

**SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

**GENERAL MEETING**

**Eleventh DAY**

*September 9, 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**

*Taken By Alison Mahoney & Diana Flesher  
Court Stenographers*

*Transcribed by Alison Mahoney, Diana Flesher and Lucia Braaten  
Court Stenographers*

General Meeting 9/9/15

*(\*The following was taken by Diana Flesher, Court Stenographer  
And transcribed by Lucia Braaten, Court Stenographer\*)*

*(\*The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. \*)*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Good evening, everyone. Good evening, Mr. Clerk, or should I say good afternoon?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Good afternoon, Mr. Presiding Officer.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Could you please do the roll call?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sure.

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

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

(No Response)

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Here.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Here.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Present.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Here.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

(No Response)

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Here.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Here.

**LEG. CILMI:**

(No Response)

**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.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Jason?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Here.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Jason?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Jason?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Should I do the roll one more time?

*(Laughter)*

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Let's all please stand for the salute to the flag, led by Legislator D'Amaro.

*(Salutation)*

Please remain standing as Legislator D'Amaro comes up to introduce the Clergy for today. The invocation will be given by Rabbi Susie Heneson Moskowitz of Temple Beth Torah in Meville -- Melville, excuse me, guest of Legislator D'Amaro. Please turn your ringers off on your phone.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. Well, good evening, everyone. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, it's my privilege to introduce to you today our Clergy, Susie, Rabbi Susie Heneson Moskowitz. Rabbi Moskowitz is the Senior Rabbi at Temple Beth Torah in Melville. She's a 1986 graduate of Duke University. Rabbi Moskowitz was also ordained as a Rabbi in 1991 from the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in Cincinnati.

## General Meeting 9/9/15

Rabbi Moskowitz began at Temple Beth Torah in 1996 as Rabbi Educator, and then became Associate Rabbi and Senior Rabbi last year. She's actively involved in numerous aspects of synagogue life, officiating at all services and important life cycle events. Rabbi Moskowitz also teaches adult education, religious and nursery school classes, and she's established a family school, and leads the synagogue in social action projects throughout Suffolk County, particularly in the Wyandanch community.

Rabbi Moskowitz is the immediate past President of the Long Island Board of Rabbis, and has served on the Executive Boards of both the New York Board of Rabbis and the Women's Rabbinic Network. She is also a board member of the Lend a Hand, and a certified yoga teacher. She created the renowned Torah Yoga Service that she has presented at conferences around the country.

Rabbi Moskowitz has two children with her husband, Rabbi Steven Moskowitz, who also serves a congregation in Nassau County. Her daughter, Shira, a recent graduate of the University of Michigan, works in Jackson, Mississippi, and her son, Ari, is a student at Northwestern University, studying abroad in Budapest.

So, Ladies and Gentlemen, please join me in giving a warm welcome to Rabbi Susie Heneson Moskowitz. Thank you.

*(Applause)*

### **RABBI MOSKOWITZ:**

Well, thank you. Thank you, Legislator D'Amaro, for inviting me to join you today. It is really an honor to be here and a joy. I have to say, any organization that serves a meal at 3:30 and calls it dinner makes me really nervous. You guys have a worse schedule than I do.

As you heard, I went to Duke University. So Coach Krzyzewski, Coach K, is an inspiration to me. And I recently heard a story about how he selected members for Team USA. He was coaching the Olympic Basketball Team, and he said he didn't just look for skill, because, of course, there's lots of good players. What he looked for was people with big egos. And what he meant by that was people who knew they could win, people who had confidence, not overinflated, misguided egos, but the right kind, who could really do a good job. And that's what we need today, is belief that we can guide our County, that we can serve our people, and know that we can get the job done. And we are surrounded by people who have that confidence and that skill, and it's a great combination.

But Rabbi Simcha Bunim from the 1800s teaches that each of us should do the act of spiritual balancing; that we should walk with two slips of paper, one in each pocket. One should say, "I am but dust and ashes," and in the other pocket, it should say, "The whole world was created for my sake." And on those days when we're feeling low, and frustrated, and helpless, and the problems of the world seem way too big for us to handle, we're instructed to reach into our pocket and take out the slip that reminds us the whole world was created for our sake. And on those days when we're feeling on top of the world and our egos maybe get a little overinflated, we take out the slip that reminds us "I am but dust and ashes."

It is difficult work that needs to be done to run our County, to serve our people. We'll find that you get criticized more than you deserve, and I hope you get praised a little bit more than you deserve as well.

This act of spiritual balancing helps to keep you focused and grounded.

As the Jewish people enter this period of Rosh Hashana, we are reminded to take stock of our lives; to review the past year and see where we fell short and where we succeeded; to remember when we were kind and when we were hurtful; when we felt balanced and when we felt off-kilter. After this

## General Meeting 9/9/15

personal and communal soul-searching, we are instructed to make amends and to do what is necessary to set us on a better course for the coming year. Only then will we be ready for Yom Kippur, when our task is to make amends, to ask God's forgiveness for our actions. But every day is one in which we are given the opportunity to take stock, to make sure that we are living a meaningful life.

Each person here has pledged to serve our people and to work to build a just society. You have heeded the call to services and know that this means you must get involved. You cannot remain indifferent, you cannot remain indifferent to the plight of humanity.

May this prayer by my colleague, Rabbi Naomi Levy, help to inspire you on your path.

*You have given us a wonderful and horrible world, God. Why? Why is this world so full of beauty and majestic, and, yet, so full of disaster and disease? Why is there abundance and dire poverty, kindness and cruelty? Why do some live in peace while others live in fear and war? Why did you bless us with one hand, God, and then curse us with the other? Please show yourself, God. Help us. Give us the wisdom to eradicate disease, the tools to end hunger, the courage and compassion to overcome hatred and bloodshed. Turn our complacency into action, soften our hardened hearts, transform our despair into hope. Grace us with your presence, God. Teach us how to bless our world with health, abundance, joy and peace. And let us say amen.*

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

Thank you, Rabbi. We certainly have plenty of egos in this business. I don't know if we won any basketball games, but we certainly have egos. But thank you for your words, your kind words.

Please, we're going to remain standing for a moment of silence.

In memory of all the victims of the terrorist attack 14 years ago, September 11th, 2001. Never forget, we are all Americans. No matter how great or how small, every act of patriotism makes the nation stronger. Every act of kindness fills the nation's heart. Every act of service makes the nation more whole. God bless the souls of 9/11. God bless America.

On September 11th, 2013, we lost a true public servant, former Presiding Officer William J. Lindsay. Bill was the longest serving Presiding Officer in the history of this Legislature. He possessed an ability to use common sense during his interactions with his fellow Legislators and constituents, which enabled him to forge a bipartisan consensus in this Legislature on many difficult and contentious issues.

In memory of Robert Smith, father of Legislator Sarah Anker; Albertina Dutra, mother of Lucia Braaten in the Clerk's Office in Hauppauge, Celide Acevedo, mother-in-Law of former Suffolk County Legislative Aide, Marjorie Acevedo; and Paul Sabatino, father of former Suffolk County Chief Deputy County Executive and longtime Legislative Counsel, Paul Sabatino. We extend our heartfelt sympathy and prayers to them and their families.

Let us always remember all those military men and woman who put themselves in harm's way every day to protect our country.

### ***(Moment of Silence)***

Okay. Next, we have several presentations from my colleagues, first being Legislator Cilmi will make a presentation or proclamation.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. It's a delight to be here again today with all of you to share some praise for one of our great County employees. If I could ask Probation Officer James Mahoney to join me at the podium.

As I always say, our Probation Officers are such a critical part of our public safety team here in Suffolk County, and the story I'm about to tell you will exemplify that.

On May 12th of this year, Probation Officer James Mahoney was in the field in Copiague when he saw an individual operating a motor vehicle who he knew had an active felony violation of probation warrant. Probation Officer Mahoney stopped the individual and immediately noticed the smell of alcohol, as well as an open container containing what appeared to be white wine in the vehicle's console. Officer Mahoney subsequently returned to the probationer's residence, where narcotics were discovered. The subject was arrested and charged with a number of felonies. She later admitted to drinking while driving, drinking wine, as well as operating a motor vehicle while taking crack, which she had been taking for a period of time, all while she was pregnant.

It's really heartbreaking, isn't it, to hear that story, somebody would do that?

Officer Mahoney's response and the actions he took thereafter undoubtedly saved lives. While this is not unusual for our Probation Officers, it is always worth recognition. So I am pleased to present to you, Jim, this proclamation on behalf of the entire County Legislature to say thank you for your great work. May you continue to do that work safely and successfully for a very long time to come. God bless.

***(Applause)***

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Great. Thank you, Legislator Cilmi. Before we move on, I have to make an announcement of a public hearing on a Certificate of Necessity that's going to be forthcoming later on in the meeting.

This notice is hereby given that a Local Law entitled a Local Law to protect public safety in Suffolk County parks, I.R. 1751 of 2015, has been introduced in the Suffolk County Legislature, and the public hearing will be held at 6:30 p.m. tonight.

Okay. Next, we have -- Legislator Browning will make several presentations.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Deputy Inspector, would you like to join us, and Linda? So I'm here today to introduce to you Officer Phillip Schoppman. The Suffolk County Legislature wishes to join with the citizens of Suffolk County in recognizing Phillip Schoppman. I'm also joined here by his -- Deputy Inspector Michael Romagnoli, and also Linda Sherlock Rich, who is an instructor for TULIPS, which you'll find out who they are in a minute.

This is World Suicide Prevention Month, and we are here to recognize him for his contributions, Officer Schoppman, to suicide prevention in Suffolk County.

Officer Schoppman created and coordinated a team of trainers known as the TULIPS, which stands for Trainers United on Long Island for the Prevention of Suicide. The team has certified approximately 650 members of the community with skills in suicide prevention or intervention skills. With funding from the Mental Health Association of New York State State, Officer Schoppman created a tool utilized to develop a safety plan when working with suicidal individuals. He also helped to create and coordinate the PEER Support Team for the Suffolk County Police Benevolent

## General Meeting 9/9/15

Association, known as Providing Enforcers Education and Resources, PEER. Officer Schoppman is being honored by the Suicide Prevention Center of New York State as the recipient of the Excellence in Suicide Prevention Award for these efforts.

I think, if I look around the room, I could probably have -- every single one of you will put up your hand and say, "I know someone, I have a family member or a friend" that you have lost to suicide. So I think we all know the importance of suicide awareness.

So Suffolk County does respect Officer Schoppman, his dedication, which exemplifies the very best of Suffolk County's law enforcement, and recognizing suicide as a serious health concern, and establishing prevention as a top priority.

So I want to say a special thank you, Officer Schoppman, for all the work that you have done.

***(Applause)***

Do you want to say something?

### **OFFICER SCHOPPMAN:**

Thank you. The only thing I would say is that I work with a great amount of people that put the energy and effort into making our community safer in the Police Department. And, likewise, I work with other people who take the time as a second job, as a hobby almost, to make sure that if someone that you know has been affected by suicide or yourself, that there's help out there. So I will say I never take the chance to not mention the Suicide Prevention Helpline. No matter who you are or no matter where you are in the United States at this point, there is somebody out there that can give you hope and that can give you help. So if you yourself or someone that you -- that you know or that you love needs help, it is certainly out there. Thank you.

***(Applause)***

### **LEG. BROWNING:**

Thank you. And I have a proclamation for you. So do you want us to come up?

***(Photograph Taken)***

And I have one more. Park Rangers Paul Barbato and Mike Tadeo, if you'd like to come forward. And we did have the -- a surfer, Andrew Becker, right? Did he get -- oh, there you are, if you'd like to come forward. And, Dodd, if you'd like to come forward.

You know, we all look at the surfers and we say they're crazy sometimes out there. My son used to do it. But I can tell you Andrew has definitely -- I have received calls from the Mastic Beach Ambulance that not once, but many times he has assisted in helping in rescues. So, on this particular occasion, it was the evening of Saturday, August 1st, Andrew was out surfing at Smith Point Park and he noticed a distressed swimmer being swept out by a strong rip current. Park Rangers Paul Barbato, who is right here, and Mike Tadeo were on patrol near the Smith Point Park when the call came through the radio about a swimmer in distress. The Park Rangers arrived at the beach, took off their duty belts and immediately went into the water to assist the swimmer. At the same time, Andrew Becker paddled out to the swimmer. With the help of Andrew Becker and Park Rangers Paul Barbato and Mike Tadeo, the swimmer was placed on the surfboard and brought back to shore. The swimmer was evaluated and released by the waiting ambulance.

General Meeting 9/9/15

Suffolk County respects and values the compassion and bravery of Andrew Becker, Paul Barbato and Mike Tadeo, who have responded to the aid of a fellow community member in their time of need. And I think we all know about the rip currents that were occurring this year.

And, again, Andrew, one of the guys in the ambulance company said to me, "You got to do something." Andrew, this not the first time that Andrew has been around, out surfing when someone was in distress and has helped them. So, Andrew, thank you, not once, but many times, for continually being there and helping people out. But make sure you stay safe yourself. Thank you. So I do have proclamations for each of them. Thank you.

**(Applause)**

Dodd, do you want say anything about our Park Rangers?

**MR. AMRHEIN:**

Well, I'd say the Park Rangers are brand new this year since last November, and we -- they're all basically part-time employees, and they've really come up strong in protecting our parks for this summer. Thank you.

**(Applause)**

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you.

**(Applause)**

Okay. Next, we have Legislator Spencer.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer, appreciate it. Today, I'm privileged to be able to recognize Eli Mollineaux, and he's here with his family, and I wanted to also recognize them. This is Eli right here. So Eli's here with his Mom, Ellen, his Dad, Jeffrey. He's also with his brothers, Josh and Sam, who you see sitting right here in the green and blue shirts. And he's also with his close Aide, Eileen, and a family friend, Ro, as well as others.

But Eli has just completed his first week as a freshman at Huntington High School, and he is a miracle. And he is one of the nicest young men you could ever meet. He's got such a vibrant personality. And, in fact, for the last two years, when he was in middle school, Eli has kind of garnered quite a reputation as someone who's very entertaining and quite a comedian.

The interesting thing about Eli is that he has an extremely rare condition called Pearson's Syndrome. And with Pearson's Syndrome, there are less than 100 people in the entire world that have this particular condition. It's a mitochondrial disease, and mitochondria are the organs inside of ourselves that provide energy. And when you have this particular type of condition, you are typically from a baby extremely ill. And so for Eli to be a freshman in high school and to go through all the challenges that are associated with this extremely rare condition is quite remarkable, it's really a miracle. And I think that he may be unique to be one of the few people that have been able to overcome that challenge to make it all the way to high school. So he has a big heart, a big spirit. He is someone that lives with his family in my Legislative District. And one of the things that he's done is that he is creating worldwide awareness. And because of Eli, there are going to be other families who will be confronted with this challenge who may not be aware, and they will maybe discover it a little sooner. They will have hope.

General Meeting 9/9/15

And, Eli, you, in my opinion, are a true hero. So it gives me great pride to recognize you with a proclamation on behalf of all the citizens of Suffolk County for your strength, and your bravery, and your character. Congratulations.

*(Applause)*

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Eli was debating on whether or not he would speak or not. And he said he's good right now. So you do? He does. All right. He changed his mind. Eli.

**MR. MOLLINEAUX:**

What is a dog's favorite button on the T.V. remote?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

What is a dog's favorite button on the T.V. remote? I think I know.

**MR. MOLLINEAUX:**

The "paws" button.

*(Laughter and Applause)*

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Very nice. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Next, we have Legislator Anker, who is going to make a presentation, recognizing Great Strides of Long Island, Inc.

**LEG. ANKER:**

That was lovely, that was very nice. Thank you, Legislator Spencer.

I have here a very special person also. She has been around horses for -- I'm going to let you maybe say just few words, because, I mean, for a long time. My daughter, who is now 23, started taking lessons at Saddle Rock Ranch when she was five. And I think -- were you back at Saddle Rock when she was --

**MS. DELL'AIRA:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yeah. And the camp, there's all kinds of wonderful programs. But what has happened at Saddle Rock Ranch, it has evolved into a true learning center, a supporter of those with disabilities. And I am very proud here to present Julie Dell'Aira for her wonderful work in what she's been doing with the Great Strides Long Island.

Now, this organization was founded in 2009 by Julie and also Marge Goldin, and is a not-for-profit that developed therapeutic riding programs at Saddle Rock Ranch, located in Middle Island.

In 2015, Great Strides was asked to make -- was asked to take over the Community Equestrian Program at the ranch, and they've expended their programs to lessons and therapeutic riding to Veterans programs. Recently, they had a Family Fun Day called Project9Line. And, unfortunately, I wasn't able to make it on that day, but if it's annual, I will be there next year. And, yeah, Julie said they had a great turnout. But, again, we need to think about those who may not have the

## General Meeting 9/9/15

opportunities that we have. And when we have the opportunity to help, we need to do that, and that's exactly what you've been doing.

Julie, I'd like to invite you up here to speak just a little bit about what you've been doing and what Saddle Rock Ranch has been doing to help others in need.

### **MS. DELL'AIRA:**

Thank you, Sarah. Actually, Great Strides was founded to support financially special needs students who couldn't afford to take riding lessons at our therapeutic riding program. This year we were asked to take over running all of the programs, and we've grown our ability to financially support those special needs students. We also finally were able to get a Veterans program started. We have a lot of returning Veterans and their families. They bring their children, they ride for nothing, and get an opportunity to learn new skills together.

So we have lots of good ideas, and we definitely plan to have the Family Fund Day again next year, so I hope we'll see you there.

### **LEG. ANKER:**

Thank you. Let's give her a round of applause. Thank you.

*(Applause)*

I also want to mention, you know, as mentioned before, my father passed away about a month ago, and he's a disabled Navy Veteran. And, you know, having Erica participate with her horseback -- horseback riding lessons, you can really see how the relationship between horses and people can heal, and that's exactly what you've been doing. So, again, I just want to thank you so much. And, again, I'm very proud to present you with a proclamation. Thank you so much, Julie.

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

Okay. Congratulations. Next, we have Legislator Stern, who will recognize someone who is no stranger to the Legislature, and, certainly, committed many decades of valiant and wonderful service. I didn't mean to age you, Jill. You started when you were 10 (Laughter).

### **LEG. STERN:**

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer, and good afternoon to everyone who's with us today. A special presentation to, as the Presiding Officer points out, someone who is no stranger to this Legislature and to Suffolk County Government, Jill Rosen-Nikoloff, who is retiring as our Director of Real Estate.

I know that my colleagues would agree that Jill over the years has always been someone who we've had the opportunity to work with and to go to with questions, who always, always made herself available to all of us so that we understood what was coming before us, and we could make the best informed decision for all of our residents.

And it's very fitting that we are recognizing Jill today. I cannot tell you what a tremendous partner she was when all of us came together to pass, and the County Executive signed, the Housing Our Homeless Heroes Act, which is Suffolk County's effort to help end Veterans' homelessness all throughout Suffolk County. And today before us we are going to have the opportunity to vote on the first of a series of homes that are going to be made available in working in great partnership with so many of the outstanding not-for-profit organizations that serve Veterans and their families to put us on the course where we can say that Suffolk County played a pivotal role in helping to end Veterans' homelessness here in all of our communities.

General Meeting 9/9/15

So, Jill, it's great to have you with us, and we say congratulations on an outstanding career, and thank you for your service to Suffolk County.

**MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

Thank you.

*(Applause)*

So this is a switch for me, I can't think of anything to say. Thank you very much for the acknowledgement and recognition. It's really awfully nice. Really, it impacts me.

And I want to thank you for the opportunity to have worked with you over the years. We have accomplished some good things, and, hopefully, in the future we'll get to do some more in my new role.

But I did want to say one thing, that, you know, nothing gets accomplished without the wonderful professional staff of Suffolk County, particularly the three divisions that I got to lead, Real Estate, Affordable Housing and Community Development. So, hopefully, you'll continue to work with them and be kind and gentle. And, of course, I wanted to thank the County Executive and all of you once again. And I'm sure I'll be seeing you around. Thank you.

*(Applause)*

**LEG. CILMI:**

Mr. Presiding Officer, if I can -- Jill. Jill, I just had to say that you look remarkably relaxed and happy.

*(Laughter)*

**MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

That's because I'm here.

**LEG. CILMI:**

It shows, this glow.

**MS. ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:**

I look this way -- one Tuesday of the month, yeah, I look this way, right. Thank you.

**LEG. STERN:**

Okay. Again, thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer, and to my colleagues. We have another very special presentation on behalf of all of the Legislators that are very ably protected by the outstanding men and woman of the Second Precinct. Perhaps, Legislator Spencer, why don't you go first.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I'm happy to stand with my colleagues and the Huntington Legislators to be able to recognize Inspector Edward Brady. And I appreciate Steve Stern for getting everything together, but I really felt compelled to express some personal feelings about what a privilege it's been to work with Inspector Brady. Inspector Brady in the Second Precinct came -- was Commander at a time where there were a lot of community stressors that were in place, and he is was a calming force. He is an extremely competent, talented lawman. He is leader, but he's also someone that knows how to reach out and connect and to bring people together. And since I've been Legislator, he's always opened his door. He has given me his personal cellphone, he's called me, and he's been such a

valuable resource. And when there was concerns in the community, I've seen Inspector Brady stand in front of a crowd of 100 people that were angry, that were scared, that had questions. And he took his time and he was able to bring calm, he was able to be able to get rid of the confusion, and he does it from his heart. He has called me from his vacation. He has called me when he's been ill. He's taken my calls at all times of the night. And I've tried not to abuse the privilege, but it has been something that I have found to be extremely invaluable. So he is an uncommon individual. And I wish him the best in his retirement, and he'll be sorely missed by me personally and by all the people in of the Eighteenth Legislative District. Thank you.

**INSPECTOR BRADY:**

Thank you, Doc.

*(Applause)*

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I just want to add to that, Doc, I had very similar experience with you, Inspector. And I have to tell you that of all the people that I've met in government in particular, you are a consummate professional.

And I have to say that when I first was elected in 2005, there was a different Commanding Officer in the Second Precinct, and then you came on board and you immediately made us very comfortable with your professionalism. You got an immediate handle on the -- some of the volatile situations that were occurring within the District. And I can -- I cannot stress the level of how much I've been impressed by you being the Commander of the Second Precinct.

You are truly a police officer's police officer, if there ever was one. You will be very much missed. And it's interesting to go into work now and sit in my District Officer, and when an issue arises or something happens, and we always were able to, as Doc mentioned, pick up the phone and call the Inspector and get an immediate handle on what was happening. And also more than just get the facts, but get a level of comfort as to how the situation was being handled, and how the Inspector was right on top of things.

So, as I said, you will be missed. The County owes you a debt of gratitude for the dedication of your entire life, adult life to policing. And I wish you nothing but the very best, and thank you for serving Suffolk County.

*(Applause)*

**INSPECTOR BRADY:**

I appreciate it.

**LEG. STERN:**

As Doc said, a -- you know, a true professional. As Lou had said, the Inspector was always there for us, whether it was to come speak to a group of 1,000 residents in front of an entire community, or even just a couple of people in their living room one evening after a hard day of work to let everybody know that the hardworking men and women of the Second Precinct were on it, and that we could all sleep well that night, because the Inspector and everybody there at the Second Precinct were always looking out for us.

You leave with the Second Precinct, of course, in very good hands. But, as Lou says, you will be sorely, sorely missed, not just for your professionalism, but because, I know my colleagues would agree, in addition to your great professionalism and your outstanding experience, you are also a true gentleman.

