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Oh, okay, good. Okay, gotcha. Gotcha. Okay. All right. All right.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Sorry.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

You confused me a little bit.

**LEG. CILMI:**

That's all right. I was just as confused with Budget Amendment Number One.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So now pay-back's a --

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. This is your --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Or should I say one good turn deserves another? It's easier, it's safer.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

This is your omni --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Oh, okay, yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes, yes, yes. Okay. So we want to leave Capital Project 3060 alone, so remove that. So the motion is to remove that capital project from the list of projects reduced in Budget Amendment Number Two.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator D'Amaro?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yeah. Do you have a second? Just on the motion.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Yeah, I second it.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yeah, just on the motion, I want to -- excuse me. This is the first time I'm seeing this particular bill. And I want to support the amendment to Budget Resolution Number Two that reduces the serial bond funding, but I'd like to know why was it reduced, and what was the thinking behind reducing it in the first place?

**LEG. CILMI:**

So, basically, having sat through a couple of Working Group meetings myself, and, certainly, Legislator McCaffrey and Legislator Kennedy both sat through Working Group meetings, and I had staff at some of the others, the objective, as I was explained or as I was told right from the beginning, was to either keep the -- keep the proposed budget flat, or reduce the proposed budget.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

When you say "proposed", you mean recommended?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Recommended budget.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay.

**LEG. CILMI:**

It became clear to us by the end of the process, by the last meeting, that there was really no will, if you will, on the part of the Working Group to do that. There was a lot of additions that we talked

about, but there weren't a lot of sub -- any subtractions, really. So we began working on some thoughts on how we thought would be best to reduce the Capital Budget for 2016. And in adding up many of the projects that were included in the 2016 proposed or recommended budget, it came to a total of roughly \$100 million of expense. That's not every project that was funded in 2016, but it was many projects that were funded in 2016. And we're talking only about serial bonds now, we're not talking about sewer money.

So the thought was then to try and save \$10 million out of the Capital -- out of the 2016 Capital Budget, and, lo and behold, 10% of those projects was roughly \$10 million. Now you could say, "Well, but some of that's funded money from other levels of government," etcetera, and while that's true, it's still taxpayer money. And what I wanted to do at least, I'm not going to speak for my colleagues, but what I wanted to do is basically force us, the County, and force our contractors to sharpen their pencils and do more with less, which is what we've asked our employees to do time and time again, and we asked our departments to do time and time again.

If we say to a contractor, "Look, we have a million dollars to spend," the contractor is going to find a way to spend a million dollars. But if we say to that contractor we're budgeting for \$900,000 instead of a million dollars, then that contractor is going to have to sharpen his pencil. Maybe we don't get the -- you know, the full-size GPS screen on the dashboard. Maybe it's a little, you know, audible GPS, you know? In other words, maybe it's not a Cadillac, maybe it's a Chevrolet.

So that was the -- that was sort of the theory behind all of these cuts. The changes that I'm proposing to be made now are based on testimony primarily from Ron Barz, who is something -- somebody that we all respect here, this morning, who had some grave concerns about reductions in any of the public safety related funding.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So I understand what your objective was. So your objective was to reduce the Working Group Omnibus by \$10 million?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Our objective was to reduce the -- was to reduce the final Capital Budget in 2016 by roughly \$10 million.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

To reduce it from when, 2015 to '16.

**LEG. CILMI:**

No, no, no. From what it was -- from what was proposed.

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

By the Capital Budget Working Group?

**LEG. CILMI:**

No, what was proposed originally. In other words, we didn't have a -- we didn't have the Working Group's proposal in front of us when we were deciding what to amend, we had the Capital Budget in front of us. And we looked through the Capital Budget, we itemized all --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, there is no -- there was no Capital Budget for 2016.

**LEG. CILMI:**

No, no, the proposed -- the recommended Capital Budget for 2016.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

All right. And your objective was to reduce that by \$10 million?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. So now what you're doing, there was one of those amendments that would help you achieve that goal you've decided that you don't want to go forward with, correct?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And to be fair, we're sort of encouraged by the amendments that were just made to Budget Amendment Number One. I mean, we started out when we last -- when we last finished the --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Wait a minute. But those amendments to Budget Number One were thought out and discussed based upon could we get to them or some other considerations.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Whatever the case may be.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

But these amendments look like you're taking a sledgehammer instead of a scalpel to the budget.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Well, I mean --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Because what you did is you went 10% across -- now, wait a minute. I just want to understand what you did --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

-- because what you just said was in theory, you know, we want to sharpen pencils, but these projects are very thought-out, planned projects. You can't just smash 10% away and say, "I hope this works."

**LEG. CILMI:**

Well, so may I respond?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Absolutely.

**LEG. CILMI:**

First of all, the process that we went through was in light of where we believed the Working Group to be at the end of the deliberations and at the end of the deadline for budget amendments. We believed that the Working Group at that point was going to be adding roughly \$10 million to the proposed Capital Budget for 2016, so we start there.

Now, if you consider asking our contractors to come in 10% below what we conceive to be the cost associated with a project, because let's remember that these are just proposals at this point until we get appropriate -- let me finish.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Until we get appropriating resolutions, it's just a plan. So, if you consider asking -- asking us to reduce our plan by 10% a sledgehammer, well, then I'm not quite sure how to respond to that. I don't view it as a sledgehammer at all.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Let me explain it further, then, because it is a sledgehammer. When the County recommends in a Capital Budget an amount for a project, okay, it's not just pulled out of thin air, it's based on consultant work, it's based on inhouse experience. There are many -- there's a deliberate process that goes into that number. Now I am all for reducing authorization and, you know, getting debt under control, you know, we share that. But I'm looking at an omni bill that just, without consultation, just said, "I believe, without any experience, know-how, or what went into this process, or how you got to this number, I think you can do it for less than 10%." That's a sledgehammer, because if you go through these -- and this is a perfect example now. Here you're putting back a cut, you want to eliminate a cut because you didn't think about it first, because you heard testimony today that this is a vital number. There was a rational decision made and a reason supporting this particular expenditure, but what you did was you just cut it right out without asking anybody.

So I want to support cuts and I want to support reduced bonding authorization, but I'm going to need a sufficient explanation on every one of these lines.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Legislator D'Amaro, what you're going to get from me is a desire to live within our means and a desire to sharpen our pencils on some of these capital projects. If we want to spend -- if we want to tell a contractor we're willing to spend \$3 million on a beach facility at Cupsogue, then tell him we're going to spend 300 million -- \$3 million and they'll spend \$300 million.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

What you're doing is you're killing every one of these projects.

**LEG. CILMI:**

No.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

By cutting 10% --

**LEG. CILMI:**

No. We're asking --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Let me tell you why, because those numbers --

**LEG. CILMI:**

We're asking them to sharpen their pencils and save 10%.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I have no problem doing that, but this is not how you do that.

**LEG. CILMI:**

We're asking them to eliminate the ski rack on the top of the car.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No, no, no. You're talking --

**LEG. CILMI:**

We're asking them to eliminate the chrome wheels.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Sorry, but I'm not going to -- this is real budgeting, Tom.

**LEG. CILMI:**

We just have a disagreement.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

This is not -- this is not let's make it up as we go along. I'm sorry.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Which each one of these projects.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I am sorry. I have to -- I have to disagree with you. You know, we can talk about not getting the Cadillac and getting the Chevy, but what does that mean to every line item here? That's meaningless. That's rhetoric, that means nothing. You --

**LEG. CILMI:**

We can have those conversations when -- you can come to us.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

If you want to responsibly offer a bill, you need to go to these departments, you need to talk them, you need to know where can we make these cuts responsibly, then I'm all with you 100%, but that was not done here.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Legislator D'Amaro, you know as well as I do that if we went to each of these Departments and ask them where they can cut, they're going to tell us that we can't cut it at all, that this is what the cost is. When they come to us with an appropriating resolution, we have -- we have the ability to vote yes or no. I would rather vote on an appropriating resolution that I'm sure that we -- that we asked our contractors to be as frugal as possible with our taxpayer money.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

But then do that.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And I think asking them to reduce those projects by 10% of the cost --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right.

**LEG. CILMI:**

-- is not beyond the realm of possibility, regardless of what it is.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I think it's wholly irresponsible, Tom, Legislator Cilmi; let me tell you why. Because you're assuming that when we do a bonding authorization, that the contractor is not going to be frugal and -- you know, we have a Department of Public Works that oversees that, and then, of course, an additional layer of oversight from us. You know, you're making assumptions that are convenient, and what you're doing is based on those convenient assumptions that, "No one's efficient except me. I can tell you, you can cut 10% out of every one of these projects." You don't know that. You don't know that sitting here. I mean, I don't either, and I would be more than happy to go back to these departments and talk to them and say, "Where can you find me 10%?" I voted for your bill that did that with Social Services. But to come in here and just pick 41 projects, or whatever number it is, and tell me, "I'm just going to cut 10%, because I believe we can sharpen our pencils and get a Chevy instead of a Cadillac," that's not responsible budgeting.

**LEG. CILMI:**

We disagree.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

These projects are going to be killed. You're going to kill every one of these projects.

**LEG. CILMI:**

We disagree.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Fair enough.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I don't know how I follow that up, but I guess Legislator D'Amaro I think made the point very clearly, and that's where do you get these projects from? And budgeting is not about just saying, "Ah, we can do this all for 10% less," it's setting priorities. That's what we do in the Capital Budget, we set our priorities. We look at the projects and we decide which ones we can afford to do, when, and when they need to get done, and how we can advance projects and the right time frames that they need to be advanced. And this particular proposal to remove this particular project from your Omnibus shows just that you didn't necessarily do that.

The fact that Mr. Barz came here today, a member of FRES, to say these capital -- these projects that affect the public safety and emergency preparedness type situations are very important, and they were well thought out, and they contained the correct dollar amounts, and when you reduce them by 10%, it's going to kill a project. And for you to say, "You know what, you're right, you know, I'm not going to make you sharpen your pencil because you're right." You know, this one is particularly the one as I was wrong on shows that you didn't do your due diligence. You didn't sit

down with the proper Commissioners, with the people that are involved, to see if we can actually sharpen these numbers or not.

And the reality is I think we're going to find that time and time again as we go through these, or that they're aided, Federal aided, State aided. And to remove that money, especially where some of these are 90% aided, it's just ridiculous. It's like the Federal governments not going to spend that money? They're going to give it to somebody else. So Suffolk County should suffer at the expense? That doesn't make sense.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. I'll put you on the list. I got a list. Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

All I go by is what I've seen here, and I saw \$300,000 to design a beach shack, and if you took 10% off of that, it's \$270,000. I talked to four different architects who laughed and said they could do it for \$30,000. So 10% in my mind is too little.

Government is incompetent, and if you haven't read the paper lately, everyone is leaving this Island. It's sinking because of this debt. If I had my way, I'd cut it by 30%. This is insanity what we pay for things here, and 10% is a drop in the bucket. I can't think of one thing that came across this in the past year that you couldn't do it for 60% less. And to sit here and say, "Oh, it's okay," and just to -- and to yell and scream and say that, "Oh, 10% is nothing," this is going to be voted on down the road. I guarantee you 90% of these things, including this stuff, which I never would have cut for public safety, can be done for less. And we have to do it, because, Ladies and Gentlemen, we read the paper every day, they're leaving. The tax base is leaving, the houses are renting and it's sinking and it's because of this. And I think 10% is nothing. I would have done -- I would have done 30%.

It sickens me to hear the numbers that we're spending on stuff here. You just argued for RFPs, which is the same principle, to get the cheapest thing we can. There's contractors that are going out of business. They will do it for 10% less, I guarantee it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Rob, that rhetoric is -- sounds nice and it might read nice in a headline, but the project you talk about is not on the list that you guys propose.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

That's an example of what's wrong with this body.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Well, if there's an example, it should be on this list, right?

**LEG. TROTТА:**

We already did it, it was last year, and I didn't vote for it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Well, you know, I particularly feel offended by this, and I'm going to call it a ploy, because, you know, we work very hard to work together, a bipartisan committee. I invite the members of the minority to be a part of the process. And then the last day, you guys come forward with this -- with this proposal that obviously had no thought, because you changed it as soon as a Director or Commissioner came before us, and said, "Well, no, you really can't cut that, that's going to threaten public safety or kill this project."

**LEG. TROTTA:**

I wouldn't cut any of it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Well, you know, it shows that there wasn't much thought into the process. And to sit there and actually approve things in the Work Group and then stand there a minute later with a proposal to say, "Oh, well, you guys are out of control, you guys need to cut \$10 million. We're going to do everything." And you sat there and you approved it. It's almost like -- you know, it was like a setup, and I don't like that. And I'm talking to Rob at the moment, Tom.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

I voted no, if you remember.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

No, but you -- I sat here, you sat here. You sat here and you guys approved stuff, and then you come at the last minute and you say, "Oh, well, we sat in the room at 8:30 or 9 o'clock in the morning and we really didn't give it much thought. We didn't have the budget in front -- the Omnibus in front of us, we're going to, you know --

**LEG. TROTTA:**

First of all, I wasn't on the Working Group.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

But there were members that were on the Working Group that supported the efforts of the Working Group, and then at the last minute said, "You know what, we're going to set our own Omnibus.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

We're sinking in debt and we're doing nothing about it. That's the bottom of line, we're sinking.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Well, proposing cuts, proposed cuts that have no thought or input from Commissioners is not --

**LEG. TROTTA:**

This is a budget process that has to be approved throughout the year. We're paying \$300,000 to design a beach hut. What planet is that okay? It's not okay.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

And you know something, Legislator Lindsay, you just said the same thing. No, we're not, but we budgeted 300,000 for it. So let's say they come in at 270.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

There's an insurance policy that covered the building that burned down.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

See, that's the mentality, oh, someone else pays for it, the insurance company or the Federal Government gets us money. It still comes out of our pockets. Who pays the premiums on that? We do.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

But you know what happens when you have a 95% Federally aided projects and you say, "Thank

you, Federal Government, we'll take your money", then actually --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Where do you think the Federal Government gets their money from?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I'm sorry?

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Where does the Federal Government get their money from? From us.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

No. But if that project is deemed vital. And if we say no to the Federal money, you're directly going to take the money from Suffolk County taxpayers, as opposed to getting it from the Federal Government. So it's actually an increase, not a decrease.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

That's a portion of what you're talking about, a portion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

No, it's not.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Since some of that was directed at me, I just want -- Legislator Trotta, I want to agree with you, as I did with Legislator Cilmi's bill with Social Services where you were not using, in my opinion, a sledgehammer, but going back to the Commissioner and saying, "Take a scalpel and make a responsibly thought-out proposal on where we can make cuts. And I agree with you, you want to cut 30%, I'll cut 50%. No problem, let's do it, but not like this, not like this. You want to sit down and participate as I have over the years in a Working Group, or if you want to have your own Working Group, whatever you want to do, but you need to be able to say this makes sense, this makes sense, and this doesn't.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Based upon my experience what I've seen here, it makes more -- 10% is nothing. I mean, I think you would agree with me --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No, but --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

-- that \$300,000 --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Rob, you're already pulling out one of your cuts. It is something. That 10% matters on that cut.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I did not pull out that cut.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I'm just making the point.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I wouldn't have voted for it.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Fair enough. I'm just making the point that I don't think anyone here disagrees that the less borrowing and the less authorization we can get through the better, but at least there's a process. And we have a -- let me finish. We have a responsibility to do that methodically and rationally so that we're making the right priorities. That's what we're put here to do. You can't just say -- you can't just say, "I'm going to cut 10% out of these because I think we can do better." That's wonderful if you're out there in the public and you have an expectation, but when you're put in the position to make the actual cuts, you got to think them through.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I know, but the public put me here to watch it. So when it comes up --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

That's fine.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

When it comes up, it's front of us to vote on it and say, "Oh, listen, we need a little bit more because of this," and you show me why, then we have that extra 10% to add to it. But I can guarantee you, as they come in here, people are going to meet that 10% cut. There might be one or two that does it and we'll have that money left over.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No, we don't legislate on your guarantees, we legislate on what departments tell us this is what it's going to cost. And then if you want to question that in a rational discussion, that's fine. But, you know, just saying -- I agree with you, there's waste and overspending in government, I agree with you, at every level.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Then what better way to find it --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

But you don't make cuts. You're put into this responsible position to do it the right way. You have the opportunity and power to do it and you're not exercising it.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Yes, I am. When they come in and they say, "Hey, listen, we need more money," show us they need more money, now we have that 10% buffer.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Then you need an offset. You can't do that.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

But we have that 10%.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No, you can't. No, you can't do that in the Capital Budget, you need an offset.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Well, then we'll find an offset.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. Legislator Kennedy.