General Meeting 9/9/15

And so, on behalf of all of us at the Suffolk County Legislature and my colleagues representing the residents who reside in the Second Precinct, it is my great personal privilege to present this Legislative proclamation to you, Inspector, among all of the other things. And congratulations on your retirement. And we say congratulations to your wife, Laurie, who is here with you today as well. But, most importantly, thank you.

**INSPECTOR BRADY:**

Thank you.

*(Applause)*

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

Okay. Congratulations, on behalf of the Legislature, to Inspector Ed Brady.

Next, I'd like to bring up Legislator Leslie Kennedy. She'll be presenting a proclamation to Moe's Southwest Grill. And I think she'll explain why they're worthy of a preservation -- proclamation.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Ribs? Do we have ribs?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Good afternoon, everybody. After just hearing about marvelous feats in suicide prevention and substance abuse, I have Moe's Grill, and it's a fabulous issue.

I don't know if all of you know, but for years, our Legislative Office has worked on recruiting people to donate blood, because it is a vital resource. And we have developed one particular -- we do eleven fairs and other venues where we go out and spend the whole day hawking and trying to convince young people to give blood, to donate for our future and for our health.

We have one signature blood drive for our County workers, and there, our whole County workforce participates. We have a band from I.T., we have -- that takes their own time and practices on their own time and plays beautifully. We do a barbecue, and we try -- we also do food donations for Long Island Cares if you can't donate blood. We try to be inclusive, and we try to have it as a teaching moment.

Well, in order to have a great extravaganza, you have to go and ask for donations, because we are not rich and we are not well funded. So Moe's Grill came to our aid, along with numerous others, to donate food for the day. It was a marvelous day, but more than a marvelous day. I want to thank our employees for coming and donating. It was a great donation to Long Island New York Blood Services.

Moe's Grill, I'd like to commend them. They are the only ones who had the guts to come to the Suffolk County Legislature to receive their proclamation. So I want to thank Marissa for coming down today, and I want to thank Moe's Grill for their donating.

*(Applause)*

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

Okay. Any other proclamations? That's all I have listed. All right, great.

We're going to move along to our public portion. Each speaker will have three minutes to make their comments known. When I call you, you -- I ask that you come up to the podium, that you state your name for our record. There is a clock here to my right that tells you what -- how much

## General Meeting 9/9/15

time you have remaining. Again, each speaker will have three minutes. I'll announce the speaker and who is on deck as well. So the first speaker will be Hope Sandrow, followed by Maud Kramer.

### **MS. SANDROW:**

I'll speak as soon -- I don't wish my three minutes to start until these papers are distributed. There's different sets.

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

All right. We're going to move along, Hope. So they're going to distribute, and they'll have to distribute while you speak. So I'm going to start the clock and ask that you begin your comments.

### **MS. SANDROW:**

I'm Hope Sandrow. My husband, Ulf, and I are here representing hundreds of people that couldn't take the time away from work to come here and talk to you and tell you that we ask you to veto Resolution 1619 outright, or table it until you've had time to make a site visit. How many of you made a site visit there?

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

Hope, our rules do not allow us to interact with you during the three minutes. So asking question, nobody will be able to answer them, so --

### **MS. SANDROW:**

Okay. Well, I think you should all take that seriously. This is not a local issue. Your constituents drive our roads, commuting to work and visiting our areas every day.

First, I want to thank you for the road improvements on Montauk Highway and North Road you authorized three years ago, as those changes have made us safer. It was worth the hundreds of thousands of dollars that it cost our County. Why me and my neighbors protest the changes proposed in this resolution, and we're wondering why you spent the hundreds of thousand dollars just a few years ago when you told us that these were going to be perfect roads, and now you're tell us that they're not perfect, and that more money should be spent to change them.

I'm a visual artist, this is not my business. I don't profit from whether this resolution passes or fails. My works are in the collection at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Whitney Museum of Art, and the -- yeah, the Whitney, the Modern and the Met. Among other museums in the country, I've traveled doing site-specific projects. I'm very aware of how to analyze areas and decide what the solutions are. That's why I know that this resolution is wrong for our neighborhood, and it's our neighborhood that will suffer, and that's what our group is here telling you, we're experts.

My husband and I have had a house on Montauk Highway for forty years. It's a T-intersection. Our driveway is the T-intersection you're proposing to enter onto Montauk Highway, and we can tell you, it's a dangerous situation. We like the road changes that you authorized three years ago on North Road.

We want to retain full access to the Eastern Canal that we have enjoyed frequenting the businesses that have been there. It's the same proposal that's being made to the CPI rehabilitation that we'll have access to, except it won't be on the water. Our Town has lost and the County have lost tax revenue all these years the Rechlers have owned the properties.

There's a lot more to be said, it's in those papers, and I do hope you'll take it seriously as I -- you take me seriously professionally as I take you.

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

Okay. Thank you. Hope is followed by Maud Kramer. Maud Kramer is followed by Kevin McAllister.

**MR. KRAMER:**

Okay. I strongly object to the transfer of County-owned land to the Town of Southampton, assisting private developers with their maritime plan developments. The Supervisor and the Town Board voted to rezone against the expertise of the Planning Department, the majority of the residents, and already adopted comprehensive guidelines regarding development, preserving the rural and the historic character of our community. Allowing a development that is conditioned upon obtaining County land in order to fit the proposed community benefit of five parking places with a long walkway to the canal was willfully wrong. Five parking places in a town of 25,000 residents and the huge influx of summer residents is a poke in the eye, and I find it insulting. Disregarding costly and accepted master plans that stated public use and benefit to this area, the Southampton Town government is again serving graciously the developers of record with increased future profits and unheeding the public, to which it falsely swears to represent.

For the County to transfer land to the Town of Southampton in order for the Town to transfer this very same land to a developer for increased profit and high rates of investments is a sweetheart deal. Has the County of Suffolk done this before? Is this a precedent to establish for future towns and developers to use for increased profit?

The false and strident calls of public benefit ring hollow when motives questionable in the most visible terms. The parcels should not be transferred, given or sold to a developer for profit. The developer has to spend money for road improvements just by building the developments. And I question the value of the parcels, that they match the money the developers intend to spend.

A lawsuit has been filed as of May 2015 challenging the Town's decision to rezone and the transfer of County land. So for the County to consider transferring property to the Town before the ruling, whether the transfer is legal, I find it hasty and premature. There are numerous public safety and traffic concerns with the reconfiguration of the roads, and this is also an issue of quality of life for residents, and especially for the people that live in that area.

To eliminate a precedent, an outright denial should be the action choice. I urge you to put politics aside and search for the common sense that we -- that I heard earlier and reject the transfer of lands. Tabling the resolution is at the very least the minimum action which should be taken, and visiting the area before a decision is made is important. This is a highly trafficked area, and utmost care as to safety, congestion, pollution and other significant impacts has to be taken into consideration.

My motive to come here to speak to you today is strictly to preserve -- I fight to preserve the rural and historic character of my community. I'm an architect, I'm an interior designer, landscape designer, and my vision for the Town is to have less of the congestion and less of the density. I really hope that you outright reject the resolution and the transfer. Thank you.

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

Thank you, Maud. Kevin McAllister is next, followed by Thomas -- I'm not sure. This is -- I can't read the handwriting -- has to do with handgun seizure. Whoever is Thomas is the next speaker.

**MR. McALLISTER:**

Good afternoon, Legislators. I hope you had an enjoyable August, and welcome back. My name is Kevin McAllister of Defend H2O. I've been before you many times on water issues. Today I'm here to speak to you about the downtown Montauk shoreline armoring project, known as the reinforced

dune by the Army Corps of Engineers.

If you recall, back in the spring, you supported the measure to enter into cosponsorship with the Town of East Hampton for maintenance fees associated with keeping a veneer of sand over the top of this structure, as well as some other augmentations associated with the structure. That agreement, as I understand it, the intermunicipal agreement is still pending based on some legal issues to the property easements. With that said, this is an opportunity to bring forward to your attention new developments in that project.

Over the course of the summer, it was disclosed and it became quite a significant issue within East Hampton, the Army Corps, the DEC, "Oh, my, we didn't look at stormwater considerations." This is 3100 linear feet, which equates to basically a wall. So the retention of stormwater from the uplands was going to be problematic, a flooding scenario for certainly the properties, the developed properties seaward of this structure.

After going around to consider a very expensive stormwater project, it was decided that the easiest means was to actually create a gap in this 3100 linear feet of wall, ultimately allowing for the release of stormwater as it built up, and also to stay the flooding of storm surge with the stockpile of 250 cubic yards of sand.

I submit to you that SEQRA -- it was not SEQRA. State Environmental Quality Review Act was deficient in as far as not looking at stormwater implications was the structure. DEC had approved this, they neg dec'd this project.

This new development, I will tell you, as a coastal expert who has considerable experience in shoreline management with my work and academics in South Florida, having a gap in this structure could be a colossal failure to this structure and have significant implications. So I implore this Legislature, please, take the opportunity why this -- I guess the municipal agreement has not been fully consummated to put this back, place this back into committee to have the factual information come forward to you to reevaluate this. You could be embarking down a road that could be quite costly. It's your fiduciary responsibility as Legislators to ensure that the taxpayers of this County are not on the hook for a colossal mistake, which I argue is the case in this particular scenario.

So, please, revisit this project, revisit your commitment, because, again, you are setting yourself up for a potential liability. And I will just leave you with this: If you recall, Mr. Gil Anderson, he came before you, and when pressed by Mr. Krupski, ultimately acknowledged that costs could run around a million dollars associated with the County and with this gap that could be significantly higher. Thank you.

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

Thank you, Mr. McAllister. Our next speaker is a retired Police Officer. Thomas, I wish I could read your handwriting on your last name, but you know who you are, please step forward. Thomas will be followed by Helen Dale Nicholl.

**MR. FREEMAN:**

Thank you very much. I appear before you reluctantly, even though I've been here a number of times as a 100% Vietnam disabled Veteran. I've been here for a number of Veteran affairs, and for all Veterans, I thank you very much for the activity.

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

Could you state your last name, sir?

**MR. FREEMAN:**

Freeman, F-R-E-E-M-A-N. I am a resident of the Town of Huntington. I'm a retired Police Patrol Bureau Commander from Southern California. When I retired, I left my handgun, my duty gun, the only gun I ever carried as a police officer in California, because, from time to time, I had to return there to qualify with that firearm to maintain my concealed weapon permit that was issued by the City of Redondo Beach.

In November of last year, after the death of my best friend, best man at my wedding, and the Range Master of the Redondo Beach Police Department, I traveled to his funeral, I picked up my duty gun and I brought it back. I went to the Suffolk County Police Department Pistol Bureau in 2014, November, and presented the gun to have it added to my already current concealed weapon permit issued by Suffolk County. I also possessed what is known as an HR218 LEOSA card, which is a concealed weapon permit for all jurisdictions in the United States. I was informed by the officer at the time that he seized the handgun that I was in violation of both Suffolk County Law and New York State Law in that I could not bring a gun into Suffolk County unless it was shipped in by a Federal Firearm Licensee to another Federal Firearm Licensee.

I read the law verbatim, this is Federal Law, referred to as HR218 as a Federal Law first enacted in 2004 that allowed qualified Law Enforcement Officers and qualified Separated from Service Law Enforcement Officers to carry a concealed firearm in any jurisdiction in the United States, regardless of any state or local law to the contrary. The police officer informed me that Suffolk County is not subject to Federal Law. He still has my gun, he's had it for ten months. I've had it.

I spoke with some Legislators on this matter, and their Chiefs of Staff intervened and tried to ask questions and find out what's going on with it, and the suggestion that comes back is to get my gun back, I'm going to have to litigate. You do not want to visit upon the taxpayers of Suffolk County litigation with these facts. That's insane. The law is the law, and you have a police officer saying that Suffolk County is not subject to that law. Suffolk County is not subject to the Second Amendment of the Constitution, the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution, the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution?

***(Applause)***

It's not "Suffolk Country". I want to my gun back. You've had it for ten months. And I'm telling you now, that if you decide to intercede, you are not in any way interfering with a criminal investigation. My gun was seized because there is a sentence in the handbook of the concealed weapon permit that says if you bring a gun into Suffolk County, it has to be by a Federal Firearm Licensee.

You all have tablets. Real quick, type in that search engine "Handgun Thefts, FedEx, UPS," and guess what, I got about a 50% chance. I brought that gun into New York on JetBlue Airlines. I was vetted at Long Beach Airport by the Department of Homeland Security, I was vetted again at JFK by the Department of Homeland Security, and Suffolk County is not subject to Federal Law.

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

Mr. Freeman, your time is up, you'll have to wrap up. Thank you.

**MR. FREEMAN:**

Thank you very much.

***(Applause)***

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

Okay. Next up is Helen Dale Nicholl. Forgive me if I mispronounce these names. James Campbell is on deck.

**MS. NICHOLL:**

Elected Legislators, I'm Helen Dale Nicholl from Shinnecock Hills.

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

You have to press the button.

**MS. NICHOLL:**

Sorry. Is that better? Okay. I'm Helen Dale Nicholl from Shinnecock Hills, I'm also a taxpayer in Lindenhurst. I am against Resolution 1619-2015 for the reasons already stated, including public safety. But I wish to talk about how unpopular the project that prompted this resolution is, how the public outcry has been ignored by our local government, and how I hope it will not be ignored by our County Government. But for the CPI MPDD, there would be no need for this resolution.

The Town of Southampton has dismissed the local public outcry, which is ten to one against this project, by belittling three significant petitions by claiming anybody can sign a petition. Well, let's look at who these anybodies are: 1,366 individuals from the Town of Southampton have gone on record as being opposed to this project, either through speaking at public meetings, writing, emailing or signing petitions. Only 133 have come out for it by the same means. In addition, 1,039 individuals from New York City, Nassau County and the rest of Suffolk County, your constituents, have signed a petition against putting townhouses on the east side of the Shinnecock Canal. None from this group are for it. Another 973 individuals from outside the immediate area had signed a petition against this project. Many of these were tourist who signed in person a local petition while visiting the Shinnecock Canal. The total recorded opposition is 3,378 against versus 113 for. The opposition is not silent. There is little support for the change in zone.

The supporters claim a new CPI will bring tourists, but there is little evidence of that. If it were a tourist attraction, it would not have become the dump it has been for the last forty years. No tourist signed the "Save the CPI" petition, but almost 1,000 signed petitions against it. More importantly, no MPDD is necessary to rebuild the CPI, it is just a ruse.

With regard to petitions and their value, last year, because of online petitions, a Japanese politician made an unprecedented public apology for shouting sexist remarks; a kidnapped Turkish journalist was released in Syria; a nine-year-old boy in the U.S. saved his local public library, and a teenager persuaded Coca Cola to remove a harmful ingredient from all of its products worldwide, this through online petitions. Politicians, governments and corporations all over the world are heeding the will of the people as expressed through online petitions, but the Town Supervisor of Southampton, New York dismisses their value because anybody can sign them. That's just the point. In the internet age, petitions are exactly how we voice our opinions.

The fate of the CPI MPDD is now in the courts, but no matter how that turns out, to give away valuable public land for such an unpopular project would be a travesty, some might say irresponsible in light of the potential 170 million dollar shortfall in the County budget.

Please vote no to this ill-conceived proposal. And I thank you so much for your time. I will leave you all of those petitions, my analysis of them. If you need to talk to me, I'm available. All my contact information is here. Thank you.

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

Okay. Thank you. Our next speaker is James Campbell. James will be followed by Tracy Garrison-Feinberg.

**MR. CAMPBELL:**

Hi. James Campbell. I live at 18 Maidstone Lane in Hampton Bays, New York, I have a house there. I'm also president of the Shinnecock Neighbors Group, which is behind the lawsuit to stop the MPDD. I do -- my house is in the neighborhood directly impacted by the proposed road changes, and also by the wastewater being pumped uphill into our neighborhood. But what I'd like to talk -- what I'd like to spend my time doing here today is actually making an ask of you. Unfortunately, it's not an easy ask, and it's for you to do your own homework, to ignore the politics around this in the spin that is being put around it and go visit the site, if you can, preferably on a weekday morning or a weekday evening, and try and envision the impact on an already bad traffic problem that these T-intersections will impact.

And the transfer of the Suffolk County land to the Town, to the Rechlers is what will achieve this.

I also encourage you to read the actual MPDD and the lawsuit that's around challenging it, and also the comprehensive plan for the Town of Southampton. If you do your own homework, I am confident you'll come to the same place that the Southampton Planning Board came to and actually opposed these changes. They came to it for very specific reasons. One was these changes run contrary to the Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Southampton. It makes an already dense -- the densest hamlet in the Town of Southampton denser, and it changes the historic Shinnecock Canal from a recreational water-based activity to private residential development. And the key to this all is the transfer of the County land to the Town of Southampton so they can pass it along to the Rechlers.

I urge you, do your own homework and come to the right conclusion. Thank you.

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

Okay. Next up is Tracey Garrison-Feinberg, followed by Jason Beck.

**MS. GARRISON-FEINBERG:**

Thank you, and good evening. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you just little bit this evening, at the invitation of Legislator Steve Stern, and of Jason Beck, who will follow me. He is an intern where I work. I am the Director of the Claire Friedlander Educational Institute at the Holocaust Memorial and Tolerance Center of Nassau County. So I am not a resident or an employee of Suffolk County, but I am your neighbor. And as the Holocaust Memorial and Tolerance Center of Nassau County, we actually do service the entire Island. And we have had many, many visitors from Suffolk County, both from temples and synagogues, as well as schools.

I have some information to share with each of the Legislators that I will distribute. I'm also a former social studies teacher, so I like to photocopy in color. So you should end up with four pieces of paper about the programs that we do.

Let me extend an open invitation to you, your families, your children, your nieces, your nephews, your grandchildren, your friends and your constituents to come see us at the Holocaust Memorial and Tolerance Center of Nassau County. We were founded in 1992 by a group of Holocaust survivors from across the Island who felt compelled and passionate about not only telling their own experiences in surviving the Holocaust, but in teaching the lessons that are still with us today.

And as I'm sure you're aware, it has been a very interesting year, both locally as well as internationally. And our key mission has remained to teach the lessons and the legacies of the Holocaust through tolerance and awareness, through anti-bullying programs, through having young

## General Meeting 9/9/15

people come and sit and listen to the experiences of people who survived amazing trauma.

One of my great pleasures is I get to work with young people still. I am a classroom teacher by heart. And one of those young people came to me this summer and wanted to volunteer, and he has an interest in researching and documenting extremism, both locally and internationally, and he's going to follow me. He's next up on your docket, his name is Jason Beck, and he has already begun to enrich the materials we have at the Holocaust Center.

So let me just say again, thank you for having us here today, and please, please, please, come visit us at the center in Glen Cove.

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

Okay. Next up is Jason Beck, followed by Jennifer Juengst.

### **MR. BECK:**

Good evening to everyone. My name is Jason Beck. I am currently a senior at Syosset High School, which is in Nassau County. However, I lived in Suffolk County for the first half of my life, so I'm very connected to this area.

I am currently interning at the Holocaust Memorial and Tolerance Center with Mrs. Garrison-Feinberg, as previously stated, in Glen Cove. In addition to this, I am a blogger on an international blog that is collecting information on acts of xenophobia in -- predominantly in Western Europe, but also internationally.

Now, for me, xenophobia is a very important and interesting subject for me, because I believe that this common thing that is not just common in Western Europe and mostly democratic countries, but also in the United States, is completely antithetical to our entire American system of democracy and equality. And because of this, it is one of my -- one of my goals in life to help gather information and spread it to everyone about how much -- how common xenophobia is, not just internationally, but locally as well.

So I did some -- in the past week, I've done some research on acts of xenophobia in Suffolk County. And one of the largest minority populations in Suffolk County in recent years is Central American immigrants who have come from Central America to come and work. And not coincidentally, there's been a lot of difficulty they've faced. A recent study by the FBI said that in the past four years, there's been a 40% rise in hate crimes on Long Island directed towards Latinos. This is exemplified by a recent accident in which a racist gang, known as the Caucasian Crew, stabbed Ecuadorian immigrant Marcelo Lucero in 2008. This is not an uncommon thing. Many studies, including a Spanish-speaking journalist from the Southern Poverty Legal Corporation, went to Suffolk County, interviewed hundreds of Central American immigrants and said that in their daily lives, more than half of them are subject to constant abuse.

And why I'm coming here today is because I believe that in the 21st Century America, this should not be a continuing part of our lives. This is something that, as I said, is contradictory and antithetical to our way of life, and something that should be brought into the public view. So why I come here today is to help raise awareness for these issues that are not just internationally, not just nationally, but locally. These issues are common and they affect all of us, no matter if -- no matter what race, ethnicity, creed or anything that we are, it is something that as -- because we are all the same species, something that all of us fact together.

So I thank you for having me here. I really hope you consider doing some more research and helping to combat xenophobia on Long Island and in Suffolk County. Thank you.

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

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Beck. Next up is Jennifer Juengst, followed by Wilkins Young.

**MS. JUENGST:**

Good afternoon, Legislators, Presiding Officer. Again, I'm here to ask you to either veto or table 1619 of 2015.

I was dismayed at the committee meeting held last week about a number of things that were spoken about. One of them seemed to be that people think that this a local issue, a zoning issue for the Town of Southampton. Anyone who lives on Long Island in Suffolk County and travels east knows how important to the tourist industry Southampton and Montauk are, and there's only two ways to get there, well, three if you can afford a helicopter. But, in any event, there are people from all over the world who travel here, and Suffolk County is inviting them onto these roads, two of which are County 39 -- County Road 39 and 80, which is Montauk Highway. This is the narrowest location for getting across into this area where people want to travel. The impacts are going to be devastating to tourism. You need to get this right. It doesn't have to be done today. Time is not of the essence here, a clock is not ticking.

Where was the proof? So far, we've seen nothing. I wrote a very long letter to each of you showing you how underperforming the SEQRA record was on the issue of traffic. It was sad to see that we have a developer who's willing to come here and does not care to put -- put forward the right foot and put a traffic signal in, despite the fact the County is asking him to. I don't know if that situation has changed; maybe we'll hear something later about it.

Also, there was no study done of a critical intersection. Old Country -- Old -- it's called Old Canoe Place Road, excuse me, and there's a neighborhood in there, and it also contains an exit and an entrance to the Hampton Maid Inn. That wasn't studied at all. These people are going to be stopped dead in traffic just trying to get in and out of their own neighborhood.

The Supervisor explained to you, in response to I think two questions, that this project will proceed regardless of whether or not the County turns over these parcels. That's wrong, and that's subject to the lawsuit as it is. And I have explained that in detail to a letter to one of your Legislators, and I'll put it in the record in case the rest of you would like to read it. These conditions -- these changes to the roads, as well as the public benefits, were made a condition of the legislation that was approved to make this PDD. If they don't meet the conditions, they don't get their permits, it doesn't go forward.

Land is precious on the East End, we all know that. There was a comment in a local paper today by the Supervisor of Southampton saying they were going to create a park on the east side of the canal. There's no park being built here. It is a strip of land to build a walkway. If you're serious about a park, make it parkland. Most bridges keep the land that abuts bridgements into parkland, so that the public can have access to it, and the municipality that needs to take care of it can. I'd urge you to reconsider, there are other alternatives. Thank you for your time.

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

Okay. Thank you, Miss Juengst. Wilkins Young is next, followed by Susan vonFreddi.

**MR. YOUNG:**

Good afternoon, Legislators. My name is Wilkins Young. I'm Director of Suffolk County United Veterans, and we provide supportive services for homeless Veterans, and we're a project of the Association of Mental Health and Wellness, and Michael Stoltz is our Executive Director.

General Meeting 9/9/15

I am here today to thank you guys for your continuing effort in order to end homeless Veterans -- end homelessness among the Veteran population in Suffolk County. I want to thank you guys for your allowing us three properties that we can build some houses on that can allow affordable housing for homeless Veterans. One will be located in Medford, where our intent is to home four -- house four homeless Veterans that are in need of supportive services, and the second one is going to be on Randall Street in Riverhead, which is a three bedroom, which we want to house a family Veteran that needs supportive housing. And our last one would be in Mastic Beach, where we have a four bedroom, where it's going to be for senior Veterans that have disabilities. That way we figure that that situation, we can cover all three areas of what we find that has been an ongoing problem with housing Veterans, you know, the senior Veterans, the family Veterans, and the individual Veterans.

We'd also like to thank Legislator Cilmi for his proposal for the Veterans, Helping Our Veterans Bill, because that would allow the Veterans that have a representative down at DSS that can help them fight through the maze that they often encounter during their stay, trying to get it there. I, myself, have been in the business of dealing with DSS and working with homeless Veterans, and have extended knowledge of the system, and I, myself, find it difficult at times to figure out what door to go through and what door not to go through. So I can only imagine the frustration that those that go down there and don't have the knowledge to go through things that they need to go through in order to get the success. So this bill would allow someone to be present at DSS, be a Veteran representative, have vast knowledge of what the process is, and make the whole process easier for the Veteran.

Again, I'd like to thank you all for all your services and help in making sure that we don't have any homeless Veterans in Suffolk County.

**(Applause)**

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

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

All right, thank you, Mr. Young. Next up is Susan Von Freddi.  
Susan is followed by Bruce King.

**MS. VON FREDDI-GASSMAN:**

Hi. I'm wearing two hats tonight, so I'm going to start off with my first one. My name is Susan Von Freddi-Gassman and as a member of the Suffolk County Downtown Revitalization Board, I would like to ask all of you that you approve IR 1728-2015, allocating and appropriating funds in round 13 of the Suffolk County Downtown Revitalization Grant Applications. We received many great applications this year. The Committee recommends that the applications by approved with the allocation of \$500,000. These grant funds will enable Suffolk County communities to greatly improve their downtowns. Please vote yet for IR 1728. Thank you.

Additionally, my other hat -- I'll repeat my name again, it's Susan Von Freddi Gassman and I'm here to speak in support of IR 1619. The issue regarding 1619 is not about an MPDD project along the Shinnecock Canal that was approved unanimously by the Southampton Town Board this past year after a five-year process. It is about road safety. Numerous traffic studies on the eastern end of Hampton Bays have been done showing the need for safety improvements. The suggested plans to realign North Road and Newtown Road are major safety improvements for all who travel on Montauk Highway.

## General Meeting 9/9/15

I've lived in Hampton Bays since 1963, and I'm a business owner on Main Street since 1973. I'm speaking to you as a local resident and a business owner. Revitalizing my community is paramount to me. I have served on the Suffolk County Downtown Revitalization Committee for nine years. I sit on the Southampton Business Advisory Council and the Hampton Bays Economic Development Committee. I am currently the President of the Hampton Bays Beautification since 2009, and served as Vice-President from 1997 until 2007. I have been involved in the planning and revitalization of our community, Hampton Bays, for over 20 years. I grew up in Hampton Bays and I care deeply about what happens to my community. We are a community of about 13,600 residents which doubles at least that much in the summer.

You are hearing from a small group of people who are against this project from the very beginning and are willing to do anything to try and stop it. IR 1619 was assigned to the Legislature Public Works Committee on August 31st; the five-member committee voted 5 to 0 to recommend it for approval. The fact that the County suggested this realignment with the DPW of these two roads and the developers have agreed to pay approximately \$1.5 million for the improvements is an example of public and private cooperation.

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

Susan, your time is up, if you could wrap up very quickly.

### **MS. VON FREDDI-GASSMAN:**

The benefit to the community outweighs the concerns of a few. Please do not table this, let's get it over with. Please approve IR 1619 and thank you very much.

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

Okay, next we have with Bruce King. Bruce will be followed by Nancy Marr.

### **MR. KING:**

Good afternoon. My name is Dr. Bruce King. Like Susan, I'm a long-term resident of Hampton Bays; I've actually been there longer than she has. I am speaking to issue IR 1619, a project to realign two roads with Montauk Highway in Hampton Bays.

I'm the past President of the Hampton Bays Civic Association and I've been involved with many, many community building projects and school projects for the past quarter of a century in Hampton Bays. This project is not about building town houses, it's not about rebuilding the Canoe Place Inn, it's about traffic safety, it's about making it safer. Two roads, North Sea Road -- I'm sorry, North Road and Newtown Road meet Montauk Highway on both sides of the canal. They don't meet in a safe way; the way it was designed by Suffolk County several years ago, but it turns out not to be the best design. They need a new design.

I'm asking you to please support IR 1619 for the safety in my community, Hampton Bays. This project is good for Hampton Bays, it's going to help Hampton Bays and I'd like to see it voted on today and moved forward. Thank you very much.

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

Okay. Thank you, Mr. King. Next up is Nancy Marr, followed by Lars Clemensen.

### **MS. MARR:**

I am speaking today as Vice-President of the League of Women Voters of Suffolk County for the public hearing regarding the sale of John J. Foley Center. My name is Nancy Marr and I have been here before about the Foley Center, but I'm speaking now regarding the possible sale of the John J. Foley Center.

## General Meeting 9/9/15

We urge the County to consider the many unmet needs in the County that could be met by the sale of the facility to Brookhaven Memorial Hospital, a local, well-regarded institution that has made an offer to purchase the building. Although their offer is lower than that made by Ken Rozenberg for Centers Health Care, the hospital would be in a position to move its Hemodialysis Program and Transitional Care into the facility as soon as the building is renovated without having to wait for State licensing, as Mr. Rozenberg would have to do.

The hospital is proposing that it bring to the facility many outpatient services that would help meet the New York State guidelines, restructuring Medicaid and reducing emergency care use. They propose increased out-patient services, including primary and pediatric care, veteran services, treatment of patients with chemical dependency, adult day-care, sleep programs, wellness programs, and possibly Medicaid assisted living in the future.

There is no doubt that there is a need for more comprehensive outpatient services that could reduce the cost of chronic disease and emergency care. The hospital is requesting a 90-day period to allow them to assess the structural problems. The County will have to apply to Brookhaven Town for a zoning change and the State will have to approve a Certificate of Need. We hope the choice of purchaser will be the local organization that will hire locally and be familiar with local needs. Thank you.

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

Okay. Thank you, Nancy. Lars Clemensen is up, followed by George Hoffman.

### **MR. CLEMENSEN:**

Good evening. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Lars Clemensen. I, too, am a resident of Hampton Bays and, like Bruce and Susan, grew up in Hampton Bays, but not quite as long; not for lack of trying, I'm just in my 30's, so. I currently serve as the Superintendent of Schools in Hampton Bays, and that's who I am speaking on behalf of this evening.

I am speaking in favor of IR 1619-2015. In the past at Southampton Town Hall, I've spoken numerous times in favor of the Canoe Place Inn PDD. When taken in whole, the project will yield nearly four times the tax revenue to my school district than those parcels do today while sending less than three students to school. I've spoken in favor of this project bringing jobs, both through construction and in the long-term to the families in my community, and have spoken about the project being a catalyst for further economic growth and development in the hamlet. As a school district, Hampton Bays is valued at less than 10% of the Town's total assessment, yet we educate more than 25% of its children. Our tax rate per 1,000 is the highest in the Town of Southampton, yet our per pupil expenditure is the least. For all these reasons, the PDD is important to us and IR 1619 is a critical component of that.

As Susan said, this is only partially about the PDD. It goes beyond the unanimous and bipartisan support by the Southampton Town Board and numerous community organizations. It's an example of intergovernmental and public/private partnerships, a smart way to handle surplus property at the gateway of the south fork -- to the south fork. The road alignments that will result from this cooperation will support the numerous studies and pragmatically provide safety on both sides of the canal. Taken altogether, the road realignment and the PDD project has the potential to revolutionize for the better the economic health and the future of Hampton Bays, while still preserving our marine environment and our maritime tourist way of life.

On behalf of the Hampton Bays Board of Education, I close by saying thank you again for the opportunity. I appreciate your support of IR 1619 for the benefit of Hampton Bays. Thank you.

***Applause***

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

Thank you, Mr. Clemensen. Next up is George Hoffmann, followed by Jay Goldman.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Good evening, everyone. My name is George Hoffman and I'm with the Setauket Harbor Task Force. We're a group of local residents that are working to improve water quality and the marine environment in Setauket Harbor and in Port Jefferson Harbor. And I'm here this evening to speak in support of IR 1661 which would ban the sale of microbeads in personal care products because of the dangers that it provides in terms of our fish and our waterways.

This would be really helpful to us. As you know, the microbeads now, we're starting to -- you know, they're showing up in our lakes and our streams and our harbors and our bays. It's really damaging to the fish. Eventually, because of the food chain, it will probably end up in humans as well, so this is really an important, you know, legislation. You know, Suffolk County has a really proud history of being in the forefront of environmental legislation, I think this is really important. I think if we adopt this, it would also help, maybe prod our State officials to also pass a similar bill for a Statewide ban.

Last year, if you know, there was a similar ban to this one. It was adopted by the State Assembly, but there was a lot of push back by industry representatives and it was never acted on in the Senate. There were some issues about can you do a biodegradable microbead, but it started to bog down. Nobody really knew what a biodegradable microbead was and they didn't even know how long it would take to biodegrade in our lakes and streams. So I'm hoping that you would adopt this resolution, and I want to thank you for all the work you've done to help us protect our drinking water. Thank you very much.

*Applause*

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

Thank you, Mr. Hoffman. Next up is Jay Goldman, followed by Stephan Ruth.

**MR. GOLDMAN:**

Good evening, everyone. I wanted to stand up here and show support for IR 1624, proposed by Legislator Cilmi, the Helping our Veterans Bill which was based largely on my Father who has been applying for Medicaid. He is a Marine Corps Combat Veteran who was looking for assistance on Medicaid after being rescued from the Philippines by the U.S. State Department.

As it stands right now, typically veterans who are applying for chronic Medicare, long-term cases, Medicaid/long-term cases -- because of the complexity due to their issues, oftentimes because of combat-related -- can take anywhere from nine months to one year. It took us about three months through the help of the State Department to rescue him from the Philippines. So after that was done, we actually were facing a much longer battle just getting him the care that he needs and the care that he deserves. He's currently at the Long Island State Veterans Home in the Dementia Unit and will need long-term care for the rest of his life.

This bill will provide not only an expedited system and dedicated rep at DSS, but it will also provide the same level of care, the same level of compassion that my Father received for any other veteran that's looking for chronic Medicare cases. The veterans that are coming back now are coming back at a greater number than seen in this -- in previous memory, and with the influx of them, the DSS is going to be faced with the challenge of having many Medicaid applications. Because of this, the veterans applications are going to take even longer, a year, year-and-a-half to get approved. With this expedited system, it takes the pressure off of the family members and the stress of having to deal with it.

## General Meeting 9/9/15

So I just want to thank Legislator Cilmi for his continued advocacy for our vets. And if we did not have a community standing behind my family with this, my Father's application would still be in limbo. And whether or not a family has the social network or the influence to afford that type of advocacy, every single veteran coming back should have a dedicated rep and should be given the same amount of care and compassion that they have given to our country. So I support 1624 and urge each and every one of you to support this bill. Thank you.

### ***Applause***

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

Thank you, Mr. Goldman. Next up is Stephan Ruth followed by Hector Gavilla.

#### **MR. RUTH:**

Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen. As God brings me here before you tonight, it is my understanding that 14 of the 16 of you voted in favor of the traffic cameras, one Legislator declined to vote. I also know that all of you know about the County's financial situation, and knowing that they're almost \$2 billion in debt, you voted for the traffic cameras. In doing so, you opened the door. You opened the door to government choosing revenue, precedence over safety. Had you done your due diligence, you would have seen all of the corruption and manipulation associated with the camera companies and local governments. You as Legislators to us the people are our last line of defense from corruption and manipulation, as well as our constitutional rights being taken from us.

In this case, you failed us as your people, your constituents and your friends, with the exclusion of John Kennedy and Rob Trotta. Unfortunately, unlike us other less important decisions, in this circumstance innocent lives were lost and we're just beginning to pick up the pieces. So when you go home tonight think about this, because right now I'm working on behalf of my God showing my son not to accept injustice and to fight for those whose lives were lost and to fight for those who cannot defend themselves to make this right again.

I just finished some time on the Gomez Show where we discussed the false scientific premise which supports the Red Light Program in Suffolk County. We discussed the need for transparency and scientific oversight for the red light programs. Oversight would have led to Professor Alexei Maradudin of U.C. Irvine, California, who indicated, *The equation used by traffic engineers to justify short, yellow lights is not valid when used in this way.* The law of man does not discredit Newtons Law of Motion. Suffolk County Traffic Light Law does not follow the rule of Physics; it needs to be examined and changed as lives are in the balance. Thank you.

### ***Applause***

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

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ruth. Next up is Hector Gavilla, followed by Michael Fulton,

#### **MR. GAVILLA:**

Hello. My name is Hector Gavilla, I'm a resident of Dix Hills and I oppose the red light cameras. There are unintended consequences as to your ruling last year to extend it to 2019. As a result, yes, it has changed behaviors, but what has it done more is it's caused people to stop short at yellow lights and become very anxious when they're approaching the light. What you're doing is you're not punishing bad drivers, what you're doing is you're punishing for people for not knowing when exactly the light is going to turn red. I've been driving since 1988 and I will tell you, and nobody in this room will be able to tell you when exactly that light is going to turn red.

## General Meeting 9/9/15

Now, my very good friend who is a State Assemblyman, Chad Lupinacci -- I think a lot of you know him -- he introduced a bill a few years ago to install counters at each intersection that would literally count down from 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, and you'll know exactly when it turns red. So if you're interested in safety, that's the solution.

And by the way, this is not a new idea. They already do this in Europe and some other countries, and someone told me recently that in some intersections in Nassau County they implemented the counters. And that is a much safer way, when all drivers know exactly when that light will turn red.

So what I'm asking you to do today is repeal the red light camera, because it doesn't work and it's not going to provide the revenue. Because another change in behavior that I am telling all my friends and all your constituents is to stop -- don't make rights on red, they don't have to. Don't necessarily go through the red lights. We don't want anyone causing accidents, but they may stop at the yellow light and there will be a reduction in the red light tickets, so the revenues will be down. Okay? So what I'm asking you to do is acknowledge that all of your constituents are angry. And the red light camera does not discriminate, it goes gives tickets to Democrats, Republicans, Independents, okay? So all your constituents are angry. But up until recently, no one knew that this whole entire group voted yes to extend it to 2019, no one knew including myself. But I'm making it my goal to inform every one of your constituents, and all of you are on notice that if you don't repeal this red light camera, your jobs are on the line. Thank you very much and have a great day.

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

All right. Next up is Michael Fulton, followed by Supervisor Anna Throne-Holst. (*Brief pause*).

All right, one more time for Michael Fulton, also on red light cameras. Going once, going twice.

Michael, are you here? No? Okay. We're going to put that card aside. Next up is Supervisor Anna Throne-Holst from the Town of Southampton.

### **SUPERVISOR THRONE-HOLST:**

Good evening, everyone. Thank you for holding this hearing. I would like to start by saying that I would like to join my voice of support for bill 1624, I think it's an important bill. But I'm here to speak about 1619.

As fellow Legislators, you know how often we talk about the importance of economic development, job creation, workforce housing, clean water and nitrogen reduction, creating tax rateables, sound planning and land use decisions, traffic and road improvements, public safety, saving taxpayer dollars and historic preservation, amongst many other things. The Canoe Place Inn project actually does all of that in one project. It's a very important project for the Town of Southampton.

Eight years ago when I first ran for office there, my constituents in Hampton Bays described themselves as the neglected stepchildren of the Town of Southampton and that very little attention was paid to them. This project, along with several others that we have worked with all of you on -- for instance, the development of Good Ground Park, the repaving of Main Street, several of the historic preservation projects going on along Main Street now and others -- have given a great shot in the arm and a face lift to South -- to Hampton Bays that needed it very badly.

The Road Realignment Project that is before you today is one that was proposed, in fact, by your Department of Public Works. It's an important traffic safety project, it's one where, rather than taxpayer dollars, developer dollars will be used for it. The land will create public access where there was none and wouldn't be any if this land was developed as-of-right rather than according to the planned development district.

## General Meeting 9/9/15

There's 60,000 year-round residents in the Town of Southampton, it quadruples in the summer. The number of bumper stickers that say *Save CPI* that are on cars and have been on cars for as long as I've been in office there, speaks to how important the preservation of this very unique spot is to the residents of all of the Town of Southampton, and this was a unique opportunity for us to do that.

This is a part of our hamlet that needed this partnership. It needed a partnership with the Town Board, it needed a partnership with the County and it needed a partnership with the {Recklers}. It put politics aside, it was a 5-0 vote, and it was one that your Planning Commission approved as well. Please partner with us again. This is a very important project to the Town of Southampton and to Hampton Bays. Thank you.

### *Applause*

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

Okay, that's all the yellow cards that I have. Is there anyone else who wishes to be heard by the Legislature who did not fill out a yellow card? Okay. That's great, I'm going to pass the microphone back to our Presiding Officer.

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

Alex wants to speak.

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

I'm sorry. Alex, I missed you. How could I do that? Go ahead.

#### **MR. STRAUSS:**

I must be losing weight; I doubt that.

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

Please identify yourself, Alex.

#### **MR. STRAUSS:**

Yes. Good evening. Alexander Strauss, 184 Radio Avenue, Miller Place. Red light cameras. Red light cameras, when they're installed, they do not use -- touch anything to do with the yellow light on an intersection; that's set by the department, the State Department of Transportation. The red light camera only gives people tickets that break the law. If you go into a study, it shows that it has cut down on accidents.

How did people learn how to drive? Let's see, they're told that a yellow light is going to tell you that it's going to change to red. Now, if you're smart and intelligent, which I know 99% of the people are, when they see a yellow light they also use that distance to determine when they're going to stop for a red light. The red light cameras only give tickets to people that go through red lights. If you enter the intersection and the yellow light isn't on, you will not get a ticket. I don't know where these people -- and as far as corruption? Where the hell did that come from? What corruption? I haven't heard of anything, I read the newspaper every day.

Red light cameras were introduced by William J. Lindsay, and the reason why that happened is because his wife almost got killed twice from a T-bone crash, from people going through a red light. That's a good reason why you should have red light cameras, to stop people from doing that. You should go on-line and take a look at some of the pictures that show when a fully-loaded fuel truck goes through a red light. Can you imagine getting hit with that? School buses, the same thing; going through a red light, not a yellow light, not even close to yellow, red. It stops people from doing that. There's a sign that tells you 300 feet from the intersection that it's red light enforced;

General Meeting 9/9/15

that should be enough to wake you up, make sure that you can stop before you reach that intersection. That's what the reason why they have that, is to save lives. It's not to make money. If we were -- if the County was worried about making money they would raise taxes, but we don't do that. It's not making money, it's not filling the coffers of the County. Red light cameras are a good thing. They should be on every intersection, maybe people wouldn't kill other people. Thank you for your time and efforts.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you, Al.

Okay, that is -- we don't have any cards. Is there any other people that want to speak that have not spoken?

**MR. AZZATO:**

My name is Nicholas Azzato from Rocky Point, New York. I just want to say everything that guy said is infactual, he has no evidence to back it up.

**MR. STRAUSS:**

*(Laughter).*

**MR. AZZATO:**

Can you prove the yellow light --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Please just address the Legislators.

**MR. AZZATO:**

I just want to say, the cronyism has to stop, it's time. Is this money coming back here, or you're paying people in Colorado? Is it filling pot holes? No. Are we in debt? Yeah. Where is this money? Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right, thank you. Anyone else?

All right, I'll take a motion to close by Legislator Hahn. Second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, we will go to the agenda. All right. Page four, the Consent Calendar. I'll make a motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

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

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. On page -- we have a lot of people/discussion about IR 1619, so we'll take that out of order, on page ten.

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

Motion to take 1619 out of order.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Schneiderman makes a motion to take ***IR 1619-15 - Authorizing a Memorandum of Understanding among the County of Suffolk, the Town of Southamptn, R Squared INV HB LLC and Canal Properties LLC in connection with County road improvements, Public Benefits, a Maritime Planned Development in Hampton Bays, and transfer of County surplus property (County Executive)***. I'll second the motion to take out of order. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. Do I have a motion?

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

Motion to approve.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion to approve by Legislator Schneiderman, IR 1619.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Barraga. The motion is before us.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Motion to table.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion to table by Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Trotta. Okay. On the motion, anyone?  
Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. So this did come up at Public Works Committee and we asked some questions about it. Not being that familiar with the area, John Stype and I, from my staff, went over the next day to take a look for ourselves. One of the big concerns here I think is public access, and certainly loss of public access. So I really don't want to comment on Southamptn's PDD or the scope or the scale of the development, because that's really a local affair, that should be handled -- and it's really outside of the County's purview.

But if you look at the aerial photograph, and if you look at Montauk Highway, Route 80 there where 39 meets 80 going over the canal, and you can see from 39, coming from the north, the old road and you can see just north on the canal, just north of Montauk Highway, the old bridge abutments. So there was an old bridge there originally. When they rebuilt -- and that's where the land transfer would take place, to the north side of Montauk highway. If you look at the old bridge abutment -- so there was an old bridge there and then when they built the new bridge, they built the new bridge next to it and they abandoned the old bridge, and the old abutments are still sitting there on the edge of the canal.

My concern is that in the future, just like if you see -- if you ever go through the Tappan Zee and you see the new bridge being built, they didn't take the old bridge down and build a new bridge; they're building the old bridge next to the new bridge. So if we give this land up, we're going to forgo, at some future time, the ability to build another bridge there. And so access through that area, I've been told, is very difficult and I've been told there's a lot of traffic in that area. And so if we give that land up, we're going to lose -- some future Legislature is going to say, *They did what? We own that land and now it's gone and now we don't have that option of replacing a bridge there.* That's my big concern, that we own it today and that we should retain ownership of it for future use.

I mean, this County is more than 300 years old, so a lot can happen in the next -- I'm looking forward 50, 100 years out when that land might actually -- we might need it for something. So I'm not against the development. We were told in committee that the development can go forward without this land transfer. I just think that the County should retain the land because someday we might need it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, thank you, Legislator Krupski. Legislator Schneiderman.

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

Okay, if I could start -- well, first let me just say that, you know, the zone change was before the Town, that's not what's in front of the County. What's in front of the County in relationship to the Town approval, at the request of the Department of Public Works, was a realignment of the intersection. There's a Memorandum of Understanding that is a part of the bill that's in front of us. There are several things, one is that the developer will pay for the reconfiguration of the roadway; in exchange, there's a land transfer. The land is being used for both screening and the land is also being used, a portion to the Town, for public access to the waterfront.

I'd like to actually, though, begin on the traffic safety issue, and that was a concern that some of the neighbors had brought to me that the intersection was becoming less safe. It is an intersection that the County had done some work on not that long ago. And adding to my question -- which I would like to invite, through the chair, Bill Hillman, who is the Chief Engineer, forward to answer these questions -- is the question that Legislator Krupski just asked about should the bridge ever need to be repaired, how does that affect it, that we're losing the aerial on the side. And Gil Anderson is here as well.

So if we could start addressing Legislator Krupski's concerns about repairs to the bridge, and then also why the department felt that the intersection needed to be realigned; what was unsafe about it and why the new configuration is safer.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

No, I didn't ask a question. Actually, what I said, if the bridge is going to be replaced, not repaired.