**(\*The following testimony was taken by Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer & was transcribed by Denise Weaver - Legislative Aide\*)**

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. I want to address Legislator D'Amaro, Legislator Calarco and the Presiding Officer on this one.

We were told that we were disingenuous when we brought these cuts to the body because they weren't fully discussed at the Budget Committee. So much was added to the budget, the County Executive's budget, that we had no choice but to make cuts. Now, you just made cuts, which I respect, and I voted for them, I really find it horrible that you're saying we did this at eight o'clock in the morning when I was up night after night till three and four in the morning. I read, probably four times, Bellone's budget, I read Budget Review probably the same amount of times, and I spoke with Commissioners, I spoke with people in the department for the ones that I put in to the 10% cut. We do our homework. That's all I want to say.

**P.O. GREGORY.**

Go ahead, Rob.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

You know, to say that we were forced to do this because the Working Group kept adding money and adding money, in the first ten minutes of the Working Group process, Legislator Kennedy, you and Legislator McCaffrey both voted to move the 2.5 million up on the County Center in Riverhead; voted to add 4.5 million in energy conservation projects that the County Executive didn't have in the budget; voted to add \$1.5 million to improve the IFMS system in 2016 that was defeated in the Working Group that was being proposed by the Comptroller. So to sit there and say that we were forced into it when both of you, at least -- your colleagues I won't address this to -- sat there and voted for those increases, it's very disingenuous.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Rob, I think you're incorrect. But I will --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

You can check the tapes, Leslie.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

You know, the first one I did, because when it's snowing inside a building of County workers and they can't maintain the temperature and it's down to the 30's, I really think that building needs to be taken care of.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

And that's why we said budgeting is all about priorities and you have to set your priorities, you have to decide what projects have to be advanced, when and where. And to just blanketly say we're going to cut 10% off the top because that's what we're going to do to save money isn't really budgeting with priorities, it's just kind of going out there with a sledgehammer and saying, *This is how it's going to happen*. And when that 10% reduction kills the project because it can't move forward, then what you're really not doing is not using priorities at all, you're just -- you're just blindly -- you're out there blindly.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

*(Inaudible)*.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

And this very first proposed amendment to your Omnibus is a clear signal that these were well thought out. You had one individual from a fire department come here and say this is a bad thing for the County, and he has no idea whether the money is needed or not, he doesn't even work for the County. And you're saying, *You know what? You're right, we've got to take that out of there.*

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Correct, he doesn't work for the County.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

So how can he have any clue whether or not that 10% -- as you're saying they've got to go sharpen their pencils, how would he know that 10% is needed or not if he doesn't even work for the County, has no -- no idea the details of that project.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Actually --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Only the people who work in those departments do. And yet now we're being told he's right, we can't afford to take then 10% out of there, we want to remove that from our Omnibus.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Actually, we can afford to.

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

Let me -- thank you. Let me start by thanking Legislator Calarco for putting together a list of eight million or so reductions and what the Working Group had done. I know that took a lot of work and you carefully evaluated these projects to see what you needed to move forward, where reductions could be made; that is real budgeting.

To just simply say we're going to assume that we can do all these projects for 10% less isn't based on anything. And, you know, having been with -- as the Chair of the Public Works Committee for many years, working closely with the Department of Public Works, you know, I'm a little bit familiar with the process and I think they do a really remarkable job in trying to estimate the cost of these projects fairly. They're not looking to pad it. If things, when they go out to bid and it's a competitive process, sometimes they come in under budget, that's great; you know, maybe we will save 10%. But if you budget it at less than 10% and it comes in then over, and I find that they've really been very good at estimating the cost, then you're going to have to find offsets or then you can't do the project. So we're back to right where we started and we're not going to be able to find the offsets to do that. So what you're saying I think is very true, is these projects won't actually move forward.

You know, if I were getting heart bypass surgery and I said to the surgeon, *You know, do 10% less surgery*, I mean I don't know what valve they're not going to connect; I'm certainly not going to be comfortable with it.

So you can't just kind of make up and say we're going to do the exact same project for 10% less, but I think you might be saying is shorten -- shrink the project by 10%, but then you'd have to say how -- what would that entail. So whatever the project, if it's a road infrastructure project, these guys know the -- you know, they do all the calculations, the storm drains, the pavement thickness,

they have so many different regulations to work within, so much review at different levels of government and different agencies, you know, they've been pretty much right on target with these cost estimates.

So to say do it for 10% less is basically saying do a different project and, you know, I don't know how they would do that.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator McCaffrey.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Thank you. I don't know where to begin. Let me start with the disingenuous 10% cuts. I think it was last year in our Operating Budget it was approved and adopted, the County Executive said, *Cut 10%. I don't care where it's coming from or how you do it, everybody cuts 10%.* That was the sledgehammer, I believe, and that's what was done. Okay? You know, difficult times call for difficult decisions and I think, you know, that was one of them and I think we need to make some more.

The most difficult decisions that we made was -- well, let me go back to the Working Group because I kind of took offense to that. Yeah, I sat here. I sat here and I thought that along the way we we're going to saving money. And on the last day when we added \$10 million to an inflated already Capital Budget, we said enough is enough. And every one of us got together and said, you know what -- on our caucus and said over the weekend, we've got to come back with \$10 million worth of savings, and we went through several different ways to do it and we looked at these things and said, *Well, what do we cut out? Well, let's not touch anything to do with water quality, don't touch anything that has to do with the sewers and let's move on some of these other projects.* And if you look at this 10% list, more than half of these are round numbers; a million dollars, 500,000, \$750,000. Those are not with a scalpel drawn up with a calculator and a spreadsheet to say this is what the number comes up to; those are round numbers which we all believe that could be cut back, and that's one of the reasons we did it.

The most difficult cuts we said we had to put on here were the ones that could possibly effect public safety. Okay? And we said, *Well, you know, if we're going to do it, we're going to stand up and do it and take the heat for it.* And it was one of the last things we wanted to do. Came back with an amendment to this budget just before that saved the amount of money that we were looking to save, brought it back down to zero, so that's why we're coming back and saying that's the reason we propose putting back these public safety issues back in here, these items without a 10% reduction, because the savings that we've been hoping to be realized were realized through the proposal which we all voted for, okay. So that's why we did it. It's no other reason other than to say, hey, we just changed our mind and willy-nilly. We had real concerns about get cutting public safety, but we're willing to stand up and say we need to do it across the board and do it. But now that they were saved, we don't have to do it, and that's why we're doing it, not for any other reason.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Oh, I'm sorry, Legislator Lindsay.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

You know, just to respond to Legislator McCaffrey. And in all fairness, to give him an opportunity to then go through this, because I think we've heard conflicting variations on how these figures were arised. One, it was just 10% across the board; another, that it was thought out and that we picked and chose which project. But, you know, if you just take your line item number one, 1132, Equipment for Medical, Legal Investigation and Forensic Sciences, it's not a round number, it's \$427,000, but your proposal is to do it for \$42,700 less. You know, what was the thought process in that line item, just as an example, and how do you think they'll be able to come up with that? And

I'll give you a chance to respond to that, Legislator McCaffrey.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Well, all I can tell you is we looked at all these things -- and maybe that's what it costs. Maybe it's really what it costs. I mean, where do we come up with this number; did we competitive bid it already, or is that the list price?

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

We came up with it from the medical investigate -- Medical Examiner's Office gave us that figure, and I don't have any information to dispute it; if you guys do, that would be helpful.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Bill, I don't have all the details on that one.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Okay. The other one that jumps out at me and is probably the most frightening is your line item No. 10, 1760, Elevators, Controls and Safety Upgrades. I'd like to know which elevator we're going to stop maintaining so I could stop riding in that one, because --

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

I could tell you, it's the fourth one all the way down.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Okay, good. I'll stay away from that one.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

I can tell you, that's the one that needs it. But that's a round number, that's \$500,000 there.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Okay.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Okay? And we're talking about cutting \$50,000 from that.

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

It's got to go to one less floor, Bill, so.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Gotcha; probably the 12th, I'm sure. But using that, again, as an example, if we had to budget for that, we go out to bid and it does come in as was originally intended, so we did it for 450,000 as you guys are proposing and then it came in at half-a-million, now we can't maintain or upgrade the elevators or maintain the safety on them. You've got to go back out to bid and you've got to go back to the Capital Budget Project.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

When was the last time we fixed those elevators? A very long time ago. And all of a sudden we come up with a round number of \$500,000, it's got to be \$500,000. I bet you it could be \$450,000 and we won't miss a beat.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I'm not an elevator mechanic, nor would I ever pretend to have that expertise. I have to -- I think to not trust the departments with their recommendations and what they're saying, then we have the

wrong people in those departments and why do we even go through this process? Why don't we just -- instead of waiting for them to come over, why don't we just make up the numbers that we want? I mean, that's, in essence, what you guys are doing here.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Do you believe that every one of these numbers cannot be -- we have a million dollars in rehab of parking lots, sidewalks, driveways and curves. Okay? Does that mean it's going to cost exactly \$1 million?

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

No, it's not.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Is it going to cost \$750,000

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

But when it comes time to appropriate it, we appropriate it and we vote on it here what to pick. You guys are eliminating the option for us to vote on it if it doesn't, if it comes in at your proposed amount. You know, as Legislator Trotta said earlier, we're just putting it in the budget, it doesn't mean we're going to do it.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

I have no idea what the scope of the work is for the -- for the elevator repairs, no idea. So maybe it's got to be less than when what it is. Maybe --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

But Legislator McCaffrey, with all due respect, because you don't know that, what gives you the right, then, to cut it by 10% if you don't even know what the project is?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

I believe, in all sincerity, and I think not only I do, but I think the taxpayers believe we could get away with 10% less than what we're spending.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Wait a minute. But I speak for taxpayers too, so that's -- you don't have, you know, a monopoly on that. And I think the taxpayers expect us to be responsible in spending their funds. So, you know, there's a big -- and I know you believe that, too. You know, I don't want to -- make this into something that it's not, but, you know, I think these are legitimate questions. I want to consider your proposed bill, but I need to know what's the thinking and the reason and the rationale behind it and I don't think we should go beyond that.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

So we're accepting that everything that every department proposes to us, the million dollars in curb replacement, that it can't be \$900,000. That any of these things that are proposed at 10% less, okay, have got -- cannot be reduced because, no matter what -- listen, Gil Anderson, he's a smart man, he's an engineer, you know, I just trust his judgment, but it doesn't mean that he couldn't probably get away, when you went to him -- just before, I think we took 10% out of one of the line items that he had proposed. What changed before then to now?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

The point is that the numbers that the departments are giving to us are thought out based on their expertise and experience. If you want to make cuts to them, that's fine, but you need to have a reason for making the cut.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Okay. Then just to -- probably not less than 20 minutes ago we took out 10%, which was proposed by Legislator Calarco on that strengthen and improving County roads, which is proposed by DPW at \$6 million, and everybody here agreed to take out 10% of that. So what changed from the time that this --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

And I had a conversation with the Commissioner --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I'd be happy to defer to Legislator Calarco to explain.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

And I had a conversation with the Commissioner and he agreed that that was a line that had more funds than they were necessarily going to be able to get to, that they understood that they needed to be able to prioritize and that was a budget amendment that they agreed to. So it wasn't just done with a hatchet to say, *I think you guys could do it for less*. To sit here and say we can do things for less and you could do the elevators for 10% less without having any thought into why it could be done for 10% less. What if the project comes in at 475,000? They got it for a little less than the 500 but it's not down to the number you proposed, so now we have an elevator that can't get fixed.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Do you think we can get 10% less for the million dollars on the curbs and sidewalks; do you think that's possible? Do you think maybe the other 100,000 could go into 2017 or 2018?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

But if I could respond to that. You know, again, you're doing that in a vacuum. The department may feel they need \$3 million for curbs and sidewalks, but they cut it to one because they're trying to balance being, you know, fiscally responsible given the economic times. And I'm not saying that's the case, what I'm saying is that it's incumbent for you to find out what is appropriate to cut and what's the rational basis to do so. That's my point.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

I believe based on what we've seen and the way we've been spending money here, we think it was a rational decision to propose those cuts.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right, so we are -- I don't even know where we are now, right?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Opposed.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

We have not voted on any of our amendments.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Right, okay (*laughter*).

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Were they amending any of their amendments?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So what was your first amendment there, Mr. Cilmi?

**MR. NOLAN:**

3060.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

3060?

**MR. NOLAN:**

3060, just eliminating --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Hang on, I've got to put the glasses back on. 3060.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Got it, Robert? Okay. All right, there's a motion and a second to amend Budget Amendment No. 2, and this is your only --

**MR. NOLAN:**

By removing 3060.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

By removing 3060.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Correct.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Opposed.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. Next --

**MR. LAUBE:**

*Sixteen (Opposed: Legislator Trotta - Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**LEG. CILMI:**

Next I'd like to make a motion to remove 3244 from the list.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On this one, I would like to know, what's -- let's get a second on this.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator McCaffrey. What's the reasoning behind this? Because you say that public safety wasn't affected; this is an upgrade to the communication system, which I think affects my

district.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

We're taking out our 10% cut.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Oh, I know, but originally you proposed it.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Well, but the Working Group, just in half an hour or an hour ago, reduced the Budget Amendment No. 1, or reduced the additions to the budget that were included in Budget Amendment No. 1 by \$8 million.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And we explained every one of them.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Right.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Well, that's what I'm -- but the fact -- that fact that we all reduced Budget Amendment No. 1 --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I wasn't on the Working Group, so.

**LEG. CILMI:**

No, no. The fact that we all reduced Budget Amendment No. 1 by \$8 million gives us some room to put some of these things back in.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Oh, so your argument is we can threaten public safety as long as the budget numbers come in line?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

No, I think -- I said before, I said those are the most difficult cuts that we had to make. And then --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

But what was the reasoning behind it?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

We explained that. We said every one of these is -- instead of just saying, *We can take this out, take that out*, these are all -- all these projects had merit, every one of them had merit.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

This is particularly interesting because if I stand correct -- and maybe, Robert, you can correct me -- this is to expand the communication system because areas like Amityville Village, which I live in, they don't have -- they don't have the capability to reach the communication, so some areas are dead spots.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

We already approved --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So that's a direct threat to public safety.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

We already approved last year I think \$10 million or 20 million to start that process already.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

And this is part of that process.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Right. So maybe we can kick it back -- just like you did in the other cuts, was to move it back a year. So we're saying maybe you can take 10% less and move it into the next year, that's all we're saying.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

But my point is a million -- originally I think it was --

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

And by the way, there's no guarantees those radios are going to work any better in Amityville.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

They're not going to work -- as a matter of fact, they said they're not going to work any better. So that philosophy is gone, they will not -- I asked them that question.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So then get rid of the whole thing then.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

We are here. I think what's on -- you're the Presiding Officer, but what I believe we're voting on is restoring those cuts.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I know, I'm just trying to find the reasoning on why you wanted to cut communications for my community, because I live on the southern part of Amityville.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

That doesn't work because it's not true.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Well --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Don't make it about that, DuWayne.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

My understanding is it's directly for Amityville Village, for Port Jeff -- for areas of Port Jeff Station, and I think parts of Jay's district on the South Fork, specifically.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

It will not -- the testimony there, even though I voted for the \$10 million to budget -- to bond, it would not change that.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Honestly, since then I've talked to Motorola and there's a new system coming out that's better than this.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I know, you've got a guy. You always got a guy, right? You've got a guy next to a guy who's going to save us a million dollars, you know.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

But when someone -- but when someone needs help.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No, wait a minute, wait a minute. He found him on the Internet, though.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Right, right.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Coming from the Town of Smithtown --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

When someone needs help, they call 911, you know, they should have some type of response, they should have the security that's going to be some type of response.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Well, coming from Smithtown with \$11 million of total debt --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So I can tell my constituents that --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

-- maybe you should listen to me.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

-- well, my colleague in Kings Park who has the reception, you guys don't -- he said it's okay.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I have no reception where I live. The radios don't work where I live.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Well, apparently they said that that's not an issue because you're not not on this list, as far as I understand.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

So are you arguing to go keep that 10% cut in?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

No, I'm arguing why was it a cut anyway?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

I think we already explained that; we said it was a very difficult decision --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

No, what you're saying is you're explaining the reason why you're removing it, you're not explaining

why you put it in there in the first place.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

We did and I went over that and they said why we thought it was very difficult, the last thing we wanted to do, it was a very heavy heart that we did that. But when we got the savings that we needed, these are the first things that we'd like to put back in there and we're proposing that. So, I mean, there's a motion --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Let's vote on the amendment.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Anker has a question.