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

Okay, if the bridge were to be replaced. Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

To address Legislator Krupski's concern, if we were to reconstruct the bridge, the likelihood is that -- and using current construction methods, we would build one side, reconstruct one side and then reconstruct the other side after that first side was completed.

You see it on thruways and other places where similar -- you know, you're in the same situation.

I would also add that under the current agreement, we would have full access to those lands for replacement of the bridge, so that we could do the work in the areas to the north. And last point I would make is something that Bill mentioned earlier, if we go further to the north with a bridge, we actually increase or create a large larger turn. What you really want to do is bring it further to the south to get a straighter movement rather than a curved movement.

As Legislator Schneiderman said, we've had issues in the past about site distance at this intersection. And this is why we proposed this to the developer, to come up with this plan where they would -- it was something that we were looking at that they would do at no cost to the County and improve the intersection, as I believe you have seen on the maps that I have here, if you would like to see them.

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

Gil, why didn't we do this several years ago when we were doing work out there? Why are we -- you know, we just spent some money reconfiguring it once, why didn't we do it right the first time?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

The project I believe you're speaking about did not reconfigure their intersection, it just resurfaced it. There was no reconfiguration. We've gone back on aerial photos just recently, back to 1994, it's been the same configuration, and we didn't need to go back further. We just confirmed our own knowledge that we have not modified the geometrics of this intersection in the last two decades.

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

The roadwork that we're asking the developer to do, did we do the designs for it or did a consultant do the designs for it?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

A consultant under the guidance -- the developer's consultant under the guidance of the County.

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

Okay. And do we know the cost if the County were to do this work, roughly what it would cost?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Total cost to the County would be roughly \$1.85 million.

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

Okay. And in doing this road configuration, there will be some land where the prior road was, right? That land is now beaming surplus and that is the land that is being given to the Town and the developer for different purposes; correct?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

That's correct.

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

And the piece that the developer is getting is roughly valued equal or less than the roadwork that's being done?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

It's valued less than, yes.

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

It's valued less than, okay. So the County is getting more than it's giving in this case.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Absolutely.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Correct.

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

Okay. So I think that's -- now the -- this may be really not for DPW, but if you could stay there. So since this went through committee, the Memorandum of Understanding has changed. Originally the easement was restricted to daylight hours only. There was some concern by community members that because people like to go fishing at night, that that restriction be removed from that Memorandum of Understanding. Counsel, is that correct, that that now has been modified and there are no -- there's no language attached to the easement that would restrict public access?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yeah, the provision that was problematic from your standpoint was removed.

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

Okay. And the use that the developer will have of the surplussed land will be limited, I believe, to two things: One is vegetative screening of the development; and two is, I guess, some sort of overflow planning parking at the Town's request if the Town later decides that more parking is needed. Is that correct?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

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

Okay. The easement will be in favor of not just Town residents, but all County residents; is that correct?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

It's my understanding that there will be public access down to some sort of fishing pier, yes

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

Okay. So just --

**MR. HILLMAN:**

There would be public parking and public access.

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

Okay, so just to close. You know, this has been through a five-year process. There's been, I think, three public hearings at the Town level, it was unanimously approved. It went to Suffolk County Planning Commission, it was also overwhelmingly approved. It is -- what's in front of us is not whether we think it's a good project or whether it's not a good project, only whether this road realignment makes sense, whether it's in the interest of public safety, and whether this transfer of land is in the greater public interest as well. So we are getting, apparently, a safer intersection, we are getting some screening and the public is getting some screening of this project, and we're

getting access that we did not have before to the waterfront; those are three positives, at least that I can see from this.

I know that some people would like to have this be a review of the entire project, and I know that there is a legal challenge to the Town's approval, that is the proper forum for revisiting the Town's decision. I don't believe that this is the proper forum for revisiting the Town's decision. I think it's important that we support local Home Rule on zoning issues, I think that's critical. And this to me meets all the tests for the transfer to occur, so I am going to support it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, thank you. Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I mean, correct me if I'm wrong, Gil. Doesn't -- over here.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Sorry.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Normally when they develop like this, aren't the -- isn't the developer responsible for making roadway improvements?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Only in that it impacts -- that it impacts their project. So if their project is going to add a certain volume of traffic to the road, they would be expected to make certain improvements that would allow the road to handle that capacity, and certainly, you know, certain impact fees that are required of them.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

You got to my next question, but let's go back to this one. So clearly there's going to be more impact on the roadway, so they would be responsible for a lot of this roadway construction anyway.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Not to this extent, no. This is a significant change to the realignment, you know, of this intersection. Getting away from the slip ramp that you see on the westbound up to the northbound, removing that. It's essentially making it into a --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

A T.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

-- a simple T intersection, correct. So, you know, generally you would do a certain amount of widening, you'd put in some drainage in front of your parcel, things like that; not to this extent. And again, I would state, this was Public Works' idea to do these improvements and, you know, we were -- we feel it's a great improvement and it's at really no cost to the County.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Well, the cost of the piece of the property, that \$1.2 million. But what's the impact fee? What is the impact fee on this project?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I don't have the figure for the impact fee, but I would say that it's fairly low. And just to expand on what the Commissioner said, 37 condos is not going to generate the need to do \$1.8 million worth of

roadway work. As the Commissioner said, when we're doing 37 condos, we would be -- the order of magnitude for improvements on the County Road, to mitigate in a peak hour 37 condos is probably going to generate, at most, 70 vehicles, two cars per hour per unit, approximately; it's probably even less than that. So the impact fee is going to be very minimal, and the impact to the roadway is very minimal also.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So what's wrong with it now, then, that it needs to be improved?  
If it's minimal, why do we need to improve it?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Well, the impact of this development on the roadway is minimal. That's not to say that there are not deficiencies in the existing intersection, which there are. So we took the opportunity to ask the developer, when they approached us with this project, if they'd be willing, we proposed the idea of the land swap for the intersection improvements. They first denied us, they said, "*No, thank you. Our project's moving forward, we don't need any additional property,*" and then they came back a couple of weeks later and said, "*We'd like to consider that.*" We opened up discussions. Why they made that decision, I'm not exactly sure, but I'm sure, you know, it's in their best interest and our best interest.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Have there been complaints about that intersection?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Again, you know, we don't just go on complaints. It's old geometry. There's -- if I could -- let's see. Okay, so this intersection or this roadway intersects mid-ramp, so we have high speed vehicles coming around this ramp and you have an intersection with very limited site distance. Legislator Browning, County Road 21, same exact thing. These are what we call slip ramps. We do our best to try and eliminate -- especially when they have a -- if it didn't have a side street on it, it really wouldn't be that big of a problem, but it has a side street on it. So, you know, when this situation occurs, and it does occur more than just this location, we have another project on County Road 21 in Legislative District 3 that we're doing the same exact thing, we're removing the slip ramp.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

How many accidents have occurred there in the past five years?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I don't have that information.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I would note, also, that on the south side of the road, this area is currently under -- being designed for development and the access point is very -- is right in line with where we're going to be putting the new T-intersection.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

And you're going to try to put a light there?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Not at present, it doesn't warrant a light. With lining it up -- as the Commissioner said, with lining it up on the south side here with this proposed development, there may be a need for some future light, but right now we don't anticipate a light.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

So you're going to turn a -- it looks to me like there's a ramp there coming on. Yeah, there's like a merge, almost, coming on from 39 heading south, going westbound onto Montauk Highway. So it's going to actually slow traffic down there because the merge will be gone, it will now be a T; is that correct?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

When you say slow traffic down, on 39 it would slow traffic down or on Montauk Highway?

**LEG. TROTTA:**

You can make the argument for both. I mean, the cars are going to have to make a full stop or they're going to have to --

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Correct.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Is there a merge there, is there a stop sign?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

No, there's -- and you're exactly right, they're going to have to make a full stop and make a traditional right-hand turn, which is a much safer movement than the merge that you described.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Well, is there a lane, is there a merge lane there now?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Very short, and you're looking over your left shoulder at a poor angle, poor site distance.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

How many -- I mean, the number of accidents is very important here. If there's no accidents, there's only two or three --

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Well, again, you're absolutely right, number of accidents is important, but also our department's experience and knowledge of highway design and highway geometrics is also important. And we don't always need accident data to tell us that the geometrics of an intersection are problematic, and I would argue that this is one of those cases.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yeah, I would think that we'd want to sell the property, because as the guy that's sitting next to you will tell you, we need money. And, you know, I'd rather sell it and keep this intersection, if it's not dangerous.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I'm not an accountant, I'm a traffic engineer and I'm a highway engineer, and I have a problem with this intersection and I'd like to make an improvement. I don't get to make the decision whether we sell it or -- that's your decision. But I'm here telling you that the geometrics of this intersection are problematic and if we have the money, we would like to improve it.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

As was stated earlier, we did have -- we have had concerns raised to us by the local community of the site distance along this intersection. We've had -- we've tried to make improvements in the

General Meeting 9/9/15

past and now we have the opportunity to get a public safety issue addressed at no cost to the County for land that essentially is not worth -- you know, it has a minimal worth because it's not buildable. The amount of land that is excessed as part of this isn't buildable, you couldn't put a house on it.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

How much land is it?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Each parcel is less than an acre, which is, I believe, the zoning for Southampton for a buildable parcel.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

But the developer is also going to develop the other side of the canal there?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct, the old Canoe Place Inn.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

And what's going to be there?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I believe a wedding catering facility/restaurant.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Okay. What's the impact fee on that?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

The impact fee on that? Again, I don't have that figure, I don't know.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Well, until I know those figures and the accident figures, I'm not going to -- we shouldn't be voting on something blind.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We are making improvements as part of the project to this. There's a -- as you see right through here, there's a similar -- we can call it a slip ramp, but a ramp that can get, you know, motor vehicles traveling westbound onto Montauk Highway, that will be eliminated.

It will eliminate the turn. You know, you're trying to go right and westbound on Montauk Highway, you have to do a sharp turn to be able to see where the traffic is coming. So, again, we're trying to improve this intersection here with Newtown Road and Montauk Highway, similar to what we're doing on the other side of the creek, and it's an opportunity to get this work done at no cost for the County.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

You keep saying at no cost to the County, but it is at a cost to the County; we're giving up land.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Land that's undevelopable. And from -- you know, I'm not trying to be argumentative here, but given the amount of review that we get for every Capital Project, the ability to do something like this seems -- I don't want to say a no-brainer, but it's -- you know, it's too good to pass up.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Why do you think the developer came back to you after saying no?  
Did he add any space, did he add another condo or two?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

No. In fact, I believe he reduced the condos. From what I was told, it was -- it made the project more aesthetically pleasing. So again, I'm not a developer, I can't value the aesthetics. You know, is it worth \$1.8 million to him? Only he can make that decision and he did.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

So there's going to be a new building between Newtown Road and Canal Road West; is that where they're building the new building or they're going to renovate the other one?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This is the old Canoe Place Inn which is going to be renovated and expanded for the facility.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

And what's off to the right, you know, between there and the canal -- between Newtown Road and Canal Road West?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This will be -- this is the development.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

No, not there, across this one right there.

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

That's a Town park right there.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

That's a Town park?

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

Yeah, that's a Town park.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

So that's not part of the project.

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

No, it's not.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

All right, so now we have a Town park? And how many parking spots -- are there any parking spots there?

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

Yeah, there's parking spots there. I don't know how many.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Where's the Town park?

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

Between the Canoe Place Inn and the canal, there is a Town park that's on the west side of Shinnecock Canal.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Where is the sewage treatment plant going to be for the condos?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

The condos are on the east side in this vicinity here, and it's my understanding that somewhere over here in this open -- I don't know how -- you can call it open space, but in this parcel somewhere over here.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

All right, so they're going to have to dig up the road anyway, to go under the road.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Not necessarily. They could -- I don't want to say rocket, but there's a tunnel under the road without having to open it up, if they use force main to go from one side to the other.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Uh-huh. All right, thanks.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay? All right, Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I just have a question for the Commissioner, just in terms of process. I understand the Town took its due diligence and went through this exhaustive PDD process, you know, with the applicant, and they certainly didn't arrive at this overnight. But at the time that it came up that they needed -- or, rather, the County land was going to be considered as part of the project, wouldn't that have been more the time to involve, you know, the legislation that -- or the Legislators who are going to be passing something and approving this, as opposed to letting a lot of time go by -- engineering, architects, all those different plans that need to be done by the applicant, all the planning that needs to be done by the town -- and then you're kind of stuck on this one point here. Wouldn't it have been better to, in this and any other project, include the decision makers earlier on in the project to say is this -- you know, does anybody have an appetite for this or should we not make this land transfer? I mean, this isn't like a little sliver of land that you're going to transfer to a municipality for drainage purposes that's going to tie something in. This is -- you know, to me this is a little bit different, it's public access to the canal. So it wouldn't -- shouldn't we have been brought in earlier on this?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Just one thing, and I know Bill wants to speak on this. The public access, the only public access that exists right now is if somebody parks and walks across private property. So there is no formal public access, with this project there will be. So I just wanted to get that across. As far as -- well, I'll let Bill speak.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Additionally, the Town's process for a development brings the County in very late, and they essentially are almost complete when they get to the County. We have no -- DPW has no control over when the Town refers it to the County. When this was referred to the County, which was maybe six months ago, this idea came up and within that six months, the County, the Town and the developer worked all this out. And what you're about to -- what you're debating on today is

just the MOU. You're only approving the MOU, you're not approving the actual transfer of the property today, and that's a very valid or interesting point, that you'll get another bite at the apple. You're approving the MOU, but you're not making the transfer.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Oh, so it's only been a few months, you're saying. It's not like years that this has been going on and that no one else has been considered.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

It's only been in the County's purview for six months.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Okay, thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Gentlemen, when you pave a road, do you look at safety of all the corners of changes that need to be made routinely or do you just pave a road?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

When we repave a road, we generally -- we generally assess our roads on an annual basis, it's done by our Highway O&M staff, it's done by our Highway Engineers. As we go into the repaving program, we will make improvements which are at the level of a repaving project, unless we see something glaring that, you know, would require a full capital reconstruction. So in this case where you'll -- if we were repaving the road, it wouldn't -- we wouldn't be necessarily able to realignment just with restriping. In this particular case, we're removing that one slip ramp and we're going to bring the westbound turn-lane, westbound and northbound turn-lane in, so we're going to have to do some reconstruction. Does that answer your question?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I knew the answer already. How long ago was it that you paved that road?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

My knee-jerk answer to that is about five years ago. And I would also say that we get \$6 million a year to resurface roadways, this is roughly \$2 million; it would have been one-third of our budget had we done an improvement like this.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Did it come up at that time as a safety need to make it a T intersection?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

No, it did not because of the excessive cost and our limited budget.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I can state that in discussions I've had, the reason I brought it up with the south side, there was concerns about trying to figure out how we would align that south side development, if you will, their entrance -- their ingress and egress with the north side under the current configuration. This will allow us to make a much safer intersection.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

So you're talking about this new project coming up.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

All right. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Barraga.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

As I understand this, it's a public/private partnership and, you know, these don't come along that often. It isn't as if we don't have major groups supporting the position to go ahead with this particular proposal.

As was pointed out, based on the notes that I have in front of me, that there was overwhelming approval at the Suffolk County Planning Commission with the Southampton's representative voting in support; was unanimously approved by the Southampton Town Board after a five-year SEQRA process, including noise study, traffic study, wastewater discharge and treatment study, appraisals and feasibility studies of the proposed projects and impacts on surrounding areas.

The two parcels in question, it looks to me one is 25,000 square feet, the other is roughly, what, 14,000 square feet; based on what you're saying, you can't develop those properties anyway.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

And in this case, the developer's willing to pick up the \$1.8 million to do the project. I'm going to support the project.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator McCaffrey.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Bill or Gil, do you know if they did a traffic study there to determine whether or not a traffic light was required at that intersection?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I don't believe a formal study was done. Knowing the volumes on both roadways, it's highly unlikely. We did not request one. I think our traffic group was fairly confident that one would not be necessary.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

And at the end of the day, though, something would come underneath the Planning Board of Southampton in their final review of that project, would they have considered that?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

No, they would leave that up to us to request --

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

It's just us?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

And you're confident that it didn't meet the -- the traffic count there didn't require a traffic light?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Yeah.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Because we're going to a stop sign as opposed to merge traffic, so it's a different configuration

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Correct.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Based on your experience and knowledge as a traffic engineer, you don't think a traffic light would be necessary there?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

That's correct.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Great. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I just want to ask, was a traffic light ever discussed at this site with either the developer or anyone else?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I do remember having some conversations with staff about whether a traffic signal would be necessary. Again, they gave me the same thing I just told this body, is that in their professional opinions it was not necessary. When the -- if and when the development on the south side that the Commissioner keeps mentioning in this area, if that does take place and it lines up very nicely with the proposed T intersection, when those are both operational, it may, may rise to the occasion of a traffic signal, but that's yet to be seen. So we would build the -- rebuild the intersection, allow -- if and when the development on the south side is approved and moves forward, we would then monitor that intersection to see if it warrants one.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

But the placement of a traffic light was never discussed with the developer; is that true?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I really can't say yes or no on that. I don't know the exact details of what was discussed between my staff and the developer.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay, thanks.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Cilmi, and then we have Public Hearings coming up.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Hey, gentlemen. It seems we're spending a lot of time talking about the need for revisions to the road construction in this area, I guess because therein lies the value that the County is going to receive in exchange for these pieces of property. But we haven't spent a lot of time discussing the project itself that's proposed. You know, have you both had an opportunity to consider some of the opposition that has been become apparent in the last week or so? And I don't know if it was apparent before then; you know, this is obviously not my district. But certainly in the last week or so, I began hearing from residents by phone, by e-mail, by Facebook, by every means possible, largely opposed to the approval of this resolution which, as you said, Bill, is really just the approval of a Memorandum of Agreement. So I'm wondering, in your view, where does the -- why is there such apparent opposition now, and is there anything that the County could consider to, you know, mitigate some of that opposition?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

If I may. I think the concern I have with that is -- and it happens in many projects where an opposition to the project tries to use County -- the County as the stick to either shut the project down or in some way change it. We don't have the ability to, you know, make those -- have those discussions with the Town. This is a Town jurisdiction, they came to us with essentially an approved project. In our view, the project will move forward in one form or another, and we have been able to negotiate an agreement that would allow for this construction, saving the County money and, you know, improving the safety of this intersection.

So if a couple of units are changed or in some way it's reconfigured, eventually the project is going to move forward, in my opinion. So to try and, you know -- and again, I may be a little bit jaded because of what we've gone through in the past, say up in the area, you know, up near Commack Road where we've had that type of situation, where folks come in to try and talk to us about sewers to hold up, you know, development that's really under a Town jurisdiction. So my concern with that is that, again, I'm going in circles, but we had a project that was shown to us to be approved by the Town, essentially. So again, in one form or another, it will move forward.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. So from a -- so just to underscore what you just said from a practical point of view, this project, the way it's been proposed, will happen beyond the scope of the County's jurisdiction. It's up to the Town, really, to sort of dictate exactly what can happen in this location. And the County is just a party to it because we have an opportunity, in your view, to reconfigure some roadways that, in your view, need to be reconfigured and have the developer pay for those roadways; correct?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And just if you could very, very quickly, because I know we have to go into Public Hearings; thumbnail sketch, what does the Memorandum of Agreement that we're entering into by way of this resolution exactly say? The short story.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I'll give you it from an engineer's point of view, and then if you want some legal counsel, the County Attorney is here. But in short order, it basically says that the 25,000 square feet piece of property and the 14,000 square feet -- foot piece of property will be provided to the developer, and some portions to the Town, in exchange for doing one -- the modifications that the County has sketched up, and in our estimation, our engineers have estimated that work to be \$1.85 million.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Is that \$1.85 million specified in the agreement?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

The sketches of the improvements are included in the agreement, and our engineers have performed that estimate to estimate it to be 1.85 million.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Has the property that we're giving over to the developer been appraised?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Yes. Now, again, I'm not -- I'm an engineer, so --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Here's my take on that.

**LEG. CILMI:**

If this is a question for Counsel, I just as easily defer to Counsel.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Well, I think -- again, I'll start and then let Counsel chime in. Knowing -- when this started, we -- this isn't our first rodeo, we've done this before with developers where we've exchanged roadway improvements for property. We know that the County always must come out on top and we must win, say. So I asked -- we have some internal -- we have an internal property appraiser and I asked her to take a look at this, and in the most conservative view, what would the value of that property be, and I also asked simultaneously to have the engineers do an estimate on the construction. She came back with a cost of 1.5 million for the property, and that was valued primarily, the property on this side, because it has about a 20-foot stretch that comes down to the water over here. It's 25,000 square feet and she valued it as Southampton waterfront property, that's it's highest and best use.

Again, I'm not a property appraiser, but less than an acre, adjacent to Montauk Highway, and to call it waterfront property is a big, big stretch. But I asked her to be extremely conservative so that it couldn't be questioned. Do I ever think in my wildest dreams the County would get \$1.3 million for that property? No, I do not. Would it be -- I don't know where it would fall, but we also asked the developer to come up with an appraisal, now they came up with an appraisal of \$10,000.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

Because they didn't make an assumption on a highest and best use. They made some assumptions --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Based on the constraints that --

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Exactly, it can't be built on, you know, it's adjacent to the highway. So they made some more logical assumptions.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

In my personal opinion, I think it would be more than 10,000, but much less than 1.3 million.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. I'm sorry to cut you off, but I know we're really up against it in terms of Public Hearings and I do want to hear from Counsel on these questions.

**MR. BRAUN:**

Yes, thank you. The MOU that's in front of you requires you to review and appraise -- if it's approved, will require or permit you to review and appraise formal appraisals -- not what Bill described to me as *back of the envelope-type* appraisals -- before you approve the transfer of the land to the developer and to the Town, if you choose to do so then. And he's correct, there's no approval of that part before you. What's before you is can we allow the project to go forward on the assumption that everything will fall into place. But until the roads are realigned, there is no excess or surplus property to be transferred. So we're not -- the MOU doesn't ask you to approve that now.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So the MOU is between the County and?

**MR. BRAUN:**

The County, the Town and the developer; three parties.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And it basically says?

**MR. BRAUN:**

It says that the developer is going to do certain things with respect to the development itself, that the Town is going to receive certain property, presumably, from us on a 72-h basis for municipal purposes, that the developer is going to receive a piece of property from us --

**LEG. CILMI:**

But does it say *is going to receive* or *may receive*?

**MR. BRAUN:**

No. It's the intention of the MOU to get to that point, but it doesn't require -- it specifically requires additional approval by the Legislature --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay.

**MR. BRAUN:**

-- when that point, you know, that appropriate point is reached.

**LEG. CILMI:**

But we are in no way handcuffed by making this -- by voting in favor of this resolution today, to transfer the property?

**MR. BRAUN:**

We're not obligated to transfer the property if this resolution is approved, no.

General Meeting 9/9/15

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. Thank you. Thanks, guys.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right, I'm calling the vote. The tabling motion goes first. We have a motion and a second. Roll call. This is to table.

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

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

No to table.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

No.

**LEG. HAHN:**

No.

**LEG. ANKER:**

No.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

No.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

No.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

No.

**LEG. CILMI:**

No.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

No.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

No.

**LEG. STERN:**

No.

General Meeting 9/9/15

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

No.

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

No.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

No.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Three.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Motion to approve. Roll call.

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

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

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

No.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

No.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Fifteen (Opposed: Legislators Krupski, Kennedy & Trotta).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right, we have to go into -- we're two minutes late, go into ***Public Hearings***. The first ***Public Hearing*** is ***Procedural Motion No. 20-2015 - Authorizing public hearing for approval of Ferry License for Beachcomber Freight Service, LLC, d/b/a Coastline Freight (Presiding Officer Gregory)***. I do not have any cards for this Public Hearing. Is there anyone that would like to speak on this matter? Please come forward. Seeing none, I will make a motion to recess. Second?