**LEG. ANKER:**

So just a quick question. I wasn't part of the Working Group, but I did, you know, hear about some of the cuts. When did you submit your 49 cuts from the budget, when during the Working Group?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

It was that -- it was Monday -- Monday after -- what was the day, after Labor Day? No, it's wasn't Labor Day. It was --

**LEG. ANKER:**

So it's Tuesday --

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

I forget what day it was.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Tuesday.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

So Tuesday, and then at that point it was the end of the Working Group session. We had just added \$9 million in that session and the Presiding Officer asked, *Are there any other amendments you'd like to see*, and I said, *Yeah, I have one*, and that's what I proposed.

**LEG. ANKER:**

So it was ready to go, it was printed out, you handed it out. You couldn't have done that at the beginning of that working session group? If that was the last day, could you have presented it at least before, cause then you could have discussed the cuts and all this, what you're hearing right now, wouldn't have to happen. There would have been open communication and transparent government, and I think a lot, you know, more productive work would have been done.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

If I may.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

I think we said we -- if I could respond. All I said is that we had put in -- there was \$10 million on that last day and that was on a Friday and that was it, and my caucus got together and said we're meeting in the morning, at 8:30 in the morning before the meeting, the next Working Group, and we're going to say everyone come up with changes to save that \$10 million.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Okay, so you met before the Working Group. You have these -- this \$10 million, 49 projects cut. Couldn't you have printed out this -- the sheet, the two sheets of paper with the cuts and said, *Here Working Group, here everybody that's at the Working Group, we have these cuts, let's talk about it.*

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

We did.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

We did, and we got called disingenuous.

**LEG. ANKER:**

No, before.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

No, you didn't. I had asked --

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

We did when we proposed it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

The last thing I asked was is it -- because there were several people that had amendments or proposals to be recommended by the Working Group. I said, *Is there anyone else that has any amendments that you want to address before the Working Group?* You said -- I don't even think it was on the mic, but you said, *Yes, we have some but we don't want to discuss them.* And I said, *Why don't you want to discuss them,* you just shook your head.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

No, I said, *We have them,* I actually gave copies out that day.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yeah, but you said you didn't want to discuss them.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

No, I didn't say I didn't want to discuss them. These are the --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Then you actually -- you know, you didn't --

**LEG. CALARCO:n**

Go back to the tape. We did this publicly

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay, so let's discuss them now.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

We were in a very public forum there. There was no doubt that you said that you were bringing this Omnibus forward, it was a Republican proposal, and that you had no intention of discussing any of those -- any of those proposals at the Working Group. I would have sat there all night long; I would have sat there until the moment my wife called and said it was time for the baby. We would have -- we would have worked through until we got the work done, that's what we do.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

We didn't even go till six o'clock. I didn't say I wouldn't discuss it. We didn't even go till six o'clock,

we broke at 5:30.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Because you said you didn't need to go any further.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, all right. All right, Legislator Cilmi, you have a motion and a second --

**LEG. CILMI:**

I think so.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

-- on -- what was it, 3244.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

DuWayne?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All in favor? Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Kate. Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I'm not going to rant, okay? No, I hate to do this, and I know that we haven't asked any commissioners. I know this is something that I have advocated for for the past couple of years, and there's been many discussions. Mike Postel is here. And, again, this is a project that for two years there's been negotiations, the cost was much higher. I really would love to let Mike come up to see -- ask him what a 10% cut would do, because I know they've negotiated for the past two years to make this supportable.

The other thing is that, you know, I'm -- we've had Motorola, we've had Motorola in those meetings, we've discussed with Motorola, so I really would like to see what Mike's got to say about a 10% cut and what this would do.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Kate, we're taking it out.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

We're putting the money back in.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

That's not the point, I just want to see that it's important.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

And actually, I think this is a Federal mandate --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes, it is; right, Mike?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

-- coming after the 9/11. Mr. Postel?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

It's more just -- if you could explain what the past two years have been like negotiating this and the Federal mandate, what it's about.

**MR. POSTEL:**

So we started this project in 2013 to figure out what we were going to do to upgrade our system because of its age and the fact of not having specific support with regard to parts as well as technical support. When we originally started the 2014/2016 Capital Program, this project was originally funded starting this year for \$10,820,000, and in subsequent years \$18,097,000, for a total of just under 29 million. Through our efforts and negotiations and through processes that we went through, we were able to get the project down to 21.9.

Now, this project will enhance our capabilities in the County, it will replace a 20 plus year-old communication system which provides public safety communications for not only part of the County agencies, but we also partner with some of our local municipalities to provide their local public safety, the park rangers, etcetera, in numerous towns, this communication.

We -- in the meantime, we've also secured additional spectrum to expand this communication system, which is part of this project as well. Because in the Middle Class Tax Relief Act of 2012, which is Public Law 112-96 from the Federal government, established on February 22nd of 2012, a reallocated spectrum to public safety because they're going to be removing spectrum which agencies in this County operate on, not County agencies but public safety agencies. And our partners at Fire Rescue who provide services for these agencies, we need a place for them to go when this happens in 2022. We cannot just build-out a system overnight, it takes time to engineer it, it takes time to build it, it takes time to get the funding for it. So we secured frequencies. We have five years to build those frequencies out. It's not like we secured the frequencies four years ago, we just secured the frequencies last year based on the Capital Project because we don't want it to sit too long, otherwise the FCC will remove the allocation from us. And frequencies are coveted across the country at this point in time because they're becoming very limited because everybody wants to do everything wirelessly.

So removing approximately a million dollars from this project would basically equate simplistically, without getting very technical, to building a building and leaving out a wall, is pretty much what it comes down to. We would have to stop the project and move forward and figure out how we could reengineer it based on what we've already set with regard to how the funding was set to go. Realizing that we are not approved for the \$10 million for next year -- it's in the project and we're hoping that the Legislative body approves that money -- we negotiated the plan based on the entire amount of money.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right, thank you. I see Legislator Trotta has a question.

**MR. POSTEL:**

Yes, Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

What was the original cost you said?

**MR. POSTEL:**

The original budgeted amount was a little under \$29 million; we're down to 21.9.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

All right, so you got them down about 27%.

**MR. POSTEL:**

Yes, sir.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Okay. That is a classic example of what we're talking about.  
The classic --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

But you're for doing that.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

No, they're doing it for 21.

**MR. POSTEL:**

We worked very diligently --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Okay.

**MR. POSTEL:**

-- to try and make that happen.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Exactly.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Good for you. That's what we expect.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

That's exactly what we're saying.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yeah, but under your logic he can get it down another 30%. So why don't you go back to them and tell them, *We're only going to give you 70% of the funding*, and see what they'll come back with.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Well, there's also -- no, we're not talking -- we're talking about taking away 5% of the funding, so 29 plus --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Ten percent, ten percent.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

No, no, it's only 5% because it's a \$20 million deal and we're only taking a million out of this one, so it's less than 5%. So now what you've just -- you've just made our point.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No, he hasn't.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So now the County Executive can stand up and say "*10% from everything*" and no one says a word, but the Republicans stay here and say, *Well, listen, we think you should do this*, and now all of a

sudden we're the bad -- we're crazy, we're irresponsible. You just proved our point that you went down 30%, and you get Gil Anderson in here and I'll tell you, I guarantee you they build that Beach Hut, they design it for 200,000 rather than 300,000. Government isn't competent and it's time they're held responsible for it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I don't agree, Legislator Trotta. A couple of times I've heard about when the County Executive goes back and says *cut 10%*, but the County Executive is going back to the experts in the department that are responsible for the day-to-day operations and procurement and they understand how their departments operate and they make responsible, or as responsible as they can be under that directive to make those cuts, and they're thought out and they're explained. Here, I don't --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I'm expecting nothing less.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Here -- and I wouldn't either, I agree. Here these cuts are just across the board and not being explained. I don't understand -- and by the way, getting that -- getting that project cost down that this gentleman is referring to is not making your point, it's making my point.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

No, it's not.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Oh, I'm sorry, sir, but it's making my point because the point is that they're in the position to go and negotiate and make the cut properly and appropriately without damaging the project. You're not, but you're taking out a million dollars that's going to probably kill the project.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

It's certainly not going to kill the project.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, you know, again, *certainly, I guarantee you*, you know, you have all of these platitudes but you're not giving us any rational explanation or how you're going to do the project for \$11 million.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

He just proved to us, they came down 30%.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

He did not -- he thought about it.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

You're budgeting stuff that's not even being bid on and now you're going to do it.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I'm sorry; he thought about those cuts and knows where to make them, you do not.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Is coverage guaranteed in these other towns, like Amityville, Fort Salonga, Port Jeffereson? I mean, I think you're the guy who told me that it doesn't -- it's not going -- you can't guarantee it.

**MR. POSTEL:**

The coverage is based on a 95% in-street portable radio coverage and 97% in-street mobile radio coverage. That is what we have at this point in time. We want to try and maintain that as an officer safety and public safety issue for everyone. But, I can tell you that if we throw enough RF in this room where a radio works currently right now, that we will stop the radio from working if you put enough RF in here.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. There's -- is there a motion and a second?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yep.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Which line? I'm sorry, that was 3024?

**LEG. CILMI:**

3244.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Thank you, Mike.

**MR. LAUBE:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**LEG. CILMI:**

Next one, 3405. Remove 3405 from Budget Amendment No. 2, which means we're adding back \$100,000 in serial bonds for 2016. That's a motion, Kevin.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

I'm sorry.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

I was talking to my colleague over here.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Kevin, you missed a que.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

That's a second.

**LEG. CILMI:**

We really have been debating, in many ways, the entire bill at this point. So let's just get through these amendments to the amendment and then we can debate, if we wish to continuing debating the entire, but we can do it at that point.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. CILMI:**

If you don't mind.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. So we have a motion, a second.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

3405. On the motion, Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Tom, I'm sorry, 3405 was it?

**LEG. CILMI:**

3405, yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. So by deleting this you're increasing debt authorization.

**LEG. CILMI:**

We're adding back -- from our reductions, we're adding back \$100,000.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

To what the County Executive did.

**LEG. CILMI:**

In other words, we're --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right, so you've changed your mind, in effect, and you want to increase the debt authorization in the final bill.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes. Yes, thanks to -- thanks to the last-minute, unexpected changes that apparently the Working Group made at eight o'clock this morning, or whenever it was they made them.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No, no, those last-minute changes I was a part of, I was not on the Working Group.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Oh, so you were a part of those changes. I understood that --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No, no, no, no, no.

**LEG. CILMI:**

-- before that it was just the Working Group that made the changes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No, no, no, not at all. Of course I was a part of those changes --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Oh, okay.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

-- because I have a right to review the bill and put my two cents in also.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

All right?

**LEG. CILMI:**

So, yeah, based on those changes --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So based on those changes, you want to undo some of that now and increase debt authorization.

**LEG. CILMI:**

We want to undo some of our reductions and put them back in based on those changes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. Yep, I gotcha.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

But I've got to ask the why; I've got to ask the why? If this is --

**LEG. CILMI:**

We've already explained why, Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

This project was 10% willing to go and now that 10% doesn't need to come off of this one?

**LEG. CILMI:**

We've already explained why, Legislator Calarco. I don't think we need to explain any longer.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Well, I want to understand why the concept of the 10% off this particular project in the first place.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I'm sorry?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I want to know why we thought 10% of this project was good in the first place --

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Maybe we can have the stenographer read back what we said before.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Legislator D'Amaro again said that we shouldn't do it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Come on, one at a time.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. I understand where we're going with this.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Poor Alison (*laughter*). All right.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Maybe we can get the stenographer to read back what we said before.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, I can tell you why, because Legislator Trotta guarantees it can be done for 10% less.

**LEG. CILMI:**

You know, the sarcasm is really -- it's really a little bit annoying, from various members of this body.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, if it's directed to me, it's not sarcasm, sir. You know what? It's my opinion, it's how I feel.

**LEG. CILMI:**

It may not come from you, Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay.

**LEG. CILMI:**

But --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay, because you're not going to stop me from speaking my mind.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I don't expect you.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

You know, if you want to go ahead and explain your cuts rationally, I'd be happy to sit here and not say another word, but you're not doing that.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I don't want you to stop speaking your mind, but there's a sarcastic tone that goes on around here sometimes that is not appreciated, and this body is above that.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. So we have a motion and second on 3405. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Opposed.

**MR. LAUBE:**

*Fifteen (Opposed: Legislator Trotta - Not Present: Legislator Hahn - Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**LEG. CILMI:**

Next motion is to eliminate 3416, Fire Rescue CAD System from the reductions proposed in Budget Amendment No. 2.

**MR. NOLAN:**

You have a second?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Second, sorry.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, motion and a second on 3416. Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

*Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**LEG. CILMI:**

And lastly, motion to remove 3418, Fire Rescue Main Building renovations and improvements from the reductions proposed in Budget Amendment No. 2.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, motion by Legislator Cilmi, second by Legislator McCaffrey on 3418. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Opposed.

**MR. LAUBE:**

*Sixteen (Opposed: Legislator Trotta - Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

And we -- there's one more additional one and that is to remove 5014 from our proposal because it was already --

**LEG. CILMI:**

No, we decided that we didn't have to do that because we're going in the same direction.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right. But if I may, did you also want to remove 1710 from your bill?

**LEG. CILMI:**

No.

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

You want to make a motion to approve as amended?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yeah, so motion to approve Budget Amendment No. 2 as amended.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Cilmi to approve as amended.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator McCaffrey.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion, Legislator Lindsay.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I guess to the sponsors. There's two bills on here that I think are contrary to some of the arguments that are being made right now. 5739, Pavement Management Rehab at Gabreski Airport; if one of you can let me know how you came up with that figure.

I mean, contrary to what you said earlier, that although these were round numbers, that's a pretty exact number, five million and \$5.00 -- 420 -- five million, five thousand four hundred and twenty-five dollars. This is also 90% funded by the FAA and 5% funded by the DOT, so this is only 5% funded by the County to Gabreski Airport. If you guys can explain that one, and also maybe further explain what what said earlier, that you're no longer interested in taking any Federal or State money to do some of these projects.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

I'm not sure what you mean we weren't interested in taking --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I think somebody made a statement before, it might have been Legislator Cilmi, that it's all taxpayer money, that we shouldn't take it either way, or maybe Legislator Trotta; forgive me.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yeah, that sounds like something he would say.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Okay.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

Okay. But if you could walk me through that one, Legislator McCaffrey.

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

Was that sarcastic?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

*(Laughter)*. No, I sit next to him, I can say that. No, we were just going -- this was -- there's a lot

of money, it's \$5 million and we thought that it could be reduced by that \$500,000 and that's our position.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Okay. But, I mean, that's sounds like a pretty exact figure, that somebody actually --

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

It's not, just accept his answer.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Okay. All right, I guess I'll accept that.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Say that on the record, Jay.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

5658, Purchase of Public Transit Vehicles. Again, this was 8,190,000, and you guys want to cut that by 10%. That is also funded -- excuse me while I flip through my pages here...bear with me. 8190? I'm sorry, 5658, Purchase of Public Transit Vehicles, it's 8.19 million. This was funded by a State grant and a Federal grant, these are vehicles for disabled veterans. Sorry, found it. It's 80% Federal funded, 10% State funded. Again, the logic on this was that you guys feel we can get it for 10% less; is that correct?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yeah, that's correct.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I think it's pretty -- this isn't like a building project. It's pretty safe to make an estimate of what it cost to buy these vehicles, we replace them all the time.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

*(Inaudible)*

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yeah, as Legislator Calarco is whispering in my ear there, it's probably already a pre-approved list with a pre-approved vendor that's already been negotiated. How do you justify the 10% reduction there?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

I think I already did, it's 10%. We want to spend 10% less on that project.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Does that mean we buy less vehicles or that means that we just tell them this is what we're willing to pay?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

It may be, or maybe they'll give it to us for 10% less if we tell them that's all the money we have, just like the radios.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

So then 10% or maybe the Disabled Veterans, we don't give them rides anymore; is that the other alternative?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

No, no. I think we could -- we could always find a way to give rides to disabled veterans.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Okay. But not evidenced by what you guys are trying to do here in reducing it by 10%.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

No, that would be the first 10% that we would fund.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I'm trying to understand that can accounting principle, but I don't know if that meets GAAP standards, but okay. All right, I'll yield, that was the two that I just thought were most obvious.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right, Legislator Schneiderman.

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

Dr. Lipp, I don't know if you've had a chance to do this, but we have now an amended budget amendment. A whole bunch of things have been deleted from it, before with the Omni we had amended it as well and you were able to do some calculations. I don't know, were you able to do -- do we know the net result if this budget amendment passes?

**MR. LIPP:**

Yes.

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

Okay. Could you go over that briefly?

**MR. LIPP:**

So it would reduce bond money by a little over 4.9 million and it would reduce Federal aid by a little over 2.5 million, and it would reduce State aid by seven -- a little less than 725,000. So the overall reduction for all of those sources would be 8.175 million.

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

Okay. Does that include the elimination of the Connect Long Island money and the Start-Up New York money?

**MR. LIPP:**

Those are standalones, they're separate.

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

Oh, those are standalones, okay. So this 10% reduction program, what's left of it, is roughly \$5 million in County General Fund obligation?

**MR. LIPP:**

Well, B money is a reduction of 4.9 million.

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

Four point nine million, okay.

**MR. LIPP:**

Reduction.

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

Okay. So then we'd end up with something that's even less than the -- well, the Omni left everything for '16 where the County Executive had it; correct?

**MR. LIPP:**

The zero change in the --

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

But this would become a negative now of --

**MR. LIPP:**

Correct.

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

-- \$5 million.

**MR. LIPP:**

A reduction of 4.9 million --

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

Four point nine million.

**MR. LIPP:**

-- in B money or bonds.

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

Okay. But we just -- and it is, I guess, as a matter of policy, but we don't know if this 10% reduction of these remaining projects will kill those projects or not. Okay.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Thank you. I wanted to go through a few of these other projects because it just, especially when I'm looking around the room and the different entities who have shown up here this morning with interest in this Capital Budget, they probably wouldn't be here otherwise.

We have several projects that effect the Community college; renovations to Kreiling Hall, our plant operations building, a warehouse building, infrastructure building. You know, the renovations to Kreiling Hall alone, you're proposing cutting the construction cost by \$300,000, and this is a project that would -- that is 50% State aid, which means that we're only saving 154 through the County General Fund by doing that reduction. But this is a project that we've already appropriated the planning money, it's already been designed, the building's ready to be built. Some of these I think we even -- one of these I think we even already broke ground in some ways, and these are projects that are just going to die. They're literally can't -- you know, are we going to sit here and say that they were so woefully inadequate in their ability to estimate the cost of the building that they're

going to be off by \$300,000? I mean, that's not even remotely -- I'd like to know how did you come up with a \$300,000 reduction in Kreiling Hall? I mean, this is --

**LEG. CILMI:**

I mean, Legislator Calarco, I think --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Did we think that this building, they had no clue what they were talking about when they went out and got their estimates on the cost of this building?

**LEG. CILMI:**

No. I think what we were saying is find a way to do it for \$300,000 less.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. So you really haven't --

**LEG. CILMI:**

I have two dollar bills in my wallet right now. If somebody said to me it's going to cost you \$4 for a candy bar, I have to tell them I can't afford it.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yeah. Well, and that's it, and that's what we're saying. So we should have said to the college, *We can't afford to build that building.*

**LEG. CILMI:**

No, we're saying build it for less.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Oh, so budgeting is about setting priorities.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

You can't just say, *Oh, we'll, do it for less.* The building costs what the building costs, we already decided that.

**LEG. CILMI:**

We setting certain priorities within a budget and we're saying do it for less.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Rob --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Another one here; renovations at the Yaphank Correctional Facility.

I see that Chief Sharkey's here in the building, I'm sure he's here because he has concerns about these projects. Renovations to the Yaphank Correctional Facility, we want to cut that.

Improvements to the County Correctional Facility in Riverhead, we want to cut this; these are ongoing projects that we have to do to maintain these buildings so that we do not lose our --

**LEG. CILMI:**

We want them to do it for less.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

-- certification to house those inmates and have to send them out of state. Or maybe we do this and instead we have the State tell us, *You know what? You guys are showing that you can't be responsible. You've got to build that jail. That jail we just gave you relief from, now you've got to build that jail because you can't even put enough money into your budget to maintain the facilities that you have. We have no faith in your ability to maintain these buildings, we're going to make sure that you -- we're going to tell you to build a brand new facility.* Is that the direction we want to move in? Do you think that the department -- the Sheriff's Office has no idea what it costs to maintain those buildings and that we're just -- have you ever been to the Riverhead jail, I mean, come on.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes, I have.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Have you toured that building? It's not exactly like, you know, the most luxurious place.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And whatever the proposed changes are, we want them to do them for less.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

How did you come up with that less? How did you come up with that decision that they should be able to do that project for less --

**LEG. CILMI:**

We agreed that the project was --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

-- if they didn't know what they were doing in that budget?

**LEG. CILMI:**

We agreed that the project was important and we believe that 10% is not excessive, to ask them to do the project for 10% less.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

But based on what decision? Based on what -- based on what analysis?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Based on our priority.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Three hundred thousand dollars for a beach (*laughter*).

**LEG. CALARCO:**

The Beach Hut is not in here, Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

It's indicative of what we --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

You know, that's the thing, we always get the chance to debate these when they come to us for the actual appropriation about whether or not that appropriation is an adequate or appropriate appropriation, but this is not doing that. It's not taking those things into consideration, it's just saying we think that we can do it for less, or we think that the Federal money -- and to sit here and say we shouldn't take the Federal money, you know, the Long Island Index just did a study not too long ago that showed how much money this County sends to Albany and sends to Washington D.C. and how much we get back; we don't get a pittance back. You know where our money goes? It goes Upstate, New York. It goes down to Mississippi, it goes all over the place then back to here. And we're going to say, *You know what, we don't want to take a little bit back when we can get it?* No way, I want to take every dime I could get back from them.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Does the Long Island Index show how many companies are moving off Long Island each and every single day? We need to make changes --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yeah, because we let all our tax dollars go to Charlotte instead of keeping them here.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

To force people to do things that are not --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

One at a time, one at a time. All right.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

They know now.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Okay. I'm going to circle back to Suffolk Community College. You know, I have -- I've been to many events with a lot of the Legislators here and we talk about how we're investing our -- our dollars. And, again, we have 2114, 2144, 2145, 2149, you know, all being reduced.

So my question, and I'll swing it over to Rob, Rob Lipp; by cutting this 10% all of a sudden, will this put these Federal dollars at risk? And I think this a point that Rob Calarco was making, is that if we're going to just take an axe and cut without really investigating and looking into the consequences of these cuts, will we lose those Federal and State dollars?

**MR. LIPP:**

It's hard to say, you know, how they -- how the Federal government would react to something like that. I mean, at the end of the day, if it's clear that the 10% shouldn't have been taken out, they could always come across with an offset. Or if there is sufficient Federal aid that's 50% or more -- or State aid, for that matter -- they could authorize a resolution without -- you could authorize a resolution without an offset if you're also adding the Federal and State aid that's at least 50%.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Right. But from what I understand with grants is when you start playing around with the numbers, you know, again, I'm working with Rails-to-Trails, I'm working with some other Capital Projects, the State and Federal government tend to find concerns when those numbers keep changing. And again, this is -- I see a lot -- some of these projects, particularly at Suffolk Community College, as

an investment. And I just -- I find it disturbing that, you know, within a five-minute period left of the Working Group, this decision was made or was put forth, so. But again, my concern is Federal dollars are at risk for these important investments with the Community College.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Why don't we just go through them one by one? If we started this an hour ago we would have been done. You go through them one by one and vote on each one like we did the other -- we have to vote on them individually; don't we, George?

**MR. NOLAN:**

We've already done that.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

We've done that.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

One by --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

The amendment -- budget amendment.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Amendment No. 2.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yeah, we did it.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Because we seem to be going through them one by one at a random pattern.

**MR. NOLAN:**

No, I think people are critiquing on a one-by-one basis, but we're going to be considering Budget Amendment 2 as amended and we're still debating it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay, thank you. Well, just thank you, not okay. Well, I want to -- first of all, I agree with Legislator Anker. I mean, the cuts to the college projects, which have been ongoing for quite some time, I mean, I know they've been paired down, they've been estimated. You know, you might as well just go to the college and tell them we're killing these four projects or three projects because that's, in effect, what you're doing. And to just say, *Well, because we think we want you to do it for less*, it's already being done for less. I mean, you really need to have a dialogue with the folks that are in the know, and you can't legislate and take out 10% of these projects on a hope and a prayer that they'll still go forward. I just don't think that's appropriate.

I also wanted to ask, there's a project line 5014, Strengthening and Improving County Roads, which is also proposed to be cut 10%, and I just wanted to know what particular County Roads would not get done with a 10% cut?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

That was your proposal to cut that and you voted for that.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, I want to know, what roads -- it's in your bill, though.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

No, no, we took it out. You -- it was in your amendment before we voted on it, you proposed it on -- in the amendments to No. 1, and you voted for it.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right, but I explained why we --

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

But you voted for a 10% reduction.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right, I want to know --

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

I don't know, you tell me. You voted for it.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

You're also presenting strengthening and improving County roads, you want to reduce funding by 10%.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Lou, that was an amendment that Legislator Calarco proposed to Budget Amendment No. 1 and that was to reduce that line item of \$6 million by 10%.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right, and I understand why I voted for it in our bill. I want to know what was your rationale for doing it.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Because for the same reason that everyone else finally (*inaudible*) with it, that I thought it could be done for less.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. Well, I didn't do it based on what I thought, I did it based on consultation with the department. Okay. Yeah.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

It was based more on priority. And again, you know, I stand behind my vote because it was more than a hope and a prayer that it could be done. And, you know, the college, you know, those projects have been in the works for many, many years and you need to be really careful that you're not killing those projects.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

I'm not killing them.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I mean, if you don't want to stand behind, you know, those educational institutions and get them done, I guess that's your right to do so, but I can't support that. I can't support taking funding away from the transportation of disabled veterans.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

And for the record, I have not either, and I told you, that would be a priority. I think if you reduce it by 10%, it wouldn't be disabled veterans. And we're talking about the college reducing \$3 million by 10%, I think is what we're talking about here. We're not saying killing those projects.

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

We're going around in circles. We have a long night ahead of us, we haven't got to the agenda. If we could just call the vote.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Call the vote.

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

The Omni as amended.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Number two as amended.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Number two.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Are we done? All right, we have a motion and a second.  
Roll call.

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

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

No.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No.

**LEG. STERN:**

No.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

*(Not present).*

**LEG. TROTTA:**

In the bathroom; pass.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

No.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

No.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

*(Not present).*

**LEG. CALARCO:**

No.

**LEG. ANKER:**

No.

**LEG. HAHN:**

No.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

*(Absent)*

**LEG. BROWNING:**

No.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

No.

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

No.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

No.

**MR. LAUBE:**

*Four (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right, let's move on.

Okay, Budget Amendment No. 3 is conflicted, so we can't vote on that.

Budget Amendment No. 4. Jay? Legislator Schneiderman, excuse me.

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

So we've been meeting, Legislator Krupski and I -- so, I'll make a motion to approve, actually,, but I'll explain it. Al, do you want to second this?

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Which one is it? I'm sorry.

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

It's for -- we've been part of a committee to try to find ways to reduce the incidence of tick-borne illnesses. We are trying to get State funds to help us. We'd like to show some support in the Capital Budget, not in '16 but in '17 and '18. We know that we're going to need chemicals, we're going to need something called 4-Poster systems. We're going to need other things in services that will be part of this program. And in an effort to -- we have meetings coming up with some State officials to try to leverage our money to show that we are committed to reducing tick-borne illnesses in Suffolk County. I think it would be important.

**LEG. CILMI:**

On the motion?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion, Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

This is a tick management plan for the entire County?

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

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Not just the East End.

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

No, the entire County, County-wide. And Dominick Ninivaggi from Vector Control has been part of this committee, the Parks Department's been part of this committee, Stony Brook's part of the -- we have a lot of people involved. Legislator Krupski's come to some of the meetings as well.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So I haven't actually seen this plan. And I've been to a couple of the meetings and Gwen on my staff has been to all the meetings and I think what it -- what this unfortunately does is it relies on pesticides and feeding the deer and feeding the rodents to try to control a tick population. We've got like a -- and it's a serious tick population, I had one on me Saturday and most people have had -- picked ticks off them over the course of the Spring so far. But I think there's -- we are working on forming a Wildlife Task Force, which would address not only the deer population, but also the problem with the goose population and emerging turkey properly problem. And I think it'd be more effective and certainly more fiscally responsible to try to reduce the population of the white-tailed deer instead of trying to feed them and put pesticides into the environment. A lot of people rely on deer as a food source and I think putting pesticides on them is -- is not a -- is not a viable option.

And in the town, years ago, we looked at the 4-Poster system, it would have cost Southold Town \$4 million at that time to develop the program, and then that wouldn't -- that wouldn't include, of course, you know, ongoing maintenance of it. And so cost-wise, it's a very expensive program. We didn't see the numbers that it would be effective, because if it was effective it would have -- I think we would have pursued it.

So I don't -- I really -- I really don't -- I really can't support a 4-Poster system. I can't support putting pesticides into the -- more pesticides into the environment when there's no guarantee that they're going to reduce the tick population, and I don't support feeding and increasing the rodent population.

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

If I might, Al, because I know you've been participating somewhat in that committee. The plan is not developed yet, we have an entomologist we're hiring. This is just estimating a cost so that we can try to leverage some State money. Some of it may be deer management, as you know. It's not specific to 4-Poster, nor necessarily will we be paying for the 4-Posters or the maintenance of those 4-Posters. Just to show a County commitment to taking action to reduce Lyme Disease and other tick-borne illness.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I've been in --

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

The number, I didn't make up the number, the number came out of conversations with the committee, with Dominick Ninivaggi, as to what might reasonably be needed in those years to deal with this. And I know I need a second on this, if there's somebody and we can --

**LEG. HAHN:**

*(Raised hand).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right, for purposes of a vote, I will second this amendment.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Oh, okay.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Oh, Kara, Legislator Hahn will be more than willing to second.

**LEG. HAHN:**

I'll second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Trotta's chomping at the bit.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Yeah, I just -- what's the plan?

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

So we passed, this body passed a resolution to get Vector Control into the business of reducing tick-borne illnesses. They've been working on, you know, West Nile Virus, mosquito-borne illnesses for some time and we commissioned them with developing a plan. They have to develop a plan and they're working on a plan, they just haven't finished it yet and there'll be extensive environmental

review. But we expect by 2017 that we will be implementing a plan and we're going to try to get as much outside money as possible. So by putting some money into 2017, based on the division's estimates, we're basically showing a future intention to really -- we spend about three to four million on mosquito control.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

And it's not working, by the way.

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

Mosquito control is actually extremely effective.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Not in my backyard.

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

Well, maybe there's some nuisance mosquitos, but in terms of mortality from West Nile Virus, they're doing a tremendous job, a tremendous job in reducing the incidence of West Nile. But Lyme Disease --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

How do you know that?

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

By the data.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

What data?

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

Listen, we can -- bring Dominick Ninivaggi in here and he can take you through this, or the Health Department. I think they've done an excellent job. I've seen the data. I don't have it memorized, Legislator Trotta. There has -- as far as I know, we haven't had a death from West Nile Virus in some time, or even incidence of Equine Encephalitis. So if you're saying they're not doing a good job, you know, I would rather have them here to address you when they say that.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I don't know how you would measure that.