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

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. ***(Public Hearing on) Procedural Motion No. 21-2015 - Authorizing public hearing for approval of rates for Beachcomber Freight Service, LLC, d/b/a Coastline Freight (Presiding Officer Gregory)***. I don't have any cards for this Public Hearing as well. Is there anyone that would like to speak on this matter? Please come forward. Okay, seeing none, I make a motion to recess. Second by Legislator Schneiderman. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***(Public Hearing on) IR 1564-15 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law establishing a Drug Stewardship Program for Suffolk County (Hahn)***. I don't have any cards for this Public

General Meeting 9/9/15

Hearing as well. Is there anyone that would to speak on this matter? Please come forward. Seeing none, Legislator Hahn, what would you like to do?

**LEG. HAHN:**

Motion to recess.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion to recess by Legislator Hahn. Second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***(Public Hearing on) IR 1605-15 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law to increase awareness of dry cleaning chemical use (Hahn).*** I do have several cards for this Public Hearing, the first being Beth Fetini; did I pronounce your name right?

**MS. FETINI:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**MS. FETINI:**

Hello, and thank you to the Legislature for holding this hearing.

My name is Beth Fetini from Green Inside and Out, a company that educates consumers on sustainable and healthy products. I'm here to urge support for Resolution 1605, the goal of which is to increase awareness of dry cleaning chemicals through a product hazard notice to consumers. This year I published a white paper called *Defining Green Dry Cleaning*, in partnership with the Huntington Breast Cancer Action Coalition, because I was receiving inquiries from people saying, *My dry cleaner is green. What does that mean?* So when I looked into it, I learned that there is quite a bit of information that I thought the public should know.

First of all, the chemical solvent used by the majority of dry cleaners is Perchloroethylene, or Perc, which is recognized as a likely human carcinogen by the USEPA and several other Federal agencies. It can also affect the nervous system, liver and kidneys. It can be an air contaminant, which is why the EPA called for no more Perc machines to be allowed in residential apartment buildings after the year 2020. Perc can also be a water contaminant and is found in ten of the National Priorities Superfund Sites on Long Island. The State of California has taken the extra step of banning the use of Perc as of 2023.

But the good and somewhat mixed news that I also learned is that there are six major alternatives to Perc that are in use: Professional wet cleaning, liquid carbon dioxide, Siloxane -- or Green Earth is the brand name -- Rinex, K4 System and Hydrocarbon. And these have varying degrees of safety with wet cleaning being the best of the bunch and hydrocarbon being the least preferable of the group, but it is the most common replacement because it works very similar to Perc. But because hydrocarbon is a carbon-based substance, many businesses advertise themselves on store windows as organic, referring to the chemistry sense of this word, but this can be very confusing to the general public which associates that word *organic* with chemical-free as in food which is a whole separate set of regulations. So clearly, there's a lot of room for education and awareness.

## General Meeting 9/9/15

So I had worked on this paper originally with the Suffolk County Health Department. They gave me great information and feedback. And I was very happy to learn from them that Legislator Kara Hahn was also already interested in working on this subject, so I want to thank her for taking the lead on this, and I know Legislator Sarah Anker is also supportive. So I strongly support this commonsense legislation that allows the public to know what is being used at dry cleaners so they can make more informed choices.

I did a survey and I identified about 30 companies across Long Island that are using a Perc alternative, which is encouraging. But right now there is no requirement for these dry cleaners to post on the wall or provide written information about what solvent or method they are using, unless they're using Perc. Perc dry cleaners are supposed to post on the wall that they're using perc, because it is hazardous.

So this wouldn't be a direct cost to the company because the Health Department would be providing this color-coded chart, which probably would be downloadable, I assume. And I would note that the City of San Francisco has already established a very similar color-coded chart for dry cleaning methods and they also provide information on this subject on their website. So I brought a bunch of copies of the executive summary of the paper, if that's useful as background. I have a couple of copies of the full paper. It's also available on my website which is *Greeninsideandout.com*; it's also on Huntington Breast Cancer's Group called -- the website is *preventionisthecure.org*.

And finally -- it's another subject, I don't know if I'm allowed while I'm standing here -- Resolution 1661. As a person interested in environmental health, I also support banning the sale of body care products containing plastic microbeads, especially given that there are more natural alternatives available that could be used for the same purpose that don't damage our waterways and public health. So thank you again.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you. Legislator Cilmi has a question and Legislator Barraga.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Hello. How are you?

**MS. FETINI:**

Good.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thanks for joining us today.

**MS. FETINI:**

Sure.

**LEG. CILMI:**

You said in your testimony that a majority of dry cleaners are using Perc?

**MS. FETINI:**

Yep.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Where do you --

**MS. FETINI:**

About 85%.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Eighty-five percent? Is that nationwide, New York-wide, Long Island wide, Suffolk County wide?  
How do you --

**MS. FETINI:**

Nationwide.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Nationwide.

**MS. FETINI:**

But actually, I got that information from the New York State DEC, so it's New York as well.  
So I identified --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Well, but if it's nationwide -- I mean, if it's nationwide it's nationwide; if it's New York-wide, it's New York-wide. Just that the DEC is giving you the info --

**MS. FETINI:**

Then I would say New York.

**LEG. CILMI:**

What's that? I'm sorry.

**MS. FETINI:**

I would say New York then, yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

You would say.

**MS. FETINI:**

Yes. It's from --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Is that what the DEC said? I just want to be sure.

**MS. FETINI:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. And you said that it's a current requirement that dry cleaners that are using Perc post the fact that they're using Perc somewhere where --

**MS. FETINI:**

Correct.

**LEG. CILMI:**

-- customers can see?

**MS. FETINI:**

Yes, to be visible for the customers to see.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. Is that a requirement for any other type of dry cleaning process or chemical?

**MS. FETINI:**

No.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Just with Perc.

**MS. FETINI:**

Right.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So you said 30 are using Perc alternatives; that's on Long Island or Suffolk County?

**MS. FETINI:**

That's on Long Island.

**LEG. CILMI:**

That's on -- okay.

**MS. FETINI:**

So I think roughly about half of them are in Suffolk County.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay.

**MS. FETINI:**

On that summary that I'm passing around.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And how many are there in Suffolk County?

**MS. FETINI:**

In total, dry cleaners? Well, when I originally did my survey, I surveyed 800 dry cleaners across Long Island, but I think there's more like thousands, we probably didn't even hit all of them. So I'm not exactly sure how many are located in Suffolk County, that I don't know.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay.

**MS. FETINI:**

That would require some more research.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. Thank you.

**MS. FETINI:**

You're welcome.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Barraga.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

How are you doing?

**MS. FETINI:**

Hi.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

In listening to your comments, why are -- if Perc is a carcinogenic, or possibly a carcinogen, why are the dry cleaners using it? Is it a less expensive product to purchase, is it to clean the clothes better than other alternatives, is that -- what's the rationale for the usage of a carcinogen?

**MS. FETINI:**

Yeah, good question. My understanding is that it is cheaper, the machinery, you know. I'm not so much sure about the solvent itself, but I know the machinery tends to be a little less expensive than as opposed to carbon dioxide, for example, that does tend to be more expensive. But hydrocarbon can be used in a Perc machine. So it's probably equivalent, I don't really know. They also claim that it's very effective, but the other alternatives are effective as well.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Is it a question of education in terms of letting the cleaners be more aware that they can use the hydrocarbon as opposed to the Perc?

**MS. FETINI:**

Yeah. And what I noticed is that --

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Cost-wise is it about the same, or is hydrocarbon more expensive than the Perc as far as the product?

**MS. FETINI:**

For the customer? No, it's the same. What I notice is prices seem to vary just by where you live on Long Island, but not so much by the --

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

So they're using the Perc because they've always used the Perc? They're sort of into a routine?

**MS. FETINI:**

Right, right. And what I learned from some of the people that had converted is that they were concerned about their workers. So they said, you know, I'm exposed to this stuff all day long, so I want to make sure myself and my workers are protected. So I was like, well, that's good, you know, they're good examples for others to follow.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

So of the alternatives, you're recommending the hydrocarbon.

**MS. FETINI:**

No, that would probably be the least preferable of the group. Wet cleaning is a process where they actually use water and a specialized detergent in this special machine, and that seems to be across-the-board, the greenest and safest method that has been identified by numerous groups.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

You have to purchase this special machine for this wet cleaning?

**MS. FETINI:**

Yeah, it's a different machine.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

There is a cost factor associated with that, that as they're using the Perc and it's not prohibited, they don't have to switch it. What is the cost of the machine if they purchase it for the wet?

**MS. FETINI:**

For the wet cleaning? Actually, I don't know. I'd have to find that out for you, which I could do. I don't know if Legislator Hahn knows that. But I know in California what they did was they actually offered an incentive for people to convert to wet cleaning or carbon dioxide.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

I have a feeling, just like in any business, a lot it's related to the cost factor associated with equipment --

**MS. FETINI:**

Right.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

-- versus what they're currently using. And, you know, if something is going to cost a considerable amount of money to purchase and then there's a whole different process, there's cost elements associated with that. And often you can't -- especially in this environment, you can't pass it on to your customer, you can't pass it on to the customer.

**MS. FETINI:**

Uh-huh.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

All right, thank you very much.

**MS. FETINI:**

You're welcome.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right, thank you.

**MS. FETINI:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Next we have Nora Nealis.

**MS. NEALIS:**

Good evening. My name is Nora Nealis and I'm with the National Cleaners Association. I've prepared written comments, but I think I'd like to address questions that were put to the previous speaker first so that we can maybe clear up a few misconceptions.

Perc cannot be used in any machine other than a Perc machine. An alternative solvent, virtually all of which are called Class 3 combustible fluids, are used in a machine especially designed for use with combustible fluids, so they are not interchangeable. Somebody can't have a Perc machine and convert it to a Class 3 machine, it just doesn't work that way.

General Meeting 9/9/15

In terms of why so many cleaners are using Perc as opposed to alternatives, New York was very proactive when Perc was first identified as a hazardous air pollutant. And as such, they, in 1997, introduced Part 232 which required dry cleaners to invest heavily in new, totally-enclosed, 4th Generation Perc dry cleaning equipment. An investment of equipment at that point in time would probably be, for your neighborhood dry cleaner, about \$50,000.

In addition, the cleaners were required to undergo training; if they were in a mixed-use building, meaning they were sharing walls or ceilings with other tenants, they had to install vapor barrier rooms to make sure vapors didn't go into adjoining spaces; they were required to and to this day are required to go undergo annual inspections to make sure the facility is in total compliance with 232. So you're looking at a situation where dry cleaners, between 1997 and 2001, which were the phase-in dates for that particular regulation, these people just got done making an investment of somewhere in the neighborhood of \$75,000 and up. You're not talking about Donald Trump here, you're not talking about Lockheed, you're talking about small, neighborhood businesses for whom that \$75,000 is probably the second biggest investment they've made outside of their homes. So the fact that they're hesitant to make a change to an alternative solvent until their current equipment has gone through its useful life is more than understandable, it's certainly not cavalier in any way, shape or form.

Yes, dry cleaners in New York State are required to post an 11 x 17 sign furnished by the Department of Environmental Conservation advising consumers that they use Perc. So, you know, that's pretty much a clear up.

*(Beeper sounded)*

In terms of wet cleaning; wet cleaning technology is available at Perc dry cleaners, hydrocarbon dry cleaners, silicone dry cleaners. Wet cleaning has been embraced by most in the dry cleaning industry as an adjunct technology. Now, when I say adjunct, I mean it doesn't -- for most dry cleaners, they have found that wet cleaning is a good supplement to dry cleaning. If the wet cleaning equipment manufacturers --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Ma'am?

**MS. NEALIS:**

-- had to survive on their sales to 100% wet cleaning -- I'm sorry.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Your time's expired.

**MS. NEALIS:**

Oh, okay.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

But I do have a question for you.

**MS. NEALIS:**

Uh-huh.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Please tell me about wet cleaning.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**MS. NEALIS:**

Okay. Well, that opens a nice door. Wet cleaning is an adjunct, so that the wet cleaning equipment manufacturers, probably 90% of their sales are to dry cleaners. So dry cleaners will make a decision when a garment comes over the counter that this should be best processed in water, wet cleaning technology. Equipment probably runs somewhere in the neighborhood of 30, \$35,000. The problem with it in terms of adding cost is the finishing equipment required to make it look like something after it's been wet cleaned is probably another 20 to 30 to 40,000 depending on how advanced a cleaner wants to get. But most cleaners offer wet cleaning as a supplement to their service line.

So that this blouse, perfectly suitable to be wet cleaned; this jacket, because it's structured, pads, backing, not suitable for wet cleaning because it would come out looking kind of like what you have in your imagination. If I had known we were going to have this discussion, I would have brought one of my favorite, loosely-woven jackets to show that the sleeves are here as opposed to where they should be. Because a certain amount of shrinkage is inherent in some weaves; it's not only a function of the fabric, but it's a function of the weave.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Can you wrap up? Your time's expired.

**MS. NEALIS:**

Yeah. I think the thing that you need to understand is a couple of things. Number one, of the alternatives that are available to a dry cleaner to choose from, from silicone to hydrocarbon, reasonable minds could analyze all that data and come up with a completely different score ranking, depending on where your own particular interests lie. So the number two choice here of liquid carbon dioxide, while it was welcomed with open arms among dry cleaners, regulators, environmental groups, there isn't one machine in the State of New York. It has proved to be an unviable technology. It's not manufactured and the poor guys who bought it in the first place can't get parts. This is a very dynamic time in the cleaning part of the dry cleaning industry. New solvents come and go because we learn things about them we didn't know when they were first introduced, and the problem with having a list like this is that it's stagnant, it's static. And the fact of the matter is what's happening in this genre of cleaning is extremely dynamic. So today's green is tomorrow's dreck.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right, I do have some questions for you. You have spoken extensively. There was a question before that the prior speaker attempted to answer in her exercise in trying to survey. Do you have a better number of how many cleaners there are in Suffolk and Nassau County?

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

**MS. NEALIS:**

According to the Stationary Source people up in Albany, there are roughly 2,000 dry cleaners statewide. Now, if you look in the yellow pages, you'll find more listings, but many of those are what's known in the industry as drop stores. There is no plant on premise, there's strictly a conveyor and a counter, and they take the cleaning in and the cleaning is done somewhere else.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Right.

**MS. NEALIS:**

So your posting notice leaves that whole piece of the market uneducated.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. And now, did I hear you say that the DEC advised use of PERC, or they had an advisory on how to handle or operate in a PERC environment, if you will.

**MS. NEALIS:**

In 1993-94, Governor Cuomo put together a rule-making committee to develop a PERC rule.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**MS. NEALIS:**

At that time, PERC was virtually the only solvent available to the dry cleaning industry. And Governor Cuomo took the lead in making sure that the dry cleaners in New York State were beyond state-of-the-art. He spec'd a technology that wasn't even available in the United States at the time. So you had the entire universe of dry cleaners in New York State, which at the time topped, according to DEC, 3,000 dry cleaning plants, make a move of, at a considerable investment, to state-of-the-art PERC dry cleaning machines, and, in the process, we lost about be 1,000 plants statewide.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. So you're not -- you're not admitting that you think PERC is something that is not advisable to use, are you saying, or --

**MS. NEALIS:**

No. I will freely grant you that PERC is a hazardous air pollutant.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. So --

**MS. NEALIS:**

I'm not about to argue that point.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

You're making more of an economic argument as regarding any potential economic hardship to the businesses that will have to pay for new equipment, because --

**MS. NEALIS:**

I think part of it is an economic argument. I think the other piece of the argument is that your PERC -- your neighborhood PERC dry cleaner is probably using 60,000 -- 60 gallons of PERC a year to clean 60,000 pounds of garments. He is heavily regulated in terms of what happens to his waste. He's enclosed totally in terms of his emissions. He's inspected to make sure he's operating properly. And while, yes, he is using a HAP, he is using it as prudently and as safely as anyone in these United States or the world.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So because it's a -- I'm not familiar with the substance, but you're referring to it as an airborne substance. So are workers required to wear masks?

**MS. NEALIS:**

They don't have to. The levels that are in a dry cleaning plant, using the equipment spec'd out by New York State, are exposed in badge exposure tests with OSHA to under 10 parts per million. And that's not time weighted average, that's a peak. So, you know, technology has come a long way in the dry cleaning industry in terms of controlling.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. Thank you. Is there anyone else that has a question? No? Okay. All right. Thank you.

**MS. NEALIS:**

You're welcome.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Can you tell us the useful life of these new closed systems that were required in 1996?

**MS. NEALIS:**

At the time, we were looking at 20 years. I think, given the fact that -- and here again, you have to be -- you learn as you go. Because the machines are inspected annually, which means every year they get a real good preventive maintenance, those machines are performing well, and I'm thinking that there are cleaners who can probably get 25 years out of that machine.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Can you also describe for me what organic dry cleaning means to you?

**MS. NEALIS:**

I am unhappy that cleaners have chosen, or that some cleaners have chosen --

**LEG. HAHN:**

Can you use that word again, so that --

**MS. NEALIS:**

Unhappy.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Unhappy.

**MS. NEALIS:**

Unhappy --

**LEG. HAHN:**

Thank you.

**MS. NEALIS:**

-- that some cleaners have chosen to hang organic signs in their window. I think it's disingenuous. I'm happy to report that I think most consumers recognize it as being disingenuous. I know I've had friends who, on seeing it for the first time, call and say, "Okay, Nora, now they're cleaning with manure, right?" I think it's unfortunate, but I think an educated consumer has an opportunity with all the information available to them on Google, on EPA websites, on other sites to determine for themselves exactly what it is that organic dry cleaning means. I mean, there's -- you have only to put in "what is organic dry cleaning" to get a Google full of pages debunking the notion that it is as it's portrayed in the agricultural world.

**LEG. HAHN:**

You said that almost every dry cleaning establishment uses wet cleaning. We have only found one or maybe two in Suffolk County.

**MS. NEALIS:**

If they thought you were asking for 100% wet cleaning, I'm not surprised, because, as I say, they're not 100% wet cleaners. My dry cleaner --

**LEG. HAHN:**

No, I get that. I'm just saying ones that make --

**MS. NEALIS:**

-- is a dry cleaner, he also wet cleans.

**LEG. HAHN:**

No, I understand that, and there may be some instance where both will be, because there's garments that -- who knows. But I do not think we can find more, if -- more than a handful of dry cleaners in Suffolk County that provide a wet cleaning option. I mean, maybe they'd have to send it out special if you requested it, but that actually have the ability to do that, you know, either on the premises or where they normally send their clothes. There are not -- it's not every -- what did you call them? Plant that has a wet -- to my knowledge, and I -- you know, I'm hoping, because I intend to recess this tonight, I'm hoping maybe you can provide for me, you know, if we can sit and talk, but if you can provide for me -- one of the things, hopefully, you can collect for me is, if possible, to know, you know, how many plants utilize wet cleaning in Suffolk County.

**MS. NEALIS:**

Well, NCA has on its staff the woman, Ann Hargrove, who ran the first 100% wet cleaning facility for the Center for Neighborhood Technologies and Design for the Environment Program in Chicago. I'd be happy to give you a list of people who have gone through her wet cleaning class who are located on Long Island, and then we can try and match them up with their plants. They may not think of themselves as wet cleaners, but, certainly, I know we've trained a fair number of people in wet cleaning here on Long Island.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Excellent. Thank you.

**MS. NEALIS:**

Okay.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Thank you. Okay. I don't have any further cards. Was there anyone else that would like to speak that -- you already spoke. We only allow people to speak once, Ma'am. Yeah, if anyone hasn't spoken, they can speak. Okay. Seeing none, Legislator Hahn, what would you like to do?

**LEG. HAHN:**

Motion to recess.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion to recess by Legislator Hahn, second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Anker)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. ***I.R. 1642 - A Local Law to Amend County Regulation of Non-Native Invasive Plant Species (Hahn)***. I do not have any cards for this public hearing. Is there anyone that would like to speak on it? Please come forward. Haven't seen -- not having seen any.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Motion to close.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion to close by Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Anker)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1643 - A Local Law to Amend Resolution No. 560-2015, A Local Law to Regulate "Board Up" Businesses in Suffolk County (Browning)***. I don't have any cards on this public hearing, but is there anyone that would like to speak on it? Please come forward. Seeing none, Legislator Browning?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Motion to close.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Anker)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1647 - A Local Law to Revise Suffolk County's Real Property Redemption Process for Transfers Involving the Suffolk County Landbank Corporation (Co. Exec.)***. I don't have any cards for this matter as well. Is there anyone that would like to speak? Please come forward. Okay. Seeing none, Ms. Horst?

**MS. HORST:**

We ask that you close this.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. I'll make a motion to close. Do I have a second? Second by Legislator Martinez. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Anker)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. *I.R. 1648 - A Local Law to Revise Suffolk County's Hardship Conveyance of Property Procedure for Transfers Involving the Suffolk County Landbank Corporation (Co. Exec.)*. I don't have any cards for this public hearing as well. Is there anyone that would like to speak? Please come forward. Seeing none, I make a motion to close, second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Anker)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

*I.R. 1657 - A Local Law to Clarify Affordable Housing Requirements at Developments Connecting to a County Sewer District (Calarco)*. I don't have any cards on this public hearing as well. Is there anyone that would like to speak on it? Please come forward. Okay. Seeing none, Legislator Calarco?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion to recess.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion to recess by Legislator Calarco, second by Legislator Schneiderman. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Anker)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

*I.R. 1660 - A Local Law Authorizing the County Executive to Execute Agreements for the Sale of the John J. Foley Skilled Nursing Facility (Co. Exec.)*. I do have one speaker, Amos Goodman.

**MR. GOODMAN:**

Thank you, Legislator Gregory. I'm Amos Goodman from East Hampton, and I'm here today not as a candidate, but really as a concerned citizen. And I'm deeply troubled, as my friends and neighbors are, by what appears to be yet another Bellone budget bamboozle, that is long in a line of sad one-off gimmicks that I think people are getting tired of.

The sale before you today, as folks will know, has been tried before. First, there was a back-room deal attempted under the Levy Administration, and it was rightfully rejected then. Now, here we are again, after we've laid off 300 middle class workers. We've spent \$5 million, at least, to maintain a vacant building. We haven't provided the medical care necessary to our residents. And now this Legislature is being asked to give this facility away in what's effectively a fire sale, where local nonprofit bidders are all but disadvantaged, if not precluded, from mounting a serious bid. This is not leadership, this is a bamboozle.

Look, the sale discussed today, it's a one-off gimmick, and it is designed in an effort to paper over what is a continued year-on-year structural deficit that this Legislature and this Administration has been unable to reckon with. When you have a \$170 million deficit, that's not called a balanced budget. That's called doing algebra, not arithmetic, when you're budgeting. Maybe algebra isn't taught anymore now in the Common Core days, but the fact is, when you know the answer, it's quite easy to plug in the variables. But that doesn't work in business, it doesn't work when you're balancing your checkbook, and it shouldn't work in Suffolk County.

## General Meeting 9/9/15

When you're robbing dedicated funding sources to fill operational costs, that's not budget prudence and fiscal responsibility. So folks can go around this County as much as you like and say we have a balanced budget, but say it until the cows come home and it doesn't make it any true -- anymore true. Let's be frank in what this really is, the sale. It's a sweetheart deal for a purchaser, and it's a bad deal for Suffolk taxpayers, and that's why I'm here today, to express my reservation.