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

Well, let them explain that to you. I'm asking for 2017, 2018, to show half-a-million in each of those years so that we can attempt to go after some significant State funding to help us with what I believe is an epidemic. And it's not just Lyme Disease, there's all -- there's Babesiosis, Ehrlichiosis and many other tick-borne illnesses, new allergies that, you know, people are coming down with to meat. There's many different tick-borne illnesses.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

And I know very, very well.

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

So I think we have to take this seriously and this shows a serious commitment to dealing with tick-borne illnesses.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

I prefer to see what you're going to do before we spend \$500,000.

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

You'll have that opportunity later on.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. CILMI:**

It's 2017, Rob, too.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Who's going to be writing the grants?

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

I didn't hear the question.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Who's going to be writing the grants; Dominick's group?

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

Dominick Ninivaggi is writing the plan, like he does with the Vector Control plan. He is writing the Tick Control Plan and we likely will need to be able to fund it, and this says, *Okay, we are ready*. You know, we are ready to show some funds in '17 and '18 to combat Lyme Disease and other tick-borne illnesses.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I agree with you, but you said you will be looking for money elsewhere. Who's writing the grants?

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

We're already approaching the State. We're approaching our Senate delegation, the Health -- the Chair of the Health Committee, so we have a meeting coming up later in June with various Assembly and Senator -- Senate representatives.

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

Doc?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Doc, you had a question?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I'm good.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, all right. We have a motion and a second. Roll call.

*(\*Roll was called by Mr. Richberg -  
Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature\*)*

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

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes, sorry.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

No.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No.

**LEG. STERN:**

No.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

No.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

No.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

No.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

No.

**LEG. ANKER:**

No.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

*(Absent).*

**LEG. BROWNING:**

No.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

No.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Four (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

You didn't call me.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Oh, Gregory.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

No.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Four (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right.

NO. 5 is conflicted.

Amendment No. 6, Legislator Browning. Budget Amendment No. 6.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. No, I'm withdrawing that one.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, withdrawn. Budget Amendment No. 7 --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

And that I'm withdrawing too.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

-- is conflicted.

***Budget Amendment No. 8-2015 - Connect Long Island, deletes \$800,000 in serial bonds and 3.2 million in Federal aid for planning in 2016 (Kennedy, McCaffrey, Trotta, Cilmi, Muratore).***

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator McCaffrey.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Cilmi. On the motion, anyone?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

What happened with five, six, seven?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

The others were conflicted.

**MR. NOLAN:**

And withdrawn.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

And withdrawn, yeah, some of them. Legislator Calarco has a question.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Just a quick question on this project, and maybe Budget Review can speak to this particular budget line. But it's my understanding that we already received quite a bit of Federal and State funding to implement this proposed -- the BRT System, the Connect Long Island Projects that we've already appropriated some of those funds in this year. And this particular proposal is a \$4 million project in which we're going to receive \$3.2 million in funding from the Federal government, and so it will only cost us 800,000?

**MR. LIPP:**

We're looking at it to confirm, hold on.

In 2014 we appropriated three million in Federal and one million -- one and-a-half million in State aid.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

So we already received a pretty substantial amount of State and Federal monies to make this project a reality?

**MR. LIPP:**

Well --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

And we've appropriated that money?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

For a study.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

For the study.

**MR. LIPP:**

Correct.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

So now we have a project that's ready to move and we're going to get Federal funding to make it happen, to the tune of \$3.2 million? If I'm reading this correctly, it's deleting 800,000 in serial bonds and \$3.2 million of Federal aid? I guess this is not necessarily construction, so it's planning money?

**MR. LIPP:**

Right.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

So the question is why would we want to turn down \$3.2 million in funding to do a project that coincides with a road project we have to do anyways, that we've already started planning?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

I don't know how it coincides with the road project, but this is -- this thing is --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Nicolls Road is a project that needs to be done as it is. That's what makes it such an ideal starting place for the bus, for transit. We're not having to do any kind of construction to a road that is in good condition, we're doing construction to a road that is in need of upgrades and improvements as it is.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

This Connect Long Island is going to become the biggest boondoggle we ever saw. This is going to be the tip of the iceberg in terms of what this is going to end up costing this County, and I think we should just cut our losses now --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

It's going to cost us \$800,000 and the \$3.2 million in Federal funding we're going to receive?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

It's \$800,000 and there's nobody that's going to be on that bus.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Legislator McCaffrey, what are you basing that on? What are you basing that information on?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

I have never heard anyone say that they want to get from Stony Brook University to Patchogue.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Wait. Hold on, hold on, please, let me address this. Because I've been very involved with the Connect Long Island plan, as the Chair of the Economic Development Committee, meeting with private equity and hedge fund groups in New York and throughout the Island.

Perfect example; we're talking today about how jobs are fleeing Long Island. You'll maintain that they're fleeing because of high taxes and high cost of doing business here, which that's definitely part of it. But a perfect example where that's not true is look at Datascan, which is a company located in Melville, moving to Long Island City which is, of course, a much more expensive venue to do business in and to house your business in. They're leaving because they want to get to an area that's connected to a larger portion of the population so they can pull employees, because they can't find the talent that they're looking for, the talent pool that they want, so they're moving to a location that has the mass transit system in place where you can locate this.

When we go through the Connect Long Island Program, or the Connect Long Island plan, when I sit down with private equity groups, when I sit down with companies that are looking to relocate their businesses, they're extremely excited and very much on board with this program. Now, those are real -- that's real data, that's real examples of where we're talking about in the public and there we're getting positive response. To say that no one's going to ride the bus, I don't know what you base that on. Is it on a feeling? Is it the fact that you don't use mass transit? It's a different mentality, it's a different demographic that we're targeting, but any -- look at civilization throughout history; any time you can connect people and products more easily, those civilizations have thrived. And this whole program, by connecting different points on the Island, north and south, will have nothing but positive effects on our economy locally.

The Melville area is another perfect example. You have a five-mile stretch of land there on the 110 corridor, that if you connect that to the Melville train station, now you can have people commute in half the time, from points east and west, to their companies and their businesses located right on the Route 110 corridor. So if you have a bus system that goes from the train station, once it reopens, all the way up past the Expressway and points north, they will be able to walk within three blocks to every major office complex that's in that location. And any time you can do that, it's only going to help spur the economy.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

All I can say is I live in Lindenhurst, my son worked at First Data and he never thought to take the bus. He takes his car like everybody else does on their --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

But under the current system, I wouldn't take the bus either, that's why it needs to be improved.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

No, but how are you going to improve the bus service on 110 corridor? What are you going to build a byway or something? I mean, it is what it is. I mean, you cannot get -- you know, it is tough-sledged down there. You're not going to make the bus go much faster.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Kevin, I worked on 110 for ten years. If you could get on the train in Lindenhurst to Melville --

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

You can't get to Melville, and there is no Melville train station.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

The Melville train station is being reopened.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

There's a Farmingdale train station, there's a Republic, I think there's --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

There's the Melville train station, the old Fairchild Complex, that's where there was a train station at one point; I don't know why it was ever closed but it was. There is a capital plan right now, money has already been appropriated, work is already going to start, I know they've already gone through the planning process with the MTA that they're going to reopen the Melville train station.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Run a bus up there and see who gets on there. Run a bus up and down Nicolls Road and see who goes on there for a year before we appropriate this money, and see if they start to use it, and you're going to find out what it's going to cost us. Find out what it costs us in the liability on these buses right now for paying for these accidents.

I mean, if I thought it was going to work -- let's try it first before we spend \$800,000 of ours and \$3.2 million of the Federal government. I don't see anybody using this. Let's try using it before we build bus shelters and conveyances and bypasses and byways. I am very familiar with the Melville and Farmingdale area and those industrial areas, you can't really walk from 110 to a lot of the places that are on there.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes, you can. You can walk from 110 to Pinelawn and --

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

You could, yeah, but it takes you 45 minutes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

No, it wouldn't, it would take you ten minutes. It's four city blocks. It's four city blocks. Anyone that's ever worked in Manhattan would walk 15, 16 blocks, you know, each way to get to their office.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

People don't do that.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

And you want to say people don't do that? You're right, Legislator Trotta, people don't do that here because we don't have the systems in place to make it happen.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

People don't do that here because Manhattan is piled on top of each other.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

And we're not piled? Go on the Expressway at 8:30 in the morning and try to get to 110, it's piled on top of each other.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

I'm talking about apartment buildings. You have people spread out across this Island in houses.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Right, and that's the exact reason why you want Connect Long Island, is you're connecting those different points.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Okay. So how do you get out of your house and walk to Nicolls Road to get on a bus?

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

You don't. You could do that because there are people that live at the end -- and this is in my district; there's people that live in Bayport that are right at the end of Nicolls Road, there's people that live in Holbrook that connect to Nicolls Road.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

And you think people are going to get out of their house, walk to Nicolls Road, get on a bus and go somewhere?

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

If I can get to Stony Brook University in ten minutes rather than a half hour, 45 minutes in rush hour traffic, I absolutely would.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Oh, so you think it's worth spending four million -- just for the plan, by the way -- then let's talk about building the thing at 10%, that's \$40 million. So now we're up to \$40 million so ten people can walk to Nicolls Road?

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Ten people based on what, though? You have no data backing up your claims.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

The data I have is --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

You're just making blanket statements.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

-- looking at --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Because you wouldn't ride the bus, that's why.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

-- the County buses; there's nobody on them.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

One at a time, guys.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I think there are people that -- and I'm not talking about in government, I'm talking about people in the private sector who have looked at this plan and think it's a great idea and think it's only going to help Suffolk County.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

It's going to raise our debt, raise our tax rate and people -- more people --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Based on what? That's based on your opinion.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Based upon reading the paper every day and talking to everyone around whose kids are leaving.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Go out and talk to people in the private sector and ask them --

**LEG. TROTTA:**

That's all I talk to --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

-- what they want for their companies and how they want to --

**LEG. TROTTA:**

-- and they laugh when I talk about this; they laugh.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

They do. I don't know which companies you're talking to.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Big companies.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Which ones? Give me names.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Well, let's talk about Computer Associates right on the thing; they're fleeing here, they're leaving. And the reason is because their taxes are \$15,000 on their house, so they go to North Carolina and spend 1500. And the reason the taxes are \$15,000 are because of decisions we've made here; exorbitant contracts --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Wait, what decisions have we made here that effected school districts which are --

**LEG. TROTTA:**

I didn't -- did I say anything about the school district?

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

You did, you said they're fleeing because their property taxes are high.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

This body doesn't control the school districts.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Right, so why do their property taxes, how does that have any effect on what we do here?

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Because why do you think the Police portion or the County portion and the Community College portion goes --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

The County portion on my tax bill is a third of what it is for the library, what it is for the ambulance corps, it's what it is for the fire department.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

It's what we --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

So the hundred dollars they spend on my tax bill for my County General Fund, that's why people are leaving.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

For the General. What about the Police Fund; how much is that, a couple of grand? And then you add it on -- we're not responsible for the school districts. We can only do what we're responsible for here.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Which is what we're trying to do here.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

And we're sinking. We're sinking.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

What you're proposing is just sit back and let it all happen, what we're trying to do is turn it around.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Is to keep the taxes under control. If this was a legitimate idea. People don't take buses, this is suburbia.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

You don't take the bus. People --

**LEG. TROTTA:**

I don't know anybody who takes a bus.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Well, I think you've got to expand your scope a little bit. There's 200,000 people who ride the Long Island Railroad every day.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Exactly.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right, all right. My neck is hurting from going back and forth. All right, Legislator Stern wants to get in and then Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. STERN:**

Certainly, high cost and high cost of living continue to be a challenge for our neighbors, for all of us and for businesses as well. But, you know, without touching on a specific project, and I know we're on one right now, but, you know, these -- the roofs don't build themselves, the roads don't build themselves, all of the infrastructure that we've been talking about for hours now don't build themselves; people build them, workers build them. And so far we haven't had that other part of the conversation where, you know, all we're talking about is a list and a graph here of expenditures, and as concerned and as responsible as we need to be, we have to keep in mind that on the other end of those expenditures are workers.

And we can talk all day long about taxes and expenses, but at the end of the day, one of the big reasons why, because the challenge of continuing to have high-paying jobs for our local workers. When we're talking about these kinds of jobs, that's exactly what we are talking about, the ability to see our neighbors, many of whom are still hurting from the downturn, go to work.

If we look at the computer modeling software that we utilize in the County, the regional economic modeling software that we are a part of, if you take a look at the proposed budget, you can identify \$242.7 million that is allocated towards economic development. Utilizing this software, utilizing this program, that would equate to the creation of 1,077 jobs, paying a total of 84,143,536, that's in direct effect wages. From that, an additional 1,083 jobs and \$56.4 million in wages, as well as an additional \$158.6 million in total output. The direct effect is 2,160 jobs, 140.5 million in wages, 401.3 million in economic output, and that's not even including the multiplier effect of this type of capital spending.

So certainly we have these kinds of challenges, certainly we have to take a look at our spending. But again, these things don't build themselves, our workers do.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yeah, but the government shouldn't be subsidizing all of this. We should get businesses in here to do this, and we're driving them out. How we pay for that is with taxes.

**LEG. STERN:**

And that is exactly the kind of thing that Legislator Lindsay is leading the charge on.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. So we have a motion and a second?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Yes, we do.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, roll call.

**LEG. ANKER:**

I just have a question.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead, Sarah, Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**

A real quick comment. Build it and they will come. Build it and they will come. And I'm going to tell you right now, I hear this from the -- I'll call them the millennials, the young adults. Our children, most of us, we have 20-year olds, they're moving to the city, they're moving to Brooklyn because of transportation; they don't want to get stuck on the Expressway. And jobs, too, and they're finding -- and so if we build a stronger infrastructure, especially focusing on those programs and the Ronkonkoma Hub and all these other projects that we're working on, our kids will stay, and that's what we're trying to do. We have a vision and I think it's going to be a very successful vision.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, roll call.

*(\*Roll was called by Mr. Richberg -  
Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature\*)*

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

No.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No.

**LEG. STERN:**

Nope.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

No.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

No.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

No.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

No.

**LEG. ANKER:**

No.

**LEG. HAHN:**

No.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

*(Absent).*

**LEG. BROWNING:**

No.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

No.

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

No.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

No.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Four (Absent: Legislator Muratore).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. ***Budget Amendment No. 9, Start-Up New York Suffolk County deletes \$5 million for construction in 2016.*** Motion by Legislator McCaffrey?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Cilmi. On the motion, anyone?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Call the vote.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Mr. Gregory?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Who was that? Oh, I'm sorry, Legislator Barraga.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Excuse my voice. After listening to you all this afternoon, I've lost my voice.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

Look, I think there's -- with reference to this Start-Up program, I think there's the natural inclination on the part of the counties throughout the State of New York to embrace a Statewide Program like Start-Up, especially when program purports to have an overall objective of increasing economic well-being and jobs and being innovative. It sounds like a very interesting proposal, but I do have some reservations. I'm always very leery of programs that come from Albany without any funding. Where is the money? Where is the money from Albany to help support the Start-Up Program for each County?

From what I've been able to investigate and look at it, it looks to me like Suffolk County in 2000 -- between 2016 and 2018, in order to fund this program, will have to sell something like \$10 million worth of serial bonds in over 18 years, another 4.8 million in interest. And what the State is saying is that, *Well, our contribution is that for the next ten years the so-called "innovative", unquote, companies that are quasi-campuses with colleges and universities; it's going to be all tax-free. The employees won't pay any taxes, no State tax, local tax, sales tax, nothing, even the employees won't pay anything as far as local taxes go.* Well, it's easy for Albany to be prospective, but they're not delivering any dollars now.

When I first heard about this proposal, there was some talk about a 50/50 split. I wouldn't be speaking on the program in terms of being against it if we were going to get 50% of the funding from the State of New York up-front, or somewhere along the line, but that's not really promised. They're giving up monies that they don't really have right now. And what they don't achieve, if this program is partially successful, their budgets don't go away, they'll just make up the money someplace else.

I mean, I've been down this road before with Foreign Trade Zones, for example. That was a great concept, a great Statewide concept, only in many of those zones the companies didn't deliver in terms of the number of new employees they were supposed to hire.

The IDAs. These IDAs are like runaway trains. There's no oversight, for the most part, no one's taking them to task. I mean, they're giving huge tax breaks to gymnasiums, storage facilities. There was one the other day where a company got \$156,000, I believe, to move from Bohemia to Hauppauge; was that the intent of the IDA's? Wasn't the intent to reach out to Upstate areas to get companies coming down here or reach out to other states to get them in, or a company here got a legitimate offer from another state and we would try to do something? This thing has gotten completely out of hand and it's extremely expensive, cause every break we give them, who picks up the tab?

The taxpayer.

There is no -- this is a risk. This particular Start-Up program is a real risk. Now, I'm concerned

about it because the Comptroller of the State of New York, Tom DiNapoli -- I know him personally, I've known him for years -- he wouldn't take a stand on an issue unless he felt pretty strong about it. He took a look at the advertising associated with the Start-Up program, \$41 million has been spent so far to promote the Start-Up program in State of New York. He says it's resulted in roughly 76 jobs; 76 jobs. He's sending a message that there's something wrong with this program. It sounds great, but the results so far from a marketing perspective, are just not there. He's got criticism from different employers saying, *Wait a minute. If some innovative company goes into this quasi-campus setting and I have a company down the street, it's not in this campus but manufactures or promotes the same product or marketing service, this new guy is going to get ten years freebie, I am paying the freight, and he's going to be my competition and I'm going to get hurt.* It's the kind of a program that's going to have a reverse effect, if you can get enough companies to begin with to go into this particular area. And it's not just new companies; as I read it, it's new and expanding companies. So anybody could turn around and say, *You know, I want to expand. I want to throw another 40, 50 -- can I get in? I qualify, let me get into this campus setting so I can get this break.*

This is a real risk, this particular program. Bottom line, we go ahead with it and eventually we sell the bonds, that's 10 million bucks plus interest, with absolutely no guarantees. I don't know what we'd get out of it. You get -- you get a new business, we're not getting any revenues from this for ten years. It's a freebie for them. All we've got is a nice expense and the hope that the program is successful, and so far, from a marketing perspective, based on the State Comptroller, and I'm sure Cuomo's not happy with him, he says it really isn't working. It hasn't worked so far in generating the kind of jobs that the Governor and Executive Branch anticipated.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right, so we have a motion and a second. Anyone else?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I had a --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Thank you. Through the Chair. Legislator Barraga, I always listen to what you have to say, especially with your State experience, and I appreciate your comments, and I want to understand it just a little bit more, your line of thinking. So, I guess, what the State is offering is the tax incentive, the tax break.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Right.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And I don't have much information in front of me on this particular program, but I would assume that there are parameters for companies to meet, or qualifications in order to get into the program.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yeah, the --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And I think they're a start up, maybe innovative or new technology, you know, things like that. So do you know a little bit more about the parameters?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yeah, the product or service has to be in line with the master plan of the college or university that they're associated with, like with Stony Brook or Farmingdale or wherever they wind up putting this. And that might be a pretty easy criteria to me, depending upon the number of degrees and the number or majors and the emphasis of a like a Stony Brook University.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right. So -- all right, so there are -- but you view them as being not difficult.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

I don't think there's going to be a major hurdle.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Because I -- you know, you really hit home with, you know, when you talk about some IDA projects and other programs that have come down the pike over the years, I mean, they're not creating the jobs, they're not producing.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Lou, here's the point. You know, if I'm sitting there and I'm in Suffolk County and I've got Connect Long Island, I've got all these other programs, we just want to stimulate growth, this kind of fits into that package.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

And it's difficult to say, *You know, maybe this isn't so hot.* I think one of the criteria -- and like I said at the beginning, I'd feel a lot better if we were getting some funding from the State. This sort of reminds me, a couple of years ago when the State Legislature turned around and said, *You know, veterans deserve a break. Let's make sure they get the tax reduction for schools.* They came out smelling like a rose. They put people in the school districts in a tough bind, because what school board is going to say no? The reality is in a given district, that may have cost the district two or three million from the veterans, but the budget didn't go away, it was just shifted. This is the same kind of thing. It's like an IDA but a different slant. It's something that, you know, we're offering again to businesses a free ride to the businesses and employees over a 10-year period, and I don't see anything coming to the County for the ten or \$15 million in bonding that we're going to have to do to fund this.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right.

*(\*The following was taken and transcribed by  
Lucia Braaten - Court Stenographer\*)*

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Can I just jump in, because I'm very familiar with the Start-Up Program. In all due respect to Legislator Barraga, the program is somewhat restrictive, or it's very restrictive, actually, to correct myself there.

The approval that we have -- let's start with the beginning when Start-Up NY came out. And we could debate about how much money has been spent on it. And I would tend to agree with you, that there's been a lot of money promoting it all over the country. I travel often and I've met people from the West Coast that talk about the Start-Up NY Program that we have and ask me questions

about it. There's been a lot of money spent on it with very little return at this point.

But just to clear up the facts on what the program is, it has to be a true start-up company. And when it was originally -- when the program originally came out, the plan was for it to only be for Upstate New York, nothing south of -- I believe it was either Rockland or Dutchess County. So we had fought as a region to be included with our State representatives to be included as a region as part of Start-Up NY.

Also, each region has a designation in terms of what type of companies would qualify for -- as a Start-Up NY Program. So right now, our region, to be in compliance with Start-Up NY, you would have to be in one of these areas: Cyber and homeland security, wireless and information technology, manufacturing technology, software development, engineering and remanufacturing, bio-technology, electronics, and process technologies. And I'll gladly email this to everyone so you can see what the application process looks like, what the approval process looks like. There's a lot of hoops you have to jump through in order to -- in order to get qualified to be a Start-Up NY company, and rightfully so. I mean, the benefits are extremely rich.

To me, on the surface, the plan or the program is extremely attractive if I was a start-up company. It's all the benefits of doing business in New York without any of the detriments that you are faced with in terms of the high taxes. So not only my company, but my employees are exempt from New York State income taxes for ten years. It's up to -- and up to \$160,000 in income, so that's extremely aggressive. If you look at -- and the only thing that we have that you can compare this to is some of the business incubators that we have located on college campuses. And if you use the incubator on -- in Stony Brook as an example, they have a waiting list of companies trying to get into that incubator, because it's so advantageous to be there. And the purpose of it is to create this symbiotic relationship with the University where you have students, you have companies that are designing curriculum along with the College to help them educate students that these businesses would later hire, and working together in a circular relationship, all to try to accomplish -- instead of just educating kids and sending them out, saying, "Go find a job," now you're educating them more succinctly with what the market demands.

And whether or not you believe in that as a -- you know, as a good philosophy or a good course of action, we could debate that as well. But I just want to kind of get the information correct out there so we know what we're talking about.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

I understand, but as you pointed out, you pointed out eight or nine different areas that would qualify somebody to participate in this particular program, especially if they're associated with a huge university like Stony Brook. You know, coupled with the fact that, again, from a competitive perspective, I think that everybody, whether they're new or expanding, would try to get into this quasi campus type of setting and qualify because of the huge savings. It's right across the board for not only the employers but the employees. But for someone who, you know, is a distance away, or not part of the campus, or for whatever reason can't get in, but makes a very similar product, they're at a tremendous disadvantage.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

And I agree. And if they find -- and this is all according to the program. And whether they'll follow these implementations or not, again, that could be debated. But if you are going to compete with an existing company, then you should not be able to qualify for the Start-Up NY Plan. And, again, I'll go through the criteria that they want in those industries. You have to increase employment opportunities, increase opportunities for internships, vocational training -- I'm sorry -- learning for undergraduates and graduate study, diversification of the local economy, environmental sustainability, increased entrepreneurship opportunities, positive, noncompetitive and/or synergistic

links to existing businesses, affect on the local economy that's positive, and opportunities as a magnet for economic and social growth.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

One thing, the program is designed for new and expanding businesses, and how do you interpret expanding businesses? I'm sitting there and I make computer systems or something.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I don't think it's -- as far as I understand it, it's not intended for expanding businesses. It started -- it's intended for true start-up companies.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

I have Budget Review's analysis and they indicate the program offers new and expanding businesses the opportunity to operate tax free for ten years.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I don't want to disagree with Budget Review. I'm going based off of what I've learned in the Start-Up NY seminars and what -- the information that they've disseminated to me.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

I guess the point I'm making here, this is a risk, not that we shouldn't take risks. You know, at some point in time, we're going to lay out, you know, \$10 million in serial bonds with interest, and there's nothing, nothing coming from the State of New York other than so-called prospective savings that the State will not take based on who goes into this quasi-campus setting.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I agree with you a thousand percent there. But in the -- absent other alternatives, I think it's a good investment to try to attract new start-up companies, and try to create economic development for our young professionals who are coming out of school and having difficulty finding jobs.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

This kind of a program is very difficult to resist. But I've been down the foreign trade zone road. I've seen, you know, this question of these IDA's and what they're doing. There's some real drawbacks to some of these programs.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I agree.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

I don't -- I don't know in this legislation if there's any provision four, five, six years down the road for anybody to come in and take a look at these things and review them and see how they're working out. Certainly, initially, DiNapoli has found some real serious issues with them.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I agree. And I think that in all fairness to the Comptroller, I think his objection has been with the amount of money that's been spent so far. And I agree with him and with you there, that there's been far too much money with very little return up to this point. But I'll send this out to everyone so they could see what the actual application looks like and have all the information. But absent any other alternatives, we're, unfortunately, forced to compete with other counties within our own state, and we have to make our economic environment as competitive as possible. So, therefore, I plan to support this.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

DuWayne.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. Quickly, please.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

I just have one quick comment. I mean, Legislator Lindsay, the logic is beyond my comprehension here. You're going to raise debt in hopes -- and raise the cost of people living here in hopes of attracting people. You're taking that \$10 million worth of debt --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

You're investing money to try to make money, I think that's the concept.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Which you just admitted isn't working.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I didn't say it wasn't working, I said the implementation of it, the advertising side of it, I think they spent far too much. It hasn't even started yet. We don't even have a location here on Long Island or in Suffolk County that we could even locate a start-up company if we wanted to.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

What's going to happen is when these people come here, they still can't afford to live here.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

If they're not paying any income tax, I think they can.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Well, they still have to pay property taxes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Okay. But if I'm making \$160,000 without paying any State income tax, I think I could find a place to live.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

You know, it's the State portion of your income tax.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

All right, 14%.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

It's not that high.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

So people that make \$160,000 can't afford to live in Suffolk County?

**LEG. TROTTA:**

It's hard.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

It's hard, but I think it's possible. That's the maximum amount of the income that's not taxable.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. So we have a long agenda ahead of us and we still have to vote on this last budget amendment. So we have a motion and a second?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Yes, we do.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Roll call.

(\*Roll Called by Mr. Richberg, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature\*)

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

(Not Present)

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Pass.

**LEG. STERN:**

No.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Pass.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

No.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

No.

**LEG. ANKER:**

No.

**LEG. HAHN:**

No.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

(Not Present)

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

No.

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

No.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

(Not Present)

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No.

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

Spencer's here.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

No.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

No.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seven. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Motion fails. Let's go to the agenda. On Page 7, we have a --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I was just wondering if maybe Budget Review could give us a quick recap of what we end up with.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right, sure. Thirty seconds or less, Robert, Dr. Lipp, if possible. Right, we only did the one, yeah.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Just on the record where it is, where we're at.

**MR. LIPP:**

Okay. So, basically, you're talking about the first omnibus, and as a result, there was no change, as we said earlier, in 2016 serial bond money, B money. Over the three years of the program, serial bond money was reduced by 2.63 million compared to the proposed Capital Program. And over the

five-year program, it was increased by 1.665 million, that's serial bonds.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Thank you.

**MR. LIPP:**

Okay.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. We're going to the agenda. I see we have Commissioner O'Neill here with us. Let's try to get him out. He's been waiting very patiently.

**HUMAN SERVICES**

So if you go to Page 7 in the agenda, Human Services, I make a motion to take ***I.R. 1418 out of order. It's amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program in connection with the purchase of vehicles for the Department of Social Services (CP 1821) (Sponsor: County Executive)***. Second by Legislator Schneiderman. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions, to take out of order?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay motion is before us. I make a motion to approve ***I.R. 1418***, second by Legislator Martinez. Anyone have questions for the Commissioner?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Just I wanted to know what the offset was. This is amending the budget.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Commissioner?

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

That would be a question for Budget to handle.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

For Budget Review, yeah.

**MR. LIPP:**

It doesn't need a budget offset, because an offset isn't required for financing in amounts that are at least 50% aided.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

That are what?

**MR. LIPP:**

It's got at least 50% aid, so, therefore, it doesn't need an offset.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

There's no offset?

**MR. LIPP:**

Right.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So, Commissioner, just explain to me the need for these particular --

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

Sure.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

-- vehicles.

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

Good evening, everybody. These are vehicles that would be used in Family and Children Services to transport children, foster care, and also two cargo vans for maintenance workers.

In January of 20 -- excuse me, let me just get my notes here. In January of 2013, we had 62 total vehicles assigned to DSS. Since January 13th to April 1st, 2015, 21 have been decommissioned; two cargo vans, four minivans, seven SUVs and eight cars. New vehicles assigned to DSS in that same time period is 16; 15 cars, one minivan. So where we could, we've replaced older and larger vehicles with smaller cars, more energy efficient in terms of gas usage and those types of things. So that leaves us down to 57 vehicles. We currently have 10 in the shop, which happens from time to time. We have 47 right now available for use. So we're looking to replace the vehicles that have already been decommissioned.

Just real quickly, just so you have a flavor for the types of vehicles that we're looking to replace, and two cargo vehicles that were decommissioned, 11, November 2014. October 2014, it had 155,000 miles on them, another one had 154,000 miles. So we averaged about -- one was a 2007 vehicle, one was a 2001 vehicle. They average roughly 19.4 thousand, 11,000 miles per year. Other minivans that were decommissioned from Family and Children: 2003 Chrysler Voyager, 140,000 miles; 2003 Chrysler Voyager, 155,000 miles; 2006 Ford Freestar, 183,000 miles. But I won't go through every single one.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

What did you, say five minivans?

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

That's correct, we're looking for five minivans.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So five minivans and two cargo vans?

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

That's right.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

What do you carry in the cargo vans? Cargo.

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

Cargo vans is our maintenance. We do deliver -- we use them for deliveries and for our

maintenance unit.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

When did the minivans go out of commission?

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

I'm sorry?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

The minivans that you're replacing?

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

The minivans are to transport children.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. When did they go out of commission or decommissioned?

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

Well, there's a whole host of them. Between -- I'm going through the one from January 2013 and April 2015.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

All right. So -- excuse me. So -- but you're transporting now. So you've been working with less, but why do you need the additional five vans now?

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

Sure. We need them now because we've been working with less and it's been inefficient, and we replaced cars where we could. Now, at this point, without the minivans, we have to use two cars to transport large families. So now we're using double the gas and double the employee's salary.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

How often does that happen?

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

Weekly, at least. So just to give you a flavor for the amount of trips, we have 19 Community Service Workers assigned to field to transport children. We have those 19 Caseworkers -- excuse me, Community Service Workers average about 12,000 transports roundtrips per year. So it's 19 workers times 12 transports.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Is this -- is this reimbursed at all?

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

Yes, it is. It's 66.29%.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So does the 185 represent the County portion or --

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

That's the total cost. I have -- the net cost would be 62,000. We would be receiving reimbursement of 123,000 on these vehicles.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Uh-huh, okay. All right. So you're saying that it would be -- the Department would become more efficient, you wouldn't have to use two vehicles instead of one?

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

Absolutely. Right now, we have two maintenance guys riding around in the same vehicles.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right.

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

We have to unload tools, and if they have to go to two separate places each day, like tomorrow, they had to go to two separate places, we have to unload tools now into a car or another old van, if we have one.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Of the 185, could you just cut 10% off the top, maybe?

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

I'll simply say that when it comes to purchasing vehicles, that's through DPW, and I trust that they've gotten the lowest price at this point.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Fair enough. I appreciate that. Okay, sir. Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

You're welcome.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Commissioner, how are you? You had said 66.29 is the percent of reimbursement that we get from the State. Does that -- that comes from OTDA?