This sale will hurt Suffolk families. It enriches connected insiders west of here. Any, by the way, I'm from East Hampton, so when I say west, I'm meaning very far west, as in New York City. You know, even the purchaser has said his vendors will come close to the City where he can get a better deal. Well, what about our workers here?

I think this sends a terrible message, that Suffolk should continue to send its jobs, its revenue, the best and the brightest west, and I take exception to that in the strongest possible terms. This affects my district on the East End, because, as it erodes the tax base, the East End will continue to share a disproportionate -- shoulder a disproportionate share of the tax burden. So, look, this is a big-city deal that hurts small town Long Island. I would urge you to do right by your constituents and by the County. Exercise fiscal prudence and discipline. Reject this proposal and create a system under which local nonprofits have a viable way of bidding and providing the services that we so desperately need in this County. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. Question, though. I probably shouldn't ask it, but I'm going to ask it anyway. I'm right here.

So your -- I just want clarification. You reference the deal. What deal are you taking about, or are you just against any deal, or what's --

**MR. GOODMAN:**

The deal as is currently -- the motion 1660, to -- and the terms under which it's --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So you're not opposed to just -- you're not opposed to any deal being made?

**MR. GOODMAN:**

I'm not opposed to doing something with an empty building that's costing quite a lot of money to keep vacant and not providing services, no. I think, in its current form, this should be rejected, and I'd like to see a process under which local nonprofits have a viable ability to provide the services that we need.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Any nonprofits in particular? Because we've been discussing this issue for, I don't know, 20 years. And sometimes we put out RFPs and gotten one or two responses, sometimes we haven't gotten any responses, so --

**MR. GOODMAN:**

I don't think it's appropriate for me to discuss particular nonprofits.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Oh, no. I mean, you came here, you alluded to that this is some bamboozle and it's a backroom deal. I would suspect that you had a suggestion as to how to move forward, that's all.

**MR. GOODMAN:**

I'm not interested in advantaging any particular bidder.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**MR. GOODMAN:**

Exactly what this proposal in its current form appears to do. So I don't believe it should -- there should be a thumb on the scale from this side or from that side.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**MR GOODMAN:**

That would be, respectfully, what I want.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I appreciate your time. Thank you for coming down. Yes, Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. I guess so. I'm just trying to (inaudible) for somebody. However --

**MR. GOODMAN:**

I'm sorry, I didn't catch that.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I would like to ask you a question. I don't know if you're aware that Brookhaven Hospital has submitted a request to consider a purchase. As you know, Brookhaven Hospital, that's their catchment area, is where the Foley building is.

So a little correction. The building, John J. Foley, is not 20 years old. So I want to correct that, that the building hasn't been in existence for 20 years. So, however, this is something that's been discussed.

Are you familiar with the John J. Foley building, as far as the residents that used to be there, the average age, the types of residents that were there?

**MR. GOODMAN:**

Probably not to the degree you are, ma'am.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. Average age was 45. We had traumatic brain injury, we had dementia. Many of those dementia residents were bipolar, schizophrenic. We had many people with drug and alcohol problems. We had people that wind up in the nursing home because -- actually coming out of the jail. So we had a multitude of residents with many varied problems and not your average nursing home.

So the offer that we have here is a \$20 million offer from a gentleman who has numerous nursing homes throughout Suffolk County. I believe he actually owns one in Patchogue, which has by far a stellar reputation. And just out of curiosity, do you think that that's important, that we should be checking the reputation, the background through --

**MR. GOODMAN:**

Oh, absolutely. I think the reputation of any entity that the County does business with is critical. I think, also, it would be wise to look at the contingencies that I understand are built into this in terms of State approval. If I was a real estate agent and trying to sell a property that had the kind of

General Meeting 9/9/15

contingencies that this deal seems to be predicated on, that would give me a great amount of pause. So with the potential transfer of workforce west of here to vendors that the -- at least my understanding is the bidder has said will come not from Suffolk, but will come closer to New York City, and that's a problem as we look to sustain our economic base here.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

So you support the -- a local entity that's going to provide a wide array of services over a nursing home with a rehab?

**MR. GOODMAN:**

I believe that's -- sure, absolutely.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. Thank you.

**MR. GOODMAN:**

What I don't support is \$5 million and 300 laid-off jobs for an empty building, and that doesn't seem to be -- it's very hard to explain to one's constituents where the taxpayer -- where their sales tax, where their other taxes are going when there's such examples of waste and profligacy in a County. We're all being asked to do our part, and I would urge the rejection of this, because it doesn't seem to be good fiscal policy.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. And I know that someone previously mentioned a met need in substance abuse and many other issues, concerns that Brookhaven Hospital has come forward with. So I thank you.

**MR. GOODMAN:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. Thank you. All right. Anyone else that would like to speak, please come forward. Okay.

**MR. STRAUSS:**

Alex Strauss, 184 Radio Avenue in Miller Place, New York. The John J. Foley Nursing Facility, when it was open and was running, took care of the people that could hardly afford to be in a nursing home, took the people that were really hurting. And if we go to this -- is this the same person that was going to buy it before? It is, it's the same guy. So now he's coming back and he wants a better deal.

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

The first one, not the second one.

**LEG. ALDEN:**

It's the first buyer? That's the first buyers that left and wants his money -- wanted his money back?

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

Yes, that one.

**MR. STRAUSS:**

Oh, okay. And I understand, is this proposal for -- to be able to negotiate with many different people or just this one person? Nobody knows?

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

This proposal deals with just the one purchaser. It's a hearing on a transfer to that purchaser.

**MR. STRAUSS:**

Oh. Well, I think that the County Executive should be open-minded, that he would be able to negotiate with many proposals. And I hope that that's the way it goes and not just the one person, the one person that already has left, pulled out and left the deal, and, all of a sudden, now he's back, looking for a better deal, I guess. I hope that if this proposal is just for this one person, and I guess it comes back to you again to approve a sale, so you have a second bite, well, I hope that it's for more than one person.

And I still think that it should have been left alone the way it was, but, again, poor management, a County Executive that just wanted to get rid of it, left it for a County Executive that just came in. It's a shame that it was empty and just sitting there again, money spent on nothing. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. Thank you. Anyone else? Okay. I think we're --

**MS. HORST:**

We ask that you recess this one.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. I will make a motion to recess I.R. 1660.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second, apparently, by Legislator Browning. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Opposed.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Spencer)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. ***I.R. 1661 - A Local Law to Prohibit the Sale of Personal Care Products Containing Microbeads (Hahn)***. I do have several cards, actually a couple of cards -- I'm sorry -- first being Maureen Dolan Murphy.

**MS. MURPHY:**

Good evening. My name is Maureen Dolan Murphy. I'm the Executive Programs Manager with Citizen Campaign For the Environment. We are here tonight to strongly support Resolution 1661, a Local Law to prohibit the sale of personal care products containing microbeads.

As many of you are aware, microbeads are a common ingredient used in over 100 different types of products, including toothpaste, body wash, hand soap, facial scrubs and shampoos. These beads are too small to be filtered out from our sewage treatment plants and end up contaminating our rivers, lakes, bays, estuaries and harbors. Unfortunately, State legislation that would have banned the sale of these product throughout New York State failed in the New York State Senate.

## General Meeting 9/9/15

In June of 2015, Connecticut passed the toughest law in the nation that will ban the sale of these personal care products. And in New York, despite failed action by the State, local municipalities are taking charge and implementing their own bans. For example, Erie County passed a ban on these harmful products in August, requiring industries to remove microbeads in just six short months. Other counties surrounding the Great Lakes and Hudson River are looking at similar legislation.

Education alone is not the answer. Just recently, I had an environmentally-minded mother tell me her daughter picked out a Frozen-themed toothpaste. Thinking this would be a great way to ensure clean, healthy teeth, the mother brought it home. And just how do you think that Frozen toothpaste got its sparkle? Yes, it was the addition of unnecessary microbeads.

Suffolk County now has a great opportunity to continue your legacy of protecting our rivers, bays, and estuaries and public health by passing this resolution, and ensuring that these harmful microbeads are not added into our everyday products. Surrounded by three critically, environmentally and economically important estuaries, two designated as estuaries of national significance, the health of Suffolk relies on healthy waterways.

I would also like to submit tonight, I do Chair the South Shore Estuary Reserve Citizens Advisory Committee, and the Citizens Advisory Committee has been tracking this issue and is very supportive of this local resolution. And I will be submitting a letter from the Citizens Advisory Committee to the Legislature as well in support of it. Thank you.

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

Thank you. Any questions? Okay. Next speaker is Beth Fitemi.

**MS. FITEMI:**

I'll pass, since I spoke earlier. Thank you. And the only thing I wanted to add earlier is that I will provide the survey on dry cleaners. But I do support this legislation. Thank you.

**LEG. HAHN:**

You can speak again, because this is now a different public hearing. So, if you wanted to say something about the microbeads, you can. You know, we might have confused you when we said earlier you can't speak twice, but you can't speak twice at the same public hearing.

**MS. FITEMI:**

Okay. I would just concur with what Maureen just said. Thank you.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Thank you.

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

Okay. Thank you. That's the last card I have on this public hearing. Is there anyone else who wanted to be heard on it? Okay. Do we have a motion from the sponsor?

**LEG. HAHN:**

Motion to close.

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

Motion to close by Legislator Hahn. Is there a second? I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Closed. Mr. Presiding Officer?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Thank you. All right. Next, as we call -- as I mentioned earlier today, we do have a CN. There's a public hearing for ***I.R. 1751 - Adopting a Local Law to Protect Public Safety in Suffolk County Parks (Muratore)***. I don't have any cards for this public hearing, but is there anyone that would like to speak on it? Please come forward. Okay. Having seen none, Legislator Muratore?

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Motion to close.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion to close by Legislator Muratore; I will second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. I'd like to make a motion setting the date for the following Public Hearings, October 6th, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., at the Maxine Postal Auditorium in Riverhead, New York:

I.R. 1691 - A Local Law to Strengthen the Code of Ethics (Trotta).

I.R. 1713 - A Local Law to Regulate Smoking at Multiple Dwelling Buildings (Martinez).

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Oh --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I'm sorry. I have a request.

**LEG. HAHN:**

I had a question for Counsel. If there was a late-starter that required a public hearing, would it be listed here?

**MR. NOLAN:**

No. A late-starter will set the public hearing later when we do the late-starters. We waive the rules, lay on the table and set public hearings at that point for those.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Thank you. Thank you. I forgot, sorry. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. I have a request from Legislator Trotta to take ***I.R. 1615*** out of order. It's ***authorizing the sale of County-owned real property pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law to the Town of Smithtown for Affordable Housing purposes (SCTM No.***

**0800-034.00-01.00-004.000) (Co. Exec.).** Motion by Legislator Trotta to take it out of order, second by Legislator Schneiderman. All in -- on Page -- I'm sorry, on Page 8, under -- it's actually, yes, Government Ops. Okay? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**  
Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**  
Okay. Motion --

**LEG. TROTТА:**  
We have somebody from the Town, I just wanted to get them out of here. So I spoke to four or five Boards Members. There's some confusion on this, so I just want to table it. This way, she doesn't have to be here all night.

**P.O. GREGORY:**  
All right. So, wait a minute. So you called -- okay, all right.

**LEG. TROTТА:**  
Motion to table. I don't want her sitting here all night.

**P.O. GREGORY:**  
Okay, gotcha. All right. Motion to table I.R. 1615. Second by Legislator Barraga to table. All in favor? Opposed? Are you fine with the tabling? I'm calling it.

**LEG. TROTТА:**  
Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**  
All right. All right. All in favor?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
Just hold on a minute, please.

**P.O. GREGORY:**  
Okay.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
Just on the motion, I just want to know the basis for tabling.

**LEG. TROTТА:**  
There was some confusion. I talked to four of the five Board Members, and it's my opinion that we should be selling this property, rather than giving it away. It's worth a lot of money. The County's in debt. I was going to ask -- I'm going to speak with the Board Members tomorrow to retract their request for taking it.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
I'm sorry. Which Board Members are you referring to?

**LEG. TROTТА:**  
The Town Board Members.

**P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Is somebody here from the Town?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

You're saying they may not be in favor of accepting the parcel?

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes. This was done under a prior Planning Director over a year ago. And, I mean, it's my and their, after talking to them, determination that we should be, the County should be selling this property, because it's worth \$200,000, rather than giving it away.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right.

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

Is there a representative from the Town of Smithtown here? Could you please step forward?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

You guys look as confused as us, as we do.

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

Could you identify yourself?

**MS. LEARNARD:**

Yes. I'm Elaine Learnard. I'm Principal Planner in the Planning Department at the Town of Smithtown.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. So, Legislator Trotta, wants to -- the Town is in favor of tabling this as you work out some agreement?

**MS. LEARNARD:**

I understand from Legislator Trotta that he has spoken this evening to Members of the Town Board. A year ago today, the Members of the Town Board unanimously adopted a resolution to accept the property. A year has past. Legislator Trotta has a particular concern, and, I gather, spoke to several Members of the Town Board tonight.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. Do you have any --

**LEG. TROTTA:**

No. I just --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I mean, it's irregular, but --

**LEG. TROTTA:**

I would be voting against this, because, you know, this is a valuable piece of property. There's \$131,000 of back taxes owed to the County. I explained this to the Town Board Members and they agreed --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

General Meeting 9/9/15

**LEG. TROTTA:**

-- that we'd rather get the money, because this property will sell, it won't be sitting there vacant.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I know. I was just excited that Smithtown was getting affordable housing.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Well, it's going to be the closest -- unfortunately, it's very hard to get affordable house when the taxes on this house are probably in excess of \$12,000. So the concept of affordable housing, unfortunately, is --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Right.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

-- fading.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Thank you for coming down. I'm sorry, I didn't catch your name or your title.

**MS. LEARNARD:**

Elaine Learnard, Principal Planner.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Principal Planner, great. Do you know whether or not the Town has reversed its position with respect to this property?

**MS. LEARNARD:**

I know that Legislator Trotta has spoken to people tonight. Prior to that, I hadn't heard that there was any --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay.

**MS. LEARNARD:**

-- discussion.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Is there -- as the Principal Planner, is there a need in the Town for this type of housing, affordable housing?

**MS. LEARNARD:**

There is need for affordable housing. It's very hard to do affordable housing in the Town of Smithtown.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right.

**MS. LEARNARD:**

It's a good really good place to live, it's a really good community, and land values are very high.

General Meeting 9/9/15

The County hasn't offered us too many parcels over time, because there haven't been that many that fall into this category.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Into the category to make them affordable, but with the --

**MS. LEARNARD:**

Yeah. And our concern about this, and I think the County's concern, or County Real Estate concern is the need for municipalities that accept Federal funding, which the County of Suffolk does, Federal funding from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The County accepts that money, the Town accepts that money, and we are all obligated to affirmatively further fair housing. That means go out of your way to do it.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right.

**MS. LEARNARD:**

And so this -- this is -- admittedly, as Legislator Trotta said to me earlier today, you know, very small, it's a single home. It's not going to make a big impact, but it's -- I'm a housing advocate. I believe that it would --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I understand that. And so that's why I'm questioning this a little bit, because it would seem to me if the Town Board itself voted unanimously to accept the parcel, and there's a Federal mandate to meet the Town -- for the Town to meet its obligation, you know, with respect to workforce or affordable housing by virtue of the fact that it accepts Federal funding, I mean, isn't fair to conclude that the Town has said, "Yes, we want this parcel"? I mean, I haven't received any information to the contrary, and neither have you.

**MS. LEARNARD:**

Nobody has spoken to me.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

If I may, I spoke to the Supervisor and three of the four Board Members and all of them said the same thing, that this property should be sold, and the taxes, back taxes being paid; that this happened under a prior Planning Director who's no longer there.

All I'm asking for is to postpone this a cycle so I can get this cleared up. So, you know, I'm hearing different things. I, unfortunately, didn't catch this, and then, when I did catch it, you know, earlier today, I called three of the four Board -- four of the five Board Members, and all four of them said, "Absolutely, hold off on this and we'll go forward." So all I'm asking for is one cycle.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I don't have an issue with that. I just want to understand, you know, why it's being held up at the last minute. But you're saying this just came to your attention today.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Uh-huh.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Does Smithtown have affordable housing?

**MS. LEARNARD:**

We have a few programs that provide housing, both rental and purchase, for below market rates. There are different definitions of affordability, and this particular house would come under the County's definition, which I think would be you could not make more than 80% of the area median income, which is about 104, \$106,000. So 80% of that is in the low 80s.

Most of Smithtown's other projects -- well, I shouldn't say most. Many of Smithtown's other projects, which also are very few units in each project, do allow us a somewhat higher income. Some of the rentals do keep them lower.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. Thank you.

**MS. LEARNARD:**

You're welcome.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Is Wayne here? Wayne Thompson, Mr. Thompson. I'm sorry. I just have a quick question before I move on to Legislator Hahn. I know she's been waiting patiently. So is this -- is this the first you're hearing this? What's -- is this -- I guess, let me back up. Is this -- why have we not chosen to auction this property?

**MR. THOMPSON:**

Well, the property is uninhabitable, and that's what deems a property whether they're offered to towns, is that it's not habitable at the moment. It needs to be extensively repaired. That makes it fall into the category that we can offer to the municipalities. This is the only second house in, to my memory, 15 years ago that has ever been offered to the Town of Smithtown, because we don't get many tax deed properties in there. Most of them are redeemed because of the high value that's associated with the Town of Smithtown. And those that don't get redeemed, we would have sold it at auction, if it was inhabitable status, with the restriction of owner occupancy. So, because this was one of the few that came through this way, it was seen that we should offer it to the Town of Smithtown, as we have offered so many to all the other towns. And they are in need of it, as has been put forward.

And I don't know anything about what Legislator Trotta was talking about, that he had spoken to recently. There's been no contact with our office from the Board or any member on it. I'm not doubting what you're saying, I'm just saying there hasn't been any contact with us, that's all.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So, with 72-h programs, obviously, it's really a transfer through the Town to a not-for-profit to redevelop it for affordable housing purposes. I mean, I'm not all that -- so I would imagine, since the Town Board passed a unanimous resolution, that there might have been some agreement. I would suspect there's probably agreement with the Long Island Housing Partnership or whoever.

**MR. THOMPSON:**

For their own doings, yes, like a --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Right, already in place. It's not a new Board. Why now are they kind of back-peddling, it appears?

**MR. THOMPSON:**

I have no input on that.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**MR. THOMPSON:**

I don't understand why they would.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. HAHN:**

How many 72-h transfers for affordable housing purposes have been made to the Town of Smithtown in the past year?

**MR. THOMPSON:**

Affordable housing? None that I know of, this is the only one.

**LEG. HAHN:**

In the past five years?

**MR. THOMPSON:**

Just this one. I think the last one we passed over was in -- was in Commack, about 10 years ago. About 10 years ago, we gave them a house in a similar condition over in the Commack area of Smithtown.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Right. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Schneiderman.

**P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Do we -- I think this is more for the Planner of Smithtown. So what is the -- what is the population of Smithtown?

**MS. LEARNARD:**

Outside of the Village is about 114,000.

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

Okay, 114,000 people. And what is the current inventory of affordably priced homes?

**MS. LEARNARD:**

We had several developments in the pipeline.

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

No. How many actually currently exist that are an affordable rental.

**MS. LEARNARD:**

Currently for purchase?

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

Or for rent.

**MS. LEARNARD:**

Okay. We have 45 units that are available for rent for seniors. Now these are -- you know, many of them are rented now. We have nine townhouses available for sale. Both of those -- that's for seniors as well. There are --

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

I specifically mentioned workforce. The senior --

**MS. LEARNARD:**

Oh, there's no workforce housing that has been -- workforce housing.

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

Workforce housing. Maybe I said --

**MS. LEARNARD:**

Which is different from the 72-h.

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

Maybe I just affordable, but I really meant workforce housing.

**MS. LEARNARD:**

Workforce housing, we only have things in the pipeline. We have not produced anything since the Workforce Housing Act. We do have -- we do have development going on.

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

The County in 2008, we had commissioned a study with Rutgers University. I don't know if you're familiar with it. It was a Workforce Housing Needs Assessment, and we went town by town, village by village. And Smithtown Town was determined, the total -- I have outside villages and with villages. But the total -- what this study concluded in terms of a yearly, a yearly target number, was 187, 187 per year. This was in 2008, so we're not quite a decade after. But you can do the numbers and you're talking about certainly well over 1,000 units. That would be just to keep things from getting worse in terms of the flight of young people out of Suffolk County. Are you familiar at all with that study?

**MS. LEARNARD:**

I haven't read it in a very long time. I certainly heard it referred to many times.

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

Right. Because, I mean, I could understand, you know, maybe the Town Board doesn't want to take this property, even though we're offering it for free. But I think, you know, we all have an obligation to house some of our workforce, and we all create labor demand. And when one area doesn't, other areas end up picking up that demand, and that's not exactly fair. So, you know, I imagine this is going to get tabled tonight, but I would just, you know, hope that Smithtown -- and if they're worried about the properties being on the tax rolls, they can -- there's several ways they can handle that, because this issue comes up quite a bit. But if the transfer is -- or they're worried about not getting -- if they do affordable housing, they can do a pilot program, or something like that, to make the school district whole. There's ways to approach that issue.

So I just encourage the Town to take this and look at it very carefully, because, you know, even Southampton, which is a very relatively wealthy area -- you talked about how expensive it is in Smithtown. I was at a ribbon-cutting. We did three, three houses just about a month ago, affordably priced, people working and, you know, are now living in the community. So everywhere can do it, and I think everybody has to do, you know, their part of it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thanks, Mr. Chair. I really just wanted to share a point of view here. A little while ago, the Legislature, despite hearing some significant opposition to a proposal in Southampton and Hampton Bays, trusted the opinion of the Legislator who represented that area and voted in favor of that particular resolution.

We have here a Legislator who represents this area, and he's said he's spoken with Town Board Members who have a concern. He's asked for -- he's asked us to agree to a motion to table for one cycle. We don't have any strenuous objection, at least, from the Town represented here by this nice young lady. And so I would suggest that we just table this for one cycle and let's see what comes out of it and we can address it at the next meeting.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator -- Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I got a question for the County, for Wayne Thompson. Thanks, Wayne. All the way to the east, thank you.

**MR. THOMPSON:**

How are you doing?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So the question is if -- we're offering this parcel to the Town at no cost?

**MR. THOMPSON:**

That's true, one buck.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

But we would take a \$131,000 loss on it?

**MR. THOMPSON:**

That would be our taxes investment that's already been paid and gone.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So why would we -- under normal circumstances, though, we would seek to recoup that money, right?

**MR. THOMPSON:**

No, not with affordable housing. All the properties that were given to all the other towns for affordable housing purposes are without cost.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Is there a threshold amount where we would say -- at some point, we would say, "Look, we really" -- "we're running out of" -- and you picked a number, whatever deficit we're running this year. Is there -- is there a certain cost at which point we would say we should auction this off and actually get money for it, because we're running at -- and you pick the number, whatever deficit we're running in this year.

**MR. THOMPSON:**

I don't think it's been said. It is more dictated to -- as to where the property is. I don't think we'd be fond of doing that over on Fire Island, or something like that, that -- really not where you want to build afford housing. But, if you took any one of the other towns and the properties we've given them over the years, or even in a particular year, three or four houses would easily exceed this 130,000 of investment to -- that you got in Smithtown. You may have given much more of that away to the Town of Babylon or Town of Islip. That's all I'm saying to put it in perspective.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Okay. I'm not sure what you mean by giving away, but this parcel, if it goes -- even if it goes through and -- someone's got to rehabilitate it, and then someone's going to live in it. Are they going to pay taxes?

**MR. THOMPSON:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Is it going to be back on the tax rolls?

**MR. THOMPSON:**

It has to go back on the tax rolls.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Okay. So there's no threshold, though. It's any -- who makes the decision, though, whether we should auction it off or give it away for affordable housing?