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

This is actually OCFS.

**LEG. STERN:**

OCFS? Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. We have a motion and a second?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Same motion, same second, on the bond resolution, **1418A**  
***(Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$62,900 Bonds to finance the cost of acquisition of vehicles for the Department of Social Services (CP 1821.510).*** Roll call.

(\*Roll Called by Mr. Richberg, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature\*)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

(Not Present)

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:**

I just want to say thank you to everybody for supporting that. I appreciate it very much. The workers will definitely appreciate it. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Thank you, Commissioner. I see we have Chief Sharkey here as well. Let's try to get him out.

On Page 7, Public Safety, I'm going to make a motion to take ***I.R. 1391*** out of order.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

It's to -- second by -- who was that? Legislator Cilmi.

It's ***Appropriating funds in connection with renovations at the Yaphank Correctional Facility (CP 3009) (Sponsor: County Executive)***. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions to take out of order?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. The motion is --

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

The resolution is before us. Actually, same motion, same second on the -- to approve. Any questions? All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Same motion, same second on the bond resolution (*Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$400,000 Bonds to finance the cost of renovations at the Yaphank Correctional Facility (CP 3009.319 and .514)*). Roll call.

(\*Roll Called by Mr. Richberg, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature\*)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

(Not Present)

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. Let's see. Back to Page 6, Budget and Finance.

**BUDGET AND FINANCE**

***I.R. 1042 - Approving 2015 funding for a contract agency (The Sunshine Center, Inc.) (Sponsor: Kate Browning).*** Motion by Legislator Browning, I'll second. Anybody have any questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1420 - Amending the 2015 Operating Budget and appropriating funds in connection with bonding for a settlement for a liability case against the County (Sponsor: County Executive).***

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Calarco. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? I'm sorry, Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Just very quickly, I just wanted to state for the record I abstained on this bill and the following bill in committee, not having information about either of the cases. I spoke to the County Attorney and I'm fine with both of them.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Same motion, same second to approve on the bond resolution, ***1420A (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York authorizing the issuance of \$197,500 Bonds to finance the settlement of a liability case against the County)***. Roll call.

(\*Roll Called by Mr. Richberg, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature\*)

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

(Not Present)

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. *I.R. 1421 - Amending the 2015 Operating Budget and appropriating funds in connection with bonding for a settlement for a liability case against the County (Sponsor: County Executive).*

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator D'Amaro, I'll second. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

*I.R. 1421A, the bond resolution (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$3,000,000 Bonds to finance the settlement of a liability case against the County.* Same motion, same second to approve. Roll call.

(\*Roll Called by Mr. Richberg, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature\*)

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

(Not Present)

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. ***I.R. 1336 - Appoint member to the Suffolk County Citizens Advisory Board for the Arts (Mark Carpentieri) (Sponsor: William Spencer)***. Motion by Legislator Spencer. Do I have a second? I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***J.R. 1398 - Authorizing 2015 Cultural Tourism Funding (Sponsor: County Executive).***

Motion by Legislator Hahn, I'll second. All in -- anyone have questions?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion? Can't hear you, Doc.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I'm sorry. Diana, you're here on this particular --

**MS. CHERRYHOLMES:**

Hello.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Hi. Could you just give us some -- just like a 30-second highlight in terms of the funding to do. Were you happy that you achieved kind of your goals? A little bit about the process.

**MS. CHERRYHOLMES:**

Yes. This is Hotel Motel Tax dollars that are given to -- not given, it's an application process for cultural and arts funding. They have to fill out an application, and your representatives on the Citizens Advisory Council on the Arts make difficult selections. They spend about a week reviewing all of the applications, and I do hope that they're all coming to you with reports of the activities of this Board to bring you this resolution that we have.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Out of the overall request for funding, as just an overall kind of gross percentage, would you say that 50% of the requests, 80%, how --

**MS. CHERRYHOLMES:**

Oh, it's of the applicants that were funded. It's pretty high. We had 61 applicants and 57 awards through the Cultural Advisory Board for the competitive grants. For Destination Downtown, which is a creative place-making project, we had five applications, but we only had two awards.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Well, thanks for -- I know this is -- this is your first year?

**MS. CHERRYHOLMES:**

This is my first cycle, yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

We miss you in Huntington. Thank you.

**MS. CHERRYHOLMES:**

Thank you.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Appreciate it. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. Thank you. All right so we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed?

Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***J.R. 1399 - Authorizing Film Promotion funding for 2015 (Sponsor: County Executive).***

Same motion, same second. Any questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislators Martinez/Absent Legislator Muratore)

**ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING & AGRICULTURE**

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***J.R. 1249 - Authorizing appraisal of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007, estate of Francis J. Dragotta – Town of Southampton (SCTM Nos. 0900-283.00-01.00-034.000 p/o and 0900-284.00-01.00-028.000 p/o) (Sponsor: Jay Schneiderman).***

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

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. I'll second.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Oh, I'm sorry. Legislator Hahn seconds. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***J.R. 1400 - Retaining capital project funds in connection with installation of stormwater runoff filters within the Village of Babylon (CP 8240.116 and CP 8240.320) (Sponsor: County Executive).***

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator McCaffrey, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***J.R. 1404 - Authorizing the acquisition of Farmland Development Rights under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (effective December 1, 2007) for the H.J.E Real Estate, Inc. Property - Eberhard Nursery - Town of Brookhaven - (SCTM No.***

**0200-679.00-01.00-006.000 p/o) (Sponsor: County Executive).**

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. HAHN:**

(Raised hand).

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***J.R. 1422 - Authorizing the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (effective December 1, 2007) - open space component - for the McMullan property - Wading River Wetlands - Town of Riverhead (SCTM No. 0600-029.00-02.00-022.000) (Sponsor: County Executive).***

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So moved.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by -- Wading River. Motion by Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. HAHN:**

(Raised hand).

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***J.R. 1423 - Authorizing acquisition of land under the Old Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program [C12-5(E)(1)(a)] – for the Schad property – Ketchum Creek addition - Town of Babylon - (SCTM Nos. 0101-008.00-03.00-011.001, 0101-008.00-03.00-011.002, 0101-008.00-03.00-012.000, 0101-008.00-03.00-013.000 and 0101-008.00-03.00-014.000) (Sponsor: County Executive). I'll make a motion.***

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Do I have a second?

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1429 - Appointing Brookhaven Town Supervisor Edward P. Romaine as a member of the Long Island Regional Planning Council (Sponsor: County Executive).*** Do I have a motion? By Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

(Raised hand).

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**LEG. ANKER:**

Cosponsor.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. ***I.R. 1436 - Expanding the Lake Ronkonkoma Advisory Board. (Sponsor: Leslie Kennedy).*** Motion by Legislator Kennedy, second by Legislator Trotta. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**HEALTH**

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1382 - Adopting a Local Law protecting children from exposure to toxic chemicals ("The Toxic Free Toys Act") (Sponsor: Kara Hahn).*** Motion by Legislator Hahn. Where did she go?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Kara, toxic toys.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Hahn. Who was the second?

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Lindsay. On the motion, Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yeah. So I appreciate a lot of the changes that were made to this bill. I spoke at length over numerous occasions with the New York League of Conservation Voters, who's been support this. And we fell a little bit short in my view of dealing with all the challenges, but I think by and large, I think this is a bill worth supporting.

The one concern that I really do still have, and it's a significant concern, and I just want to ask the County Executive's Office not a question, but if they would work with and if the sponsor would work with the Health Department in terms of preventing a heavy-handed approach to enforcement here.

I used to be in the printing business, I used to buy a lot of paper in that business, and I can imagine if somebody came to me and tested the paper that I purchased, and because of a regulation that the County passed found that some of that paper had some sort of a chemical in it that was bad that had been banned, if I went to my supplier and asked them to take that paper back, they would have told me, "Sorry, you know, we can't" -- "we can't just take back paper because of Suffolk County's law."

So I'm afraid that small retailers, who depend on every dollar to put food on their tables, are going to get stuck with product on their shelves that they're not going to be able to return, and, you know, basically, they're going to be out of luck. So if we could -- if the Health Department could work to, A, number one, limit the heavy-handedness of their enforcement without sort of diluting the intent of this bill, and number two, develop some sort of a written form or statement that retailers could then give to their suppliers to say, "This is what the County law is, you know, we don't wish to accept or purchase any products that don't comply with this law, and any products that we purchase that are found to be not in compliance with this law will be returned," and maybe their distributors can sign that statement, or something like that, just to offer some protection for those small retailers. That's my major concern here.

**LEG. HAHN:**

I'm going to respond, because the Presiding Officer said I could. Yes, absolutely. You know, we left a lot of time in here for educating the retailers. I think -- and also in a previous version, we had had some kind of form like that, but then I got the push-back from the retailers that that was too much paperwork they'd have to keep. So, you know, there's a balance here on what's -- you know, where are we -- where are we giving them too much to do. But the bottom line is we're trying to protect children and the health of children.

And so there's absolutely no question that the goal of this legislation is not to, you know, get \$500 or \$1,000 in fines each time we go out there. The goal to get the toxic chemicals and toys with toxic chemicals off the shelves. So we have -- you know, the intent, and with speaking to the Commissioner just a little bit earlier this evening, you know, the intent here is to educate, educate, educate, educate during that education period of time. We can even -- you know, I know Legislator Schneiderman was concerned about small toy stores in his district. We can hold round-tables and forums to educate them, help them, educate their own suppliers about what they can and cannot sell here.

And so, you know, I think that the full intention of this legislation is to -- is first and foremost to get the toys with toxic chemicals off the shelves and out of our children's hands, and we -- the intention is not to penalize anyone. And the end result will be, you know, safer households and healthier children.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So just to be clear, I am worrying about the fines, but I'm even more worried about the product. So

I know that it will be in the Health Department's discretion to, you know, determine how stringent to enforce this in terms of a penalty. But, again, if you're the small retailer and you purchased \$10,000 worth of product, and the Health Department comes in and says, you know, this Matchbox car, and I hate to keep using them as an example, but, this car contains an excessive amount of one of the prohibited components in this law, you know, then what? Does the retailer have to test every single Matchbox Car that they have? I mean, as a retailer, I at that point wouldn't feel comfortable selling those products, because now I've been notified that there may be a problem. And if, Heaven forbid, something happens to somebody who purchased one of those products after I've been told, I'm going to be held liable.

So, you know -- so I'm going to feel obligated, at least, to try and return those products, or to at least not sell those products. And knowing how business works, it's going to be very difficult for that small retailer, who has very little clout with large manufacturers and distributors, to return those products for a refund. So if we could just work with them to try and prevent, to the best of our ability, them receiving toys that might not comply, that would be helpful.

**LEG. HAHN:**

And I think we'll be working with a bunch of the organizations that have been supportive of this bill to begin education now. You know, we are a year-and-a-half away from enforcement, and so letting -- you know, letting retailers know. Obviously, the department doesn't have to begin the education until January of next year, but I think it will be in everyone's best interest to start that educational process now. They'll have a year-and-a-half to be talking to their suppliers, and, you know, be making sure that they're in compliance once the enforcement begins.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. It's hard to argue against, you know, protecting children from anything, let alone, you know, toxic chemicals in toys. So it's I think -- and we had this discussion with some of the people who came in who were chemists who came in during the public hearings that we had about the dangers of toys with batteries in them, and the dangers of children, and you see how many children put cell phones in their mouths, and people use them as -- you know, they're using cell phones as -- you know, binkies. And you can imagine, you know, anything with a battery in it, it's going to be a lot more dangerous than something that doesn't have a battery in it.

So I think, if anything, you could expand this in the future to include any kind of electronic devices that you see children either getting it in their mouths or close contact with their head constantly. I think that would be something that you should probably look into. But, otherwise, you know, who wouldn't want to protect children?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Spencer.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I commend Legislator Hahn on this bill. It's very bold. There's been a lot of changes that she's made responding to the industry, the Health Department, even me. And, you know, I think that we've heard testimony over the last six weeks with everything that's been going on, and I think it comes down to a couple of points, and I'll be brief.

One issue was I feel the Albany County lawsuit was -- the toy industry wanted to try to bully us in a sense, and they were basing it off of a Federal preemption. But I think that Legislator Hahn has adjusted the bill where it mirrors the Federal bill, and I don't think that's any longer an issue. I

think the toy industry is a billion dollar industry and they feel that they can have -- they can kind of tell us what to do.

One of the issues, when you talk about the safe levels of these chemicals, the chemical industry tried to indicate that we don't know the effects. But if we look at the history of lead, where they initially said it was 25 micrograms per deciliter, and then they dropped it to ten, then they dropped it to five, one of the issues is that we don't know what the long-term effects are. And some of the effects that we're seeing, especially in children, we may not see those things for 25 or 30 years. And so for us to err on the side of caution I do think is prudent.

I think that she did her homework, and she put in levels so that we don't have to worry about naturally occurring amounts of these substances. And we really have a law now that really focuses on substances that are purposefully added to take shortcuts or to minimize manufacturing costs.

The Commissioner expressed concerns; Legislator Hahn responded. As being the Chair of the Board of Health and being in contact with him, he feels confident that we can work and enforce this law and he supports it.

So I think that once again we can lead the way, as we've done with BPA, smoking, Pesticide Notification Law, and I think this is a bold new -- I applaud Legislator Hahn and I'm proud to support it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**

I also want to commend Legislator Hahn for moving forward with this bill. And it did take a little bit of time, but I think a lot of things have been worked out where it's a doable bill. And I think we're asking too much. Basically, we're asking our society to keep toxic chemicals away from our children. And it will not only benefit the children, but there's a secondary benefit, and that is that we're taking these toys out of our environment that will end up in our landfill. Those chemicals can get into our drinking water, which will affect everybody, so it's not even just our kids.

So, again, I commend you, and I will be supporting your bill.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. We have a motion and second?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Yes, we do.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen -- 17. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. Congratulations. All right. ***I.R. 1385 - To appoint member to the Food Policy Council of Suffolk County (Nikki M. Kateman) (Sponsor: Kara Hahn).*** Motion by Legislator Hahn, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**PARKS AND RECREATION**

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Parks and Rec: ***I.R. 1390 - Authorizing use of Smith Point County Park for Mercy Center Ministries 5K race (Sponsor: Kate Browning)***. Motion by Legislator Browning, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1413 - Authorizing use of Cupsogue Beach County Park for parking by the Barrier Beach Preservation Association for its Oyster Fling Fundraiser (Sponsor: County Executive)***.

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

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. You want to -- second by Mr. Beach Hut himself, Legislator Trotta.

(\*Laughter\*)

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. ***I.R. 1427 - Authorizing use of Montauk County Park by Concerned Citizens of Montauk, Inc. For its Membership Picnic Fundraiser (Sponsor: County Executive)***.

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

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**PUBLIC SAFETY**

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. We did 1391. ***1394 - Accepting and appropriating a grant as pass-thru funding from the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services to the Suffolk County -- I'm sorry.***

**MS. SATERAMO:**

1394, we need to table 1394, because there's a name change.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**MS. SANTERAMO:**

The agency changed their name from the Suffolk County Coalition to the Long Island Coalition, so we need to make the correction.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Motion to table by Legislator Calarco, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1415 - Approving the re-appointment of Timothy Crafts as a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services Commission (Sponsor: County Executive).***

Motion by Legislator Browning.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1416 - Approving the re-appointment of Vincent Bologna Jr. as a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services Commission (Sponsor: County Executive).*** Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1417 - Approving the re-appointment of Arthur P. Bloom as a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services Commission (Sponsor: County Executive).***

Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**PUBLIC WORKS, TRANSPORTATION & ENERGY**

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1388 - Appropriating funds in connection with planning and design for the rehabilitation of Guggenheim Lake (Deer Lake), Towns of Babylon and Islip (CP 8716) (Sponsor: Lou D'Amaro).*** Motion by Legislator D'Amaro?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yup, motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Stern.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion, Legislator Krupski, then Legislator McCaffrey.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

All right. You know, I took a look at this with -- in Public Works. We asked a lot of questions about it. You've got an area here that seems to have a dearth of public access. And I'm -- you know, I'm really blessed to come from an area that has a lot of public access to the water. So any time -- and the public access wasn't free. You know, in most cases, the Park District land or the Town land, it was -- somebody bought it at one point in time, and we still buy open space for access to the water so the public can enjoy it. And sometimes you develop it with a trail or with a parking lot, and sometimes you just leave it open.