**MR. THOMPSON:**

That was the Director of Affordable Housing, then the Director of Real Estate, with my input and my field people -- person, telling how badly the house is off and whether it meets the qualification of being habitable or not habitable.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Okay. Thanks.

**MR. THOMPSON:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I pass.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Pass. All right. Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I just have a statement that I want to make to Elaine. I have not been able to watch Channel 18 since last week's meeting, but it is true, that we have large apartment complexes in the wing, many of which are affordable, on Smithtown Boulevard in Nesconset. We have another one going in -- what?

**MS. LEARNARD:**

I'm not sure I heard you correctly. There are five units on Smithtown Boulevard that are affordable.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Are we talking about the same project?

**MS. LEARNARD:**

Are you talking about a project that's coming on line?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

A project that's coming on line system.

**MS. LEARNARD:**

I'm sorry.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. All right. We also have another large project in the northern end of the District that's going to have a large amount of affordable housing in it. I don't want to give this up in case it's not public --

**MS. LEARNARD:**

Right, right.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

-- at this point in time. So, as a Town, we are moving forward. This particular piece of property, I can understand why the Town is shaky about. The taxes are, I think, twelve and change, uninhabitable, in unlivable shape. When this house is done, Smithtown taxes will be far greater than that. And according to affordable -- affordable housing standards, to make \$81,000 a year, you can't afford to rehab a house and pay \$16,000 worth of taxes a year and have a family, you just can't. So it's a difficult piece of property and a difficult thing, you know, to deal with at this point in time.

And I think Smithtown is right in taking some time under the new administration since the last time it was voted to take another look at it before they make a decision.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Just very quickly to maybe Mr. Thompson or maybe to the Administration. Legislator Trotta is requesting an adjournment really here for the cycling. Are there any time elements here?

**MR. THOMPSON:**

No.

**LEG. STERN:**

No, time limits, right? All right.

**MR. THOMPSON:**

If you passed it tonight and the Town said they didn't want it, we'd be offering the deed and they'd say no, and it would be ours to dispose of elsewhere.

**LEG. STERN:**

All right. So there's no -- there's no critical time concern here.

**MR. THOMPSON:**

No.

**LEG. STERN:**

So, certainly, a tabling for a cycle to get some direction from representatives in the Town of Smithtown won't have an impact either way.

**MR. THOMPSON:**

Right.

**LEG. STERN:**

All right. Thank you.

**MR. THOMPSON:**

They would contact us tomorrow.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yeah, thank you. I wasn't going to speak, but I changed my mind. I'm sorry. I've just got to correct some statements here.

Smithtown has not indicated in any way to this body that they don't want to take this project on. They sent their -- someone from their Planning Department, both through the Government Ops Committee, where we heard this in committee and where Miss Learnard spoke in favor of this resolution, saying that they most certainly wanted to move forward with this. They had been working on it, clearly, for over a year, since it was a year ago that this Town Board, the same Town Board that there is there today, voted to approve the resolution accepting the property from us.

They have a plan that they developed with the Long Island Housing Partnership to put this property back into use and have a home buyer going into this property. So there's nothing from Smithtown that we have seen in any way that says that they didn't want this property. What we have is the Legislator from the District saying that he thinks we should be selling this for the money. Now that's valid, and if that's the argument he wants to make, I can appreciate that.

I think we need to create affordable housing, and I think we have made a great commitment to doing that in this County. I'm glad to see Smithtown is willing and wanting to do their part in providing affordable housing for the residents of this County, and I think that's what this resolution does. And I haven't heard anything from Smithtown saying otherwise, including statements from Ms. Learnard tonight. Obviously, they wanted this. They sent her here to say, "We would like this property to come to us." So, you know, the statements that they don't want this is -- it's just not accurate based on anything they sent to us to date.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Well, I resent the fact that you say that, considering I spoke to four of the five Board Members today, and they suggested that I put this on hold so we'd talk about it. So the fact that you didn't hear it and you question whether I am telling the truth or not, I take offense to that.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

I'm just saying that they've passed a resolution in favor of this, and they sent their employee here twice to ask for it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. Anyone else? All right. We have a motion to table and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. CILMI:**

In favor.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Opposed.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Opposed.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. Those who oppose, raise your hands, oppose tabling. There were several I heard.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

(Raised hand).

**LEG. HAHN:**

(Raised hand).

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. One second.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Sixteen.

**RESOLUTIONS TABLED TO SEPTEMBER 9, 2015**

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. We're going back to the agenda under Tabled Resolutions. ***I.R. 1558 - Authorizing the sale of two surplus County para transit buses to Long Island GLBT Network (Schneiderman)***. Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, I'll second. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS**

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1639 - Authorizing the creation of a blanket utility easement for project Phase 2B for use by selected utility service purveyors at Francis S. Gabreski Airport (Co. Exec.)***.

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, I'll second.

**LEG. HAHN:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion, Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. HAHN:**

I just need to note for the record my recusal.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, recusal noted. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen.

**EDUCATION AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***J.R. 1571 - Appropriating funds in connection with the Renewable Energy and STEM Center - Grant Campus (CP 2141) (Co. Exec.)***. Motion by Legislator Anker, I'll second.  
Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***1571A, bond resolution***, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Pass right now.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. ***1.R. 1572 - Appropriating funds in connection with the Master Plan Update - College Wide (CP 2186)(Co. Exec.)***. Motion by Legislator Anker, second by Legislator Calarco. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Opposed.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Opposed.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Opposed.

General Meeting 9/9/15

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Opposed.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Fourteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. *I.R. 1572A, bond resolution*, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

No.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

No.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

No.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

No.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Fourteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Did you get Muratore?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. ***I.R. 1620 - Authorizing transfer of surplus County equipment to Selden/Centereach Youth Association (Muratore).*** Motion by Legislator Muratore, second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1626 - Authorizing transfer of surplus County Equipment to Bellport Hagerman East Patchogue Alliance (Browning).*** Motion by Legislator Browning, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1627 - Authorizing transfer of surplus County Equipment to Central Islip Community Patrol (Martinez).*** Motion by Legislator Martinez, second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1629 - Authorizing transfer of surplus County equipment to RSVP (Kennedy).*** Motion by Legislator Kennedy, second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen. (Vote amended to 18)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1630 - Authorizing transfer of surplus County equipment to Tri-Community and Youth Agency (TRI-CYA) (Spencer).***

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator D'Amaro, second by Legislator Spencer. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1636 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Countywide Replacement of Computer Equipment/Infrastructure (CP 1816) (Co. Exec.).*** Motion by Legislator Anker, I'll second. You want to second, McCaffrey? No, I'm only kidding.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

I'll second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. Second by Legislator McCaffrey. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1636, bond resolution,*** same motion, same second. Roll Call.

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

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING & AGRICULTURE**

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. *I.R. 1570 - Amending the Adopted 2015 Operating Budget to transfer funds from Fund 477 Water Quality Protection, amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds in connection with Aquatic Habitat Restoration of Various Shellfish Species and Eelgrass in Bellport Bay (CP 8710.416) (Co. Exec.).*

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Anker -- excuse me -- Krupski, seconded by Legislator Anker. All in favor?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion, I'm sorry, who's that?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Me.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Oh, Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, my first questions is why this is amending. I guess because we're transferring funds from 477 into the Capital Program?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So this wasn't originally contemplated either by the 477 Fund or by the Capital Budget when it was passed. So now we have the County and the Town working together to throw some scallops and clams in the water and plant some more eel grass, which we -- I'd like to know what efforts have been made in these areas in the past, and I'd like to know if they've been successful, and I'd like to know what the expectation is with respect to this particular program. I mean, if there's anyone here that knows the answers to those questions.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I could answer.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Krupski is volunteering.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I could answer partially. I don't know what efforts have been made in the past. However, I did ask about the condition of the water quality in that area because of the new breach there at the old inlet, which I did go and take a look at by boat. It is -- the water quality has improved a good deal there, and I've been told there's a good natural set of clam. So there's all likelihood that shellfish -- and this is coming from people who raise shellfish for a living, that shellfish would survive there and thrive there. So this -- in all likelihood, this project would have a very good chance of success.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

It's unfortunate that there -- I appreciate that, Legislator, thank you. It's unfortunate that there's no one here, though, to talk about the other seed programs that we've put in place, and the eel grass programs that we put in place and what we've spend, and whether or not they've been successful. I would like to have some information before we continue to use the 477 Fund, to just get some comfort that when we undertake this type of program, that there's going to be some level of success.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I don't know how -- I don't know where the money came from, but the County did fund in recent years a scallop restoration project in Peconic Bay, and that they actually did a scientific paper on that proving that the County's efforts were responsible for the increase in the scallop population to the point of last season's harvest being as good as pre-1985 harvest, and it was economically -- certainly economically significant. So these kind of efforts, they have to start

General Meeting 9/9/15

somewhere. Because of the -- because of the inlet there that hasn't been closed, the water quality is better, and there's a good chance here.

It's not like you're just going to do it because it sounds good, we're going to restore the shellfish. There's actually a good -- a good opportunity there, I think.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right, because I do remember in the past doing the clams and the oysters and not really having much success with those programs.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Right, right.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And I don't -- I just don't have the specific knowledge of, you know, what the history is here. But, Director Lansdale, did you want to speak on that?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Sure. I just wanted to let you know that it's our understanding that because of the opening of the breach created by Sandy, that there has been an improvement in water quality in and around this proposed area, and that will, as Legislator Krupski mentioned, will enhance the results and improve the results of planting these -- this eel grass and other efforts in conjunction with this project. And I can certainly get back to you. I can't speak tonight, but I can request a comprehensive listing of projects that we have funded in the past with 477 funding for various eel grass and shellfish restoration projects.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Thank you. Do you know how much of the funding is going towards purchasing the eel grass, and the hard clams, and the oysters and the scallops, as opposed to salaries and administrative?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Let me check.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Thank you.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

I don't have those budget details with me, but I can certainly get that for you. I do know that the total budget amount is \$56,710.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And the Town is also contributing?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

That's right. The Town is matching with 72,000, approximately.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So what you're say is with the improvement of water quality in that area, which is kind of a silver lining in the breach?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

That's right. So this --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

You might as well take advantage of that.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

That's right.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

All right. Thank you. I appreciate you answering my questions. Legislator Krupski, thank you, also.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Just on the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Oh, I have Legislator Anker, then you. Legislator Anker?

**LEG. ANKER:**

I also want to mention with this particular reso is that, you know, this is a great example of partnering with our Towns trying to overcome some of the issues that we experienced with the superstorm and the just erosion, all those things that we're trying to work with. But now, here we have a partnership with the Town and the County, so I think this is a very good program, and I'd like to see more of this programs. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'm not against this bill. I just want to ask a question of Robert. Robert, we're taking the money out of 477 and we're moving it into the Operating Budget or the Capital Budget?

**MR. LIPP:**

So this is -- this is basically pay as you go, it's cash.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**MR. LIPP:**

Most of the Water Quality allocation is being used for Operating Budget stuff, such as salaries and benefits. And in addition to that, what -- basically, these projects are always adopted as a zero amount. And then during the year, as they come through and they're adopted, then they get written off as part of the total. That being said, since most of the budget in terms of Operating is already spoken for for the water quality piece, the money is basically coming out of the fund balance for -- that's reserved already for Water Quality and there's about 3 1/2 million there.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

If we're moving something into the actual budget, don't we have to do like a purported life of the project?

**MR. LIPP:**

No. This is -- that would be for bonding. We're not bonding.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**MR. LIPP:**

This is paying cash.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

All right. I just wanted to clarify, because I had no idea what the purported life of a seed clam is. So thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Anyone else? Okay. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. *I.R. 1577 - Amending the Adopted 2015 Operating Budget to transfer funds from Fund 477 Water Quality Protection, amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds in connection with the Town of Shelter Island Legion Hall and Recreation Center on site Sanitary Waste Disposal System Project (CP 8710.329)(Co. Exec.).*

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Krupski.

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

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

What type of system is proposed here, and is it one of the new piloted systems?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Yes. This would be -- what's being proposed is, from my interactions with staff, is that it's a shallow-narrow drain field system that is going to be piloted, and that's replacing the leaching pools that are common with septic systems. So this is a system that's subsurface and right within the root zone of turf. So it would be -- the roots of the turf would be absorbing the nitrogen. So it's a combination of an irrigation system where you're providing water through the effluent, as well as you're providing the nutrients to the grass.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

It's a fertigation system.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

That's right.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Schneiderman.

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

So is that similar to the one that's being done at Sylvester Manor, or is that a different --

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Sylvester Manor is a constructed wetland system. It's a little bit different than this.

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

Okay.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

This is -- this is technically called a shallow-narrow drain field, or as Legislator Krupski refers to it as a fertigation system.

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

And the Health Department currently don't approve these, but they're going to be studying it?  
This is part of a study?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

It's more than just a study, it's a pilot program. So through the results of this effort, as well as a previously funded 477 Water Quality project, we're installing six other types of systems throughout the County. This is on track for not only study, but eventual approval, if it meets certain Water Quality parameters.

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

Now is this in addition to their conventional system?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

That's right, yes.

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

So, if it doesn't meet the standards, they stick with their conventional system?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

That's right.

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

Okay.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Hi, Sarah.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Hi.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

So this is a pilot program. It is not going to be the only pilot program of this type of --

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Yeah.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

-- waste program. Shelter Island, I understand why Shelter Island is picked. My question is at a -- this is the VA, VFW Center? American Legion Hall. What is the population that actually uses it?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

The idea behind this, my understanding is the flow would be comprised of -- it would be an intermittent flow based on, you know, when the venue is being used, and the total flow would equal or average out to a few homes. So our standard here in the County is 300 gallons per day per home, roughly, so if it's a few homes, maybe 1000 to 1200 gallons per day.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. So we don't know an exact number --

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

We don't.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

-- or 20 or 30 people a day come in there and they use it? Is this is the same facility that in the summer is used as a camp, do you know?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

I don't know. But all of those considerations would be in the design of the system to accommodate the uses, and that would be post contract to work out the specific design of the sanitary system.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Thank you.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I have one.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Who owns this?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

It's owned by the Town of Shelter Island.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

The Town is asking us for money to redo their sewer system?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Their septic system, not sewer system.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Just their septic system?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Yeah, uh-huh.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Is there a precedent for us doing this?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

We have provided funding for other projects. We've provided municipal -- funding for other municipal projects, for instance, to upgrade specifically their sewage treatment plants, different kind of wastewater system, for instance, in the Town of Riverhead, Town of Babylon, Village of Northport. So this is -- the benefit to this is that it provides a demonstration area and increases public awareness about these technologies, as people visit this hall and learn about it.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

This comes from the quarter cent sales tax?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Excuse me?

**LEG. TROTTA:**

This 477 Fund, it comes from the quarter cent sales tax?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

That's right, yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

So they pay sales tax. All right.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. Anyone else? Okay. We have motion and a second?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Yes, we do.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1610 - Reappointing Philip Schmitt as a member of the Suffolk County Soil and Water Conservation District (Krupski).*** Motion by Legislator Krupski, second by Legislator Anker. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***J.R. 1611 - Appointing Brian T. Culhane as a member of the Suffolk County Soil and Water Conservation District (Krupski).*** Motion by Legislator Krupski, second by Legislator Anker. Does anyone have any questions? This is a new appointment. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***J.R. 1637 - Amending the Adopted 2015 Operating Budget to transfer funds from Fund 477 Water Quality Protection, amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds in connection with Hook Pond Watershed Stormwater Improvements (CP 8240.125/.336)(Co. Exec.).***

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

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Schneiderman, second by Legislator Anker. On the motion, Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

A question, if I may, for Budget Review. Given the less than stellar performance of sales tax numbers, I would imagine the number that we've budgeted for receipts in the 477 Fund for this year is going to be -- we're going to miss that number, I would imagine. Can you speak to that a bit?

**MR. LIPP:**

Okay. So right now, as I said before, before these resolutions, approximately 3 1/2 million as a fund balance that's left over through the end of last year, and actually up to date now. And these projects will eat into that fund balance, so it will go below the 3.5 mark. It's not a lot of dollars, so it won't go below by a lot. The bigger problem is moving forward, whether or not we will be able to have enough, on a stand-alone basis, revenue to pay for all the operating expenses that we have in the budget, which is basically staffing and some Cornell projects.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So what did we budget for in 2015 to go into the 477 Fund?

**MR. LIPP:**

About 8 million or so, I believe, for this particular piece, off the top of my head. What I mean by this piece is that the Water Quality portion of the quarter cent is 11.75%. So it's --

**LEG. CILMI:**

And if things hold true, or if our sales tax collection is consistent with what it has been for the first half of the year, what do you think the number will ultimately end up being by the end of the year?

**MR. LIPP:**

Well, it's hard to say because it would depend upon what the recommended budget looks like, how they're moving monies around.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Well, how does the recommended budget impact what we ultimately end up collecting this year?

**MR. LIPP:**

Well, it would -- A, it would show in there what the 11.75% is of the quarter cent, okay, for the Water Quality portion. Number two, then it would presumably be up to the County Executive and the recommended budget to see if they could sort of not spend on a deficit level what's in the Operating Budget, assuming that is exactly break-even. Then all you're doing with these projects is spending down the 3 1/2 million.

**LEG. CILMI:**

No, I understand that. And I guess my question is not so much specifically related to this resolution that we're talking about now, but in general. If we budgeted roughly \$8 million for revenue into the 477 Fund this year, and that revenue comes from sales tax, and we know that our sales tax is coming in well below what we budgeted, then necessarily, the money going into the 477 Fund will come in below what we budgeted for this year. And my question is what do you expect that to be?

**MR. LIPP:**

It's a little hard for me to say, because we haven't done our projections yet. If you give me a minute, I'll come up with a number, though. I have to think about it for a minute.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. He's good. I think it will be less than a minute.

**MR. LIPP:**

I believe -- I'm sorry. I didn't actually think you were going to stop everything for me, but I'm truly impressed. So I believe it's only a few hundred thousand dollars we'll be short, 300,000.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. Thank you.

**MR. LIPP:**

So your colleagues confer with me.

**LEG. CILMI:**

You're always a fount of information, Robert, appreciate it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Are you done?

**LEG. CILMI:**

I am.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Cilmi -- excuse me, Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Just a quick question. I read this; I can't recall. Where is this one, watershed, it's in the Hamptons?

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

East Hampton.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

It's East Hampton. And as I tried to ask before, why don't they use their Community Preservation Funds to do their work? We just gave them two-point-something million in the last month. If we

are struggling to keep 477 in place because we're not getting enough, could they contribute from the Community Preservation Funds to a 477 project?

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

Well, I mean, I'll try to answer that. But, first of all, the Village doesn't have its own Community Preservation Fund, that money goes to the Town of East Hampton.

There is some agreements between the Town and the Village in terms of some targets and things like that, but there's no specific. But that money can't be used for this type of project. It could be used toward open space preservation, it could be used toward active recreation, historic buildings, those kinds of things. But this is not one of the allowable uses, so they -- even though they have quite a bit of money from their Real Estate Transfer Tax, it could not be used for this. And there was a competitive process for this money, and they've put in a request for, I think it was, 50,000 or so, and they went through the Water Quality Review Committee and it was approved.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

There's a proposal to change the 2% fund to allow for these projects to be funded through that, but right now, that wouldn't happen until it would go through the referendum until 2016, that would have to pass. But this is just a standard, you know, stormwater remediation project that's --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I understand. And now it's going to come to us, the proposal to allow these to go through CPF?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

No, no, that's voted on by the Towns.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

That's voted on by the Towns individually. Okay, thank you.

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

Just one other comment, too. This area does also collect a lot of sales tax. Therefore, it collects a lot of this quarter penny money as well. So, you now, they're eligible for it, certainly.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. I am not against this program at all. Stormwater remediation is something vital. We drink our groundwater. I just am looking for ways that we can keep ourselves within budget, that's it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. Anyone else? All right. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

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

Co-sponsor.

**GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, PERSONNEL, HOUSING & CONSUMER PROTECTION**

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***1.R. 1618 - Authorizing the transfer of eight parcels of County-owned real property pursuant to Article 36 of the Suffolk County Administrative Code to non-profit housing***

**agencies for development as affordable housing for military veterans pursuant to the Housing Our Homeless Heroes Act (Co. Exec.).** Motion by Legislator Stern, second by Legislator Muratore. On the motion, Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yeah, on the motion. I was actually going to make a motion to table at this time. I do see the properties, and I think there's quite a few questions that probably more than myself have to ask.

I was not aware that one of the homes is in my District. I just looked it up. I have a sober home a couple doors away from that one. I have a sex offender who lives a couple doors away from that also on the other side. So some of the questions I have is what are the intentions and plans for these homes? I would also like to know if these homes are coming off the tax rolls once we transfer them. And are our school districts aware? Is the Town of Brookhaven aware? Does anybody have any answers?

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

Kate, was that a motion to table? I'm sorry.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Sure, I'll make a motion to table for the moment.

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

I'll second for the moment.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

You know, again, I have to -- I know, Wayne, we've talked often, and I know with Jill, is the many non-profit organizations that are in my District. In fact, I know the concern. Beacon House, I'm not sure about the Mental Health and Wellness, but I know CHI, Federation, FREE. I could name a number of organizations in my District. Brighter Tomorrows has, I think, about four homes, so -- Nana's House. So I have a number of homes in my District for homeless. We have lot of unregulated sober homes, which is something I've been working on.

And so the question is, is what is the plan for the home in my District? I'm sure the rest of the Legislators would like to know what the plan is for the homes in their district. Rob has two in Gordon Heights community. There's a lot of unregulated sober homes in Gordon Heights. The Flanders community, not one of the best communities. I know that you're trying to do work in Flanders, Monica's District, Central Islip. And again, I'm seeing that there seems to be a continuous target in the same communities, and I know it's because these are tax lien properties. I understand that, I get that. But again, I think we need more information.

I'm a little disappointed that I, as -- I don't know about the other Legislators, but I was not contacted, or has the Town of Brookhaven, to the best of my knowledge, been contacted, or my school district, to let them know that this is a property that's going to come off the tax rolls when there's a developmental disabled organization, the likes of IGHL. If they want to open up a home in a community, the local municipality is contacted to let them know that there is an intent to put a home in their community. I have one in Yaphank.

I don't want this to be perceived that I'm not supporting our homeless Veterans. As you well know, I have the homeless shelter in Yaphank called the Vets Place, and I have a number of homes in my District, like, again, for homeless, for people with mental health problems, people with substance abuse problems. So my concern is, is that if we're going to take another property off the tax rolls, what does it do to our communities? What does it do to our school district? Because I know the William Floyd School District cannot afford to lose that -- those taxes.

General Meeting 9/9/15

So can you kind of give us some background on them, since no one has ever reached out to me in the past?

**MR. THOMPSON:**

I am not certain that they come off the tax rolls once they're given to an organization, unless they're totally tax exempt also.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. I believe that the Mental Health and Wellness is.

**MR. THOMPSON:**

That was just pointed out to me; then they would pay the tax rolls.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. I spoke with Mike Stoltz and I believe that the Mastic one is Mike Stoltz' organization, correct?

**MR. THOMPSON:**

Mastic one?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yeah. 197A is a sex offender living there.

**MR. THOMPSON:**

Mental Health and Wellness, Inc.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yeah.

**MR. THOMPSON:**

What is it that wish to know?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Well, I did speak with Mike Stoltz earlier and he did tell me that, yes, properties would be coming off the tax rolls because they're a non-profit agency.