And so I think it's a good idea to support this access to the water for recreation, and just general enjoyment should be encouraged for everybody. And, obviously, the closer you live to it, whether it's -- you could say, well, it's County, it's open to everyone in the County or the state, but it's most of the people who live around there who are going to enjoy it, so I think this is important.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Thank you. Legislator McCaffrey.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Yes. You know, I support this project for the reasons that Legislator Krupski mentioned, but I do have a concern. And we don't have anybody here from Public Works, but -- oh, we do. Is Gil here? Oh, Commissioner.

Commissioner, my concern is the -- is the water flow going down into my district from there. You know, it appears as though we're going to be doing something that's going to affect the water levels in that Guggenheim Lake. And I am getting already some concerns. I know a lot of it has to do with the drought that we had, and this is before we had the heavy rains. But a lot of those streams in Babylon are dried up, and this, you know, regulates Sumpwams Creek. So I'm concerned about changes in the elevation of the water, Guggenheim, which leads to Sumpwams, which is right in Babylon Village. So can you address those concerns for me?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah. The discussions we've had preliminarily with DEC and their well people, their well staff, they -- their feeling is, is that it's going to be a very minimal pump rate, if and when it needs to be pumped. Once the soils that are there have swelled up and the -- you know, the pond would be reconfigured, it would be able to hold water, and it would only need a minimal amount of flow. Now that -- you know, I can't speak, obviously, for large storm events, things like that. There's a weir that's controlled and it is intended to move further downstream. But the rate of pumping that would be needed to maintaining the level is extremely minimal. I don't have the number in front of me, but I can get it for you.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

So the idea is to keep the lake at a level, a certain level, and it would not have an adverse impact on the downstream areas in terms of level of that?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

All right. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Oh, I'm sorry, Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

We can't do this inhouse?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Given the level of expertise and the level of our workload at the current time, no.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

If you had an extra employee, the \$300,000 we could have saved from the beach hut?

*(\*Laughter\*)*

All right. And how about we can't find -- we have to bond \$25,000? Here we go again. To Dr. Lipp, can you explain to me like how we can spend \$131,000 a day in police overtime, but we can't find \$25,000 for this? How does that work?

**MR. LIPP:**

I don't think that's a fair question to ask me.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**LEG. TROTТА:**

It's not?

**MR. LIPP:**

In terms of it's priorities. You know, the Legislature sets priorities. It's not up to me to say that you should or you shouldn't do this or that.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

All right.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. We have a -- I'm sorry, Legislator --

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

No. Waiting for you to make --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. *I.R. 1388, bond resolution (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$25,000 in Bonds to finance planning and design for the rehabilitation of Guggenheim Lake (Deer Lake) in the Towns of Babylon and Islip (CP 8716.110).* Same motion, same second. Roll call.

(\*Roll Called by Mr. Richberg, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature\*)

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes for Mr. Sarcasm.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

(Absent)

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1392 - Appropriating funds in connection with Weatherproofing County Buildings (CP 1762) (Sponsor: County Executive).***

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Who was that? Oh, motion by Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

(Raised hand).

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Browning. On the motion, anyone? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Bond resolution ***1392A - (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$200,000 Bonds to finance the cost of weatherproofing of County buildings (CP 1762.312).*** Same motion, same second. Roll call.

(\*Roll Called by Mr. Richberg, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature\*)

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

(Absent)

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

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***J.R. 1396 - Appropriating funds in connection with Energy Conservation and Safety improvements to the H. Lee Dennison Building (CP 1659) (Sponsor: County Executive).***

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Krupski, I'll second. On the motion, anyone? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Bond resolution, ***1396A - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$100,000 Bonds to finance the cost of energy conservation and safety improvements to the H. Lee Dennison Building (CP 1659.320)***, same motion, same second. Roll call.

(\*Roll Called by Mr. Richberg, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature\*)

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

(Absent)

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. *I.R. 1397 - Appropriating funds in connection with Decommissioning and Demolition of County Facilities (CP 1665) (Sponsor: County Executive)*. Motion by Legislator Krupski, I'll second. Anyone on the motion?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion, Legislator Trotta, then Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Gil.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yup. Yes, sir.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Do we have a bulldozer? What building is this?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This is actually for two radio towers that we own. One of them is in Yaphank, and the other one is here in Hauppauge. They're radio towers. I know the one in Yaphank very well, because it's obviously behind my building, and it's something we've been looking to do for some time. We actually -- we've talked about trying to do it inhouse, but because of either -- you know, either trying to knock it down, it was just too dangerous. You'd have to get somebody to climb up there.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

How tall is it?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Okay. I'm going take a long shot, 100 feet, 150 feet. I mean, they're regular good-sized radio towers.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

All right. Are you ready?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Sure.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Get the fire -- get the FRES guys and a still fire truck, tie a rope to it and yank it down, save 100 grand, and sell -- and sell the metal and make some money. All right. This is something that, you know, the County should be able to do.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We did actually talk about that. We talked about not selling the metal, but actually trying to get one of the Fire Departments, but because of liability concerns, we felt that this was more appropriate.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

All right. I will personally climb up there and tie the rope to it and you can pull it down.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Second.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Tonight.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Just as long as Legislator Lindsay is nowhere around.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

We'll name the building after him in Cupsogue Beach.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Seriously, this is something that we should be able to do. You know, on a Sunday, it would be overtime, have the people park somewhere else. Maybe we could sell tickets to it and make some money. But this is really something that we should be able to do. You know, this is -- you know this is a no-brainer here.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I disagree, but that's your decision.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Are there houses behind it? I know the one near you is. What's behind your building?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right behind? Well, when we talked about taking that one down, we talked about bringing it down onto the parking lot, there's a parking lot. To the south there are County buildings, and actually to the north, there's the main garage. So there is an open area. And we did speak of it, but we just

didn't think it was appropriate.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I don't disagree that this -- I don't know why it seems more complicated than it is. But my question is not about who could take it down, but, rather, could we let it go for another year? It is \$120,000. And can it go for another year?

And also, is there any way you can do a contest? There's a lot of smart people on the Island, to take the tower down and make it into a contest. You've get a lot of engineers. I have a feeling you have a lot of people who would kind of enjoy that kind of challenge and were able to do it -- be able to do it safely.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Could you wait -- I'll answer the "Could you wait a year" question. Obviously, we put this forward because we recommend taking it down. I believe last year the funds were put off a year, and every year, you know, it just keeps getting pushed back farther and farther. Again, we don't recommend it, but it's your decision.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

(Opposed: Legislators Krupski, Kennedy, Trotta, Cilmi and McCaffrey)

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Twelve. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. *I.R. 1397A, bond resolution (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$100,000 Bonds to finance the cost of decommissioning and demolition of County facilities (CP 1665.312)*, same motion, same second. Roll call.

(\*Roll Called by Mr. Richberg, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature\*)

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

No.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

No.

**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.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

(Absent)

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eleven. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. Bond fails. ***I.R. 1401 - Authorizing execution of Agreement by the Administrative Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 Southwest and 65 Marcus Drive (HU-1681) (Sponsor: County Executive).*** I'll make a motion.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

*I.R. 1419 - Authorizing the filing of a Grant Application for Federal Fiscal Year 2014 Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities Funds to purchase paratransit vehicles for the Suffolk County Accessible Transportation Program (Sponsor: County Executive).*

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Krupski, second by Legislator Browning. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

*I.R. 1430 - Authorizing the conveyance of County-owned surplus unused right-of-way fronting a parcel of land having a Suffolk County Tax Map Identification Number of District 0100 Section 230.00 Block 01.00 Lot 053.00 pursuant to Section 125 of the New York State Highway Law (Sponsor: County Executive).*

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

(Raised hand).

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Krupski, I'll second. Any questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

*I.R. 1431 - Accepting FTA FFY 2012 Section 5316 Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) funds for the provision of Sunday Bus Service for the Suffolk County Transit Bus System (Sponsor: County Executive).*

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

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

(Raised hand).

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Krupski. Anyone on the motion? All in -- oh, Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I'm sorry. Is there a -- is this a cost to the County or is this 100% fund?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This is actually JARC funding. It allows us to use -- it allows us to reimburse the Sunday Service Program, 50% of the cost.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. All right. Thank you.

**LEG. STERN:**

Is that just in one year, or is that over a few years?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

That's two years, 20 -- I'm sorry, it's three years.

**LEG. STERN:**

Three years, 2014, 2015, 2016?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Okay. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***J.R. 1432 - Authorizing the execution of an Agreement between the County and the New York State Department of Transportation for Federal and State Aid funding for the continuation of the HOV Bus Service on the Long Island Expressway for 2015 (Sponsor: County Executive).***

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

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, second by Legislator Krupski. On the motion, anyone? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***J.R. 1439 - Authorizing the sale of one surplus County Para Transit Bus to St. Michaels (Sponsor: Jay Schneiderman).*** Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***J.R. 1440 - Authorizing the sale of one surplus County Para Transit Bus to Camp Soulgrow (Sponsor: Jay Schneiderman).*** Same motion, same second.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Working together.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)

**WAYS AND MEANS**

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Ways and Means: ***I.R. 1395 - Approval of auction rules for the disposition of surplus property acquired under the Suffolk County Tax Act (Sponsor: County Executive)***. Motion by Legislator Stern, second by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1402 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Thomas Downs and Bonnie Downs (SCTM No. 0800-083.00-04.00-006.012) (Sponsor: County Executive)***.

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Stern, second by Legislator D'Amaro. Okay.

**LEG. STERN:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion?

**LEG. STERN:**

On the motion. This is a sale of adjoining property, adjoining property owner for \$19,500. It was appraised for \$19,500; sold with restrictive covenants; cannot be developed.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. ***I.R. 1414 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law - Town of Brookhaven (SCTM No. 0200-403.00-10.00-011.000) (Sponsor: County Executive)***.

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Stern. Anyone from Brookhaven want to -- second by Legislator Calarco. On the motion?

**CHAIRMAN STERN:**

Just quickly on the motion. This is in the Town of Brookhaven, and we did receive a copy of the resolution from the Town of Brookhaven that accompanied the legislation.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***1.R. 1433 - Authorizing the Village of Mastic Beach to utilize a parcel, (Suffolk County Tax Map No. 0209-024.00-02.00-026.000) for village purposes (Sponsor: Kate Browning).***

Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Krupski. On the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. If we go to the red folder, we have a CN. ***1512 - A Charter Law to amend Local Law No. 32-2014 to accelerate the consolidation of financial management functions in the County Department of Audit and Control (Sponsor: County Executive).***

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Lindsay, second by Legislator McCaffrey. Anyone on the motion? Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)

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

Tim, cosponsor.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Tim, cosponsor.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. In the manila folder we have some procedural motions.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Presiding Officer.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I'd like to recuse myself on Procedural Motion Number 11, and I filed the appropriate paperwork with your office and with the Board of Ethics.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. *Procedural Motion Number 11 - To set a public hearing for the inclusion of new parcels into an existing Agricultural District – Albert J. & Mary F. Krupski, Jr. (SCTM Nos. 1000-074.00-04.00-004.001, 1000-074.00-04.00-004.002, 1000-074.00-04.00-004.003, 1000-074.00-04.00-004.004, 1000-074.00-04.00-004.005, 1000-074.00-04.00-004.006, and 1000-074.00-04.00-004.009) (Sponsor: Pres. Off. Gregory).* Motion by Legislator Browning, I'll second. Anyone have any questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi).

**P.O. GREGORY:**

*Procedural Motion Number 12 - To set a public hearing for the inclusion of new parcels into an existing Agricultural District – JR Landscaping, Inc. (SCTM No. 0900-083.00-01.00-009.002) and Long Lane Farm Corp. (SCTM No. 0300-157.00-03.00-002.000) (Sponsor: Pres. Off. Gregory).*

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

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

*Procedural Motion Number 13 - To set a public hearing for the inclusion of new parcels into an existing Agricultural District – John Verderber (SCTM No. 0600-085.00-03.00-012.003), 359 Main Road LLC (SCTM No. 0600-085.00-03.00-067.000), 1486 Sound Avenue LLC (SCTM No. 0600-085.00-03.00-072.104), 406 Main Road LLC (SCTM No. 0600-085.00-03.00-073.002), 1546 Sound Avenue LLC (SCTM No. 0600-021.00-02.00-008.000) (Sponsor: Pres. Off. Gregory).*

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

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Krupski. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

*Procedural Motion Number 14 - To set a public hearing for the proposed inclusion of a parcel into an existing Agricultural District – JCNSL LLC (SCTM No. 0200-722.00-01.00-017.000) (Sponsor: Pres. Off. Gregory).*

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Krupski, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

*Procedural Motion Number 15 - To set a public hearing for the inclusion of new parcels into an existing Agricultural District – Pal-O-Mine Equestrian, Inc. (SCTM No. 0504-004.00-01.00-016.000) (Sponsor: Pres. Off. Gregory).* Motion by Legislator Martinez, was that? Is that your -- oh, Browning? Was that you, Browning?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes, Hauppauge somewhere.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Oh, okay. I thought it was in Monica's District. Procedural Motion Number 15.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Do you need a second?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I'll second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Village of Islandia. Motion by Browning, second by -- I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi) .

**P.O. GREGORY:**

*Procedural Motion Number 16 - To set a public hearing for the proposed inclusion of a parcel into an existing Agricultural District – 29 Norwood Road LLC (SCTM No. 0400-011.00-01.00-025.000) and Norwood Property Search & Management LLC (SCTM No. 0400-011.00-01.00-026.000).* (Sponsor: Pres. Off. Gregory). Same motion, same second.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

No, no.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I'm sorry.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Different motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Motion by Legislator Spencer, and second by Legislator Trotta. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***Procedural Motion Number 17 - To set a public hearing for the proposed inclusion of a parcel into an existing Agricultural District – Sagaponack Realty, LLC (SCTM No. 0908-010.00-03.00-001.000). (Sponsor: Pres. Off. Gregory).*** Motion by Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor? Opposed?

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

I'm going to abstain on this.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. I'll make the motion, second by Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yup.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Fifteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***Procedural Motion Number 18 - To set a public hearing for the inclusion of three new parcels – Sylvester Manor Educational Farm Inc. (SCTM Nos. 0700-008.00-01.00-005.005, 0700-008.00-01.00-005.007, 0700-008.00-01.00-005.008) and the disapproval of one parcel – Sylvester Manor Educational Farm Inc. (SCTM No. 0700-008.00-01.00-005.010) into an existing Agricultural District. (Sponsor: Pres. Off. Gregory).*** Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***Procedural Motion Number 19 - To set a public hearing on the Suffolk County Comprehensive Master Plan 2035 (Sponsor: Pres. Off. Gregory).*** Motion by Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Maybe not. Motion by Legislator Krupski, I'll second the motion. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Procedural Motion -- ***Procedural Resolution Number 20 of 2015 - Authorizing public hearing for approval of Ferry License for Beachcomber Freight Service, LLC, d/b/a Coastline Freight (Sponsor: Pres. Off. Gregory).*** Motion -- I'll make a motion, second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***Procedural Resolution Number 21 - Authorizing public hearing for approval of rates for Beachcomber Freight Service, LLC, d/b/a Coastline Freight (Sponsor: Pres. Off. Gregory).*** Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Late starters: I'll make a motion to waive the rules to lay the following resolutions on the table:

I.R. 1513, Ways and Means; I.R. 1514, Government Ops; 1516, Public Works; 1517, Public Works; 1518, Ways and Means; 1519, Public Works.

Set the Public Hearing for June 16th at 6:30 p.m. at Riverhead.

1520, Economic Development; 1521, EPA; 1523, Government Ops; 1524, Public Works; 1525, Public Works. Second by Legislator McCaffrey. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore/Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

That's our agenda. And, oh, before we leave, I'd like to congratulate Legislator Calarco and his wife Laura for their brand new baby boy, Patrick Robert, 8, .36 ounces.

***(Applause)***

**LEG. CALARCO:**

8-3-6, yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

8-3-6. Congratulations.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

That's exactly where I'm going. Thank you, everyone.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. We stand adjourned. Thank you.

*(The meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.)*