**MR. THOMPSON:**

I don't know what to tell you about that. If that's -- if they're exempt, then, yes, they would have that right. As to where we pick our properties from, it's from where the taxes are not paid. And certain areas, as you know, we get a lot more taxes --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Right.

**MR. THOMPSON:**

-- that were paid than others.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Which is why we're trying to turn our communities around. I mean, I know, Jay, we were just talking about Flanders and about trying to change the community, and how do you change it is we need to get more homeownership. And we can't continually target the same communities for sober homes, homeless shelters. You know, you might as well tell the people who are buying homes there, working hard, trying to raise their families that their taxes are going to continually go up,

because they're constantly being targeted with non-profit organizations taking over homes in their community.

**MR. THOMPSON:**

I understand. I don't --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

You understand, but so then we shouldn't be doing it.

**MR. THOMPSON:**

Well, like Flanders was brought in, because, as I recall, in the last couple of years, we really haven't gotten much property in Flanders at all. So I think that area is turning around, although whatever comes in in the immediate circle near Flanders we generally turn over to the Town automatically anyway. So, I mean, are you saying you propose we're better off giving it to the Town for affordable housing than the exempts?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. Right, because it puts it back on the tax rolls. And, like I said, 177A Mastic Boulevard, sex offender. 190 is a sober home -- not 190, sorry. 180 is an unregulated sober home. So we already have problems on that street, and we do get police calls on Mastic Boulevard from residents. We hear from them about drug dealing, that type of stuff going on. So are we going to put Veterans in this home who have recovered and are now in another stage of their life on a street where there's drug activity; is that what we're going to do for them?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

It's my understanding, in the development and selection of these parcels, these eight parcels for affordable housing for military Veterans, is that we, through, I believe, Legislator Stern's efforts and the large committee through our Housing Our Homeless Heros Act with Tom Ronayne and others, worked with a series of agencies to comprehensively review a set of parcels that were available through Real Estate and these were the eight parcels, using the criteria that these groups identified as the best viable places for these, these particular individuals.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. So 190 Mastic Boulevard is a good viable option when a few doors away there's a sex offender, and a few doors away from that there's an unregulated sober home? And there has -- again, at what point in time were you going to reach out to each of the Legislators whose Districts they were in? I don't -- I don't know if any of them were reached out to and told, you know, "This is your District." And of the 18 Districts, how many homes are in all 18 Districts, or possibly of the 18th Districts, where have you targeted and decided that you want to put one in Doc Spencer's District, Legislator D'Amaro, Legislator Stern? You know, tell me where they're going in all of the other Districts.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

So, again, these are -- these particular parcels were chosen by the housing groups that specifically work with homeless military Veterans, and all of the parcels are listed here in this resolution specifically.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

And there's a home in my District in Mastic Beach that was -- we did a ribbon-cutting with Beacon House for a homeless mom and her daughter, and it was a great event, she's now a homeowner. And so I'm not saying that this is a bad idea, but she is a homeowner in that property, and this is before even that legislation was even passed that we have homes that have been opened up in my District with Veterans moving into them. In fact, we just had another one a couple of months ago,

so -- but, again, these are homeownership, they're back on the tax rolls, they're paying. But I'd like to know what the impact would be if you were to take more in my District and say, "Okay, William Floyd School District, we're going to turn over more properties to another nonprofit organization," and let's look at the impact on the taxpayers in those communities. That's my concern, because, as I say, I have lots more besides these three organizations.

So I would request that we table this, that we do a -- I think that we should be a bit more open to our school districts, to our municipalities, and make sure that there is no concerns on their part.

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

**LEG. BROWNING:**

And, again, when IGHL wants to open up a home in a community, they have to notify the local municipality. We, as Legislators, receive those letters to see if there are any concerns or disagreements with that and again, when IGHL wants to open up a home in a community, they have to notify the local municipality, we as Legislators receive those letters to see if there are any concerns or disagreements with that location. And again, you know, we're always hearing about saturations. Is this a homeless veteran, you know, a family that are homeless and the parent being a veteran? I don't know that. Are these people with drug and alcohol problems? And again, is this the right location, when I can tell you for a fact there's problems in this community, in this part of the community that now you're going to subject these people to possibly fall backwards and wind up back in a rehab.

So, I'm not hearing any answers and I don't think that we should be moving this unless we have all the answers.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

You know, I personally can't speak for all the eight properties. I was at a press conference where we did the one in Copiaigue. You know, the neighbors were outside. You know, they were supportive of the program, they're supportive of vets, they spoke to the not-for-profits that are going to be managing the home and they were assured that it was going to be well kept. They're supportive of our veterans, as I think we all are and should be. You know, I can only speak for that. And it's right down the street from a school; you know, it's your average middle class community.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Right, and I respect that. You were notified ahead of time.  
That community --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

No, I wasn't. I was notified there was a press conference, I wasn't --

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Oh, okay. However, you were invited to a press conference, I know I wasn't. But at the same time, that's one particular property. What about the other Legislators and their districts and the properties in their districts, what were we told? You're saying that the people who live in that community said this is great. I might get the same answer, but I don't know that because I'm just seeing it now. And I think out of respect for each of us in our districts, the Administration should have notified us.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Schneiderman.

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

I'm in a similar position as Kate, you know, just kind of finding out about all the various properties and which groups are going to be in charge of them. I don't -- you know, in my district there's one property that was chosen. I don't fully understand the process. I know that this property is 150 feet from the elementary school in that Flanders/Riverside area, it's very close, 150 feet. And, you know, it's a group, the Association for Mental Health & Wellness. I don't know who they are or whether they have a local office, whether they'll be monitoring how many people they're planning on putting into the home, what issues these individuals may have and whether being 150 feet to the elementary school is an appropriate spot. I also haven't been able to look at the maps that Renaissance Downtowns drew up that the Town adopted in their plan for the revitalization of that area to see whether this is within the boundaries of every development area.

So I would like to at least be able to speak with the Association for Mental Health & Wellness, and I think the school ought to be aware as well if there is going to be a group home for individuals with mental health issues so close to the schools. I wish had been contacted earlier, because I hate to table something I know that's very important to our vets, but I think those are legitimate concerns. And I'm not saying no, but, you know, so close to the school, I don't know how many individuals and I don't know the state of those individuals, I don't know whether this group has an office and can monitor them in any way, and I feel like I should know those things. If you want to respond, that's great.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

We can certainly get back to you with all of that information.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I almost don't know where to start with this. I respect my colleagues, I know you have some legitimate concerns. But these are exactly the types of road blocks that you should not be putting in front of our veterans. I mean, what are you saying? You want to screen military veterans to determine whether or not they're good enough to live in your community? I'm not quite sure where these arguments are going.

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

That is not what I'm saying. What I'm saying is that 150 feet from an elementary school there's a proposal to have, I guess, a group home for homeless vets with mental health issues, and I just want to know a little bit about the agency that is looking at it, that's going to be overseeing it; I know nothing about them, I haven't heard of them before. I want to make sure that, you know, the community -- you know, oversight is there. This is the first I'm hearing of this, Lou. And as a Legislator for this area, I feel like I should have a chance to get my questions answered that can't be answered tonight.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, I --

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

The group that's in charge of this house isn't even here tonight. Is there a representative from this group? This is the Association for Mental Health & Wellness.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yeah, that used to be Clubhouse of Suffolk and Suffolk County United Veterans, they merged under that new name and it's the Suffolk County United Veterans. And yes, the gentleman from there was here earlier today and spoke in favor of this. And they as well as Community Housing Innovations, who were the sponsor of the other properties, were both at committee. I have other comments, but I'll add them later.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, could I just pick up? You know, I mean, I've been on this committee also and I know that Mr. Ronayne was probably involved in the selection of these organizations, knows these organizations, recommended these organizations. You know, I think you have to be a little bit careful when you talk about returning veterans. These are people that put their lives on the line, they return here, they're homeless for whatever their -- because of their situation, and now we're just going to throw all the red tape right in front of them.

I think this was fully vetted. This program wasn't just -- we didn't just pull some names out of a hat and say, *Hey, you want to run a homeless organization for veterans?* I mean, this is something that was thought through. These are probably the best organizations; Mr. Ronayne is not here tonight, but I'm sure if he were he would be telling you exactly that.

You know, we're raising all these larger issues about saturation. And Legislator Browning, as I've mentioned to you in prior discussions, I think those are legitimate issues, but this is not the time to be raising about eight locations for homeless veterans, this is not the time to draw that line and say *No more*. So if we want to do a study and study saturation and take a look at where -- you know, how we're placing different facilities and what communities are bearing an unfair burden, I'm all for that. But we're going to draw the line here tonight on this bill for homeless vets? I mean, I just don't -- I don't understand why we would go down that road.

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

Do you know how many individuals are going into this house? Do you think that's a fair question, to you want to know how many individuals are going into this house 150 feet from the school?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I think a more fair question is why don't these veterans have a home when they return for defending their country; how is that for a legitimate question?

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

Well, it's a homeless -- it is a homeless shelter, right, which is our responsibility to begin with, to house the homeless; we're mandated to do that role. Now, this is going to be more transitional housing, a long-term housing; in this case, for those, you know, with mental health issues. And you may not feel it's a legitimate concern, it's the first I'm hearing of it tonight, that this particular property is so close to the schools. I just want to know how many individuals.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

But are you saying --

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

And what --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

-- to me that veterans shouldn't be close to a school but somebody else can? I don't understand that argument.

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

No, I want to know the group that is overseeing it. I'd like to be able to ask them some questions and know how many individuals are going there. Is it four, five, six, eight, ten? I have no idea.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I'm sure the number of individuals going in there would be appropriate for the facility. I mean, what are we going to do? We're going to take our homeless vets and we're going to throw them into a facility and pile 15 of them inside the house and make them uncomfortable? That's not the purpose.

You know, again, you know, I understand -- I understand, frankly, Legislator Browning's argument I think is legitimate about, you know, what communities are bearing a burden that's disproportionate to what they should be, I get that, and I agree with that and I think we need to look at that. But I do not think that this is the time or the bill or the subject matter to be raising that particular issue on. I mean, we could have studied that for the last five years. Why are we choosing on a bill to house homeless veterans? Now all of a sudden we're saying, *You know what? Let's stop it here. Let's not go forward with this particular proposal.* You know, let's study this problem now for another two years while these veterans that have returned from overseas, fighting for this country, are going to be told by Suffolk County, *We're going to put you on hold until we study this larger issue.* I just don't think that's appropriate; that's my opinion.

I'm going to support this bill a hundred percent. You know, again, I understand the concerns about, you know, which communities are bearing burdens that they shouldn't be bearing, or perhaps too much of the burden, but I don't think that these eight facilities are going to, you know, be the straw that breaks the camel's back on that particular issue, I just don't.

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

Well, can somebody answer -- from the County answer those questions in terms of will they be used conforming to zoning, will they be -- what oversight -- are there reverta clauses if they're not used in that way? Is there somebody that can answer some questions about this program and any kind of conditions attached to the transfer?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

But can I just ask --

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

Those are legitimate questions.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

But Jay, here's the facts. We convey parcels to towns and villages and organizations all the time, not for veterans, but all the time for other -- you know, for workforce and homeless --

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

We know how the --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Workforce housing; we don't ask any of those questions, ever.

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

Well, we know it can be used --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

One at a time.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

But why are we asking them tonight?

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

We do ask those questions, Lou. This is different, these are groups homes, this is not a single-family residence. This is basically a shelter we're creating, but I think it's a long-term housing shelter; it's not going to be subject to the typical 90-day DSS requirements.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Are we waiting on a response?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

We're trying to get the answers to all of your questions. One second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator D'Amaro, you have some further questions, or?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, again, I don't think that this is the time or the bill or the subject matter to be, you know, raising the larger issues. I think that we have an obligation, if a program has been put together, it's been thought through by the folks in the County that deal with veterans all the time with some good organizations that are willing to finally, finally, you know, give some deference to the fact that these folks need facilities as well. I think that we need to move forward with that and I think we need to do it now.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I agree. I have just a year ago, Liberty Village, which CHI runs, 64 units for homeless vets. I think, Legislator Kennedy, it's in your district, Lake Ronkonkoma?

**LEG. CILMI:**

*(Raised hand).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Or Cilmi, they're building their second?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yeah, Tom's now, it was mine.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

And in my district.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Right, right.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Already in my district.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Right. So they're --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Probably the first of all of them. So being the wife of a veteran who was deployed and a son of -- having a son deployed three times, I can tell you this is not against our veterans. What I am

saying --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I didn't suggest you were against our veterans.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Right.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I. Wouldn't do that.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

To say that I'm not supporting veterans or trying to make it appear that way, the fact of the matter is you cannot -- you cannot continue to saturate the same communities over and over again. If this is a group home, it's a group home; it is what it is, whether it be veterans or anyone who is homeless. We have to take care of our veterans, absolutely. But do we redline and saturate the same communities? And no, this isn't where this should be done, it should have been done when that committee met. That committee that met and picked my district without even contacting me and saying, *How's your district? What's it like there? What's going on in your neighborhood? And how many sex offenders live on that street? How many sober homes are already on that street?* Why didn't they ask those questions? But no, there's a committee that sat and made a decision. And I want to know when the next one's opening up in yours, Lou, right next door to you. Let me know when that's going to happen.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Kate, I'd welcome them with open arms.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Oh, I --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I would welcome them with open arms and --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I beg to differ. I think when it comes to --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

-- you can quote me on it.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

-- your neighborhood, your community.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No, you know what? You can say that all you want --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Your neighbors and your residents --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

-- but the fact is I would welcome them with open arms.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, okay.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I would never --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I could guarantee you won't.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

-- never, never --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, okay.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Never, with respect to veterans, say that this is the time now to raise the County study and let's take a few years to look at these issues; this is not the time to do this.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

So why didn't that committee, before they came up with these addresses, why didn't that committee decide and look at -- seriously look at the addresses, seriously look at the communities? I used to represent Gordon Heights. What was one of the biggest problems they had? Too many sober homes, unregulated sober homes, and a lack of taxpaying homes. That hurts that community, that hurts that school district. The Longwood School District will suffer when you continually take properties off the tax rolls, and I have the Longwood School District also. So the Yaphank Veterans Place has been there for many years, it's got a lot of support, it's run very well. Mike Stoltz I know very well; I have a lot of respect for him and his organization. However, when each and every one of you can say that you have one and you're willing to take one -- let's talk about Smithtown, we just went through this thing about an affordable housing, right? Why don't we take one and take that one property and let's use that?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

But, Kate, we're not talking about affordable housing, we're talking about veterans.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Right, so -- okay.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

We're not talking -- you know, I hear words like mentally ill, sober homes, workforce housing. What we are talking about --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

And we need to know that information.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

-- are individuals that have served their nation and have come back here in need, and I think we as a County need to open our arms to a program like this. Do we have other issues that need to be addressed? Absolutely. But to raise them here tonight and tell me we need to table this bill on the backs of returning vets in need, I am not willing to do, not on this legislation. I'm all for looking at all the other issues, I have no problem with that. And of course we should -- sex offenders, workforce housing, Town of Smithtown; I mean, you're raising everything but the fact that these folks were willing to die for their country.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Oh, please. I mean, don't go there with that.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I am going there.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Please, I've had that in my family, I know what it's like to send them away --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I'm not talking about your family.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

-- and not know what it's going to be like.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I'm talking about the individuals that need this.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I know what it feels like to be a family member; I've experienced it more than once.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I'm not personally talking about you.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

But don't go on about --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, okay.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

-- our veterans, our veterans, our veterans.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, it's just too bad, I'll go on about them all I want.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I've been there, I understand.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

The fact of the matter is --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

The fact of the matter is you --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

-- who are going to be living in these home?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

-- should not oppose this bill here and now tonight.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Well, the committee should have done --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Cease fire! Cease fire!

**LEG. BROWNING:**

-- a better job. No, the committee should have done a better job and they failed.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

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

Let's get our questions answered.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

So let the committee go back and relook at the properties that they looked at. I'm sorry, Steve, I don't see one -- you're on that committee, I'm assuming. You were the sponsor of the bill. Where's one in your district?

**LEG. STERN:**

If I may?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

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

Sarah has some answers.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Do you have some answers for us?

**LEG. STERN:**

I just don't know what the allegation is about some nameless, faceless committee choosing these places in various locations.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Who was on that committee? Who's on the committee?

**LEG. STERN:**

First of all, the idea behind this legislation, one of the -- I think the most important elements of this legislation is that if there are to be properties that can be identified throughout Suffolk County that are appropriate for our homeless veterans, that these properties not just simply be turned over without any ongoing supervision, without any ongoing services provided. The idea here was to partner with these not-for-profit organizations that have a longstanding, well-proven, professional track record of working with homeless veterans and their families who are exactly the type of people and our neighbors that require this assistance.

These are organizations that have outstanding reputations. These are organizations that couldn't wait to get involved with this program to show all of our neighbors and other jurisdictions, not just throughout New York State but across the country, how we care for our veteran neighbors in need. They are putting their professional reputations on the line every single day providing this assistance to our veterans and perhaps family members as well. Every single one of these organizations has a proven track record, every single one of these organizations has been vetted, every one of them is well known to our Veterans Service Agency and our Real Estate Department and they worked hand-in-hand in the not-for-profit organizations selecting these properties.

This is not a situation where these properties were identified by some nameless, faceless County committee and then dictated where -- you know, which organizations were perhaps going to be involved. It was the not-for-profit organizations that identified these properties and believed that they would be well-suited to carry out their mission. And by the way, not every organization has the same mission. Some are providing services to veterans that might be on one end of the spectrum and other organizations might have a particular expertise in providing services to others. The idea behind the program was to provide that kind of flexibility because there is no one-size-fits-all for a veteran in need and there is no one-size-fits-all for any of the organizations that we are partnering with.

So the process here I think is important to everybody, because here what you're suggesting is actually not what happened; it was actually the exact opposite. It was the organizations that identified and selected these properties based on the services that they know that they can provide because they've done it in the past. And they made these selections because of however many that they're going to be providing services to -- a single family, two, three, four people, whatever it might be, whatever it might be -- they believed that this particular property in this particular location was going to enable them to be able to carry out their mission in providing for our veterans.

So I just wanted to be clear --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay.

**LEG. STERN:**

-- on process because you're bringing up process, but at least let's understand what's happening here. It was not dictated from on high or by some nameless, faceless committee. These are site selections that were initiated by those not-for-profit organizations because they believed that these properties would best allow them to fulfill the mission.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. And I can tell you, Josh was telling me that one of the organizations did reach out about this particular address and another one. We gave them the information with regards to the issues around that neighborhood and it was our understanding that they'd pull them, for good reason; however, I find out otherwise, but I was not reached out to and told.

And the one thing that I can tell you that I think you know only too well is that my district has always said, *We will do our fair share. We will take our fair share, no matter what the issue is, no matter who they are.* However, when you wind up looking at the same communities over and over and over again and saying, *Okay, this non-profit can go here because this is where we can find an affordable home, and this organization can go in there because, yeah, we've got enough tax liens in that community.* You can't keep putting them in the same communities over and over and over again. So we have our fair share. We have our fair share of homes that we have helped veterans with, we have done all of that. But I want to know that every single Legislative District has their fair share, and I can guarantee you they have not. And I can guarantee you also that if any one of

these organizations was to go to certain districts, the people in that community will say, *Absolutely not*. So it's about fair share, equal distribution, because when you don't equally distribute, that becomes a problem.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, we have a long list. Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Thank you. First, there are two properties that are being proposed that are in my district, and I will advocate for my district myself, I don't need anybody else to do that for me. And it is in probably one of my most impacted districts, although I would say every zip code that I represent has its fair should of various forms of community housing because that's the mode that the State decided they want to house people of all needs and disabilities these days and that's what's happening more and more and there's a lot of great organizations doing that.

We've dealt with a lot of our boarding house problems in Gordon Heights by doing a couple of things, and first and foremost was by not demonizing the people living in the houses. The reality is those people are there for whatever reason, they have fallen on hard times, they're having problems, just like many of these homeless veterans. And we decided we weren't going to treat those people as the problem because they weren't the problem, it was the homeowner that was the problem, it was the person putting 20 of them in a house that was the problem. Those people were just looking for a place to go.

What this particular resolution is doing is it's saying we have a need with our veteran population to get them housing. We are identifying quality organizations to do that housing, similar to your Sober Home Oversight Committee that put out an RFP for quality organizations to do housing for people with drug and alcohol addiction issues. So that those people are getting the kind of housing they need, so they get the assistance they need so they could get back on their feet and become productive members of society. That is certainly something that my residents in my community have said very clearly in meeting after meeting that they want us to do.

What they don't want us to do is ignore the problem, ignore the fact that there's a situation that needs to be addressed and allow these people to be exploited by those unscrupulous landlords who want to put 30 of them in a house, and that's what we're doing here. We're making sure we have a quality organization that's going to be committed to those individuals, it's going to give them the services they need and it's going to make sure that the house is not a problem for the neighborhood.

Every single time I've had somebody in one of my communities -- and I have one right around the corner from my house, it was actually the worst place that I had in my district. Robbery after robbery coming out of that place because they were dealing drugs right on the property. It finally got closed down. It's a home for veterans, I don't have a single problem anymore. The community is quiet and they're happy. And over and over and over again, when you have a quality organization taking on the house, I may hear a few complaints at first, but after a year's time goes by, people don't know there's anybody in there any different than any other house, because it's a quality organization doing the work.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Rob, I --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

No, I'm not asking for a response, Legislator Browning. I'm making my own statement, so please leave me my time because I gave you yours.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Well, you're giving the impression --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

No, no, I gave you your time, please give me mine.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

-- that the ones in my district that I'm complaining about are not quality organizations; in fact, one of these quality organizations, I've had problems with.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

As I said, I have the floor and I would like to have my time.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I'm just trying to correct you.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

No, I don't need you to correct my statements.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, one at a time.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

You can have your floor -- you can have the floor when you have the floor, Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Can I respond to that, please?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

We have a long list, Kate, we really do. Okay?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

What I'm saying is that we have two quality organizations that have been very well vetted, and I would much rather them providing the services in my community than having these veterans, and I have plenty of veterans in Gordon Heights who are looking for housing that this is good and clean and not exposing them to the problems they get in those so-called sober houses that aren't sober houses, they're illegal boarding houses. And I'm going to support this because this is doing that for those individuals. And it's not just because they're veterans, but because each and every individual deserves to have a good, clean place to live and get the services they need so they can get back on their feet.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Kate, I understand your feelings about having a bad block, I definitely do.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

More than one.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay, I understand perfectly. What disturbs me here is we're talking about veterans and we're talking about homeless veterans. I would fathom a guess that 80% of homeless people have a

General Meeting 9/9/15

mental illness, whether it be PTSD or Bipolar Disorder or something else. I think these organizations are all vetted, and please correct me if I'm wrong, and approved by the Office of Mental Health. I, too, would be disturbed if I was putting my homeless veterans two houses away from sexual predators, that would be disturbing for me because of the care for our veterans.

I will definitely support tabling this if that's the right thing to do, but I think the Office of Mental Health knows far better than we do about what is going into a home, what is appropriate. They must have vetted them. You vetted these houses? In what way, other than just financially, Sarah?

**MS. LANSDALE:**

Tom Ronayne is on his way and will answer questions.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Good.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So you guys want to pass over it until Tom gets here?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Sure.

**LEG. CILMI:**

That would be great.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right, because we have still a long agenda ahead of us.

All right, so that is 1618.

**Health**

***I.R. 1606-15 - To extend deadline for Tick and Vector-Borne Diseases Task Force to December 31, 2015 (Schneiderman).***

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

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1625-15 - Amending Resolution No. 132-2014, creating a Tick Control Advisory Committee (Schneiderman).***

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

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. I'll second. All in favor?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

These are something that my staff or I attend, and they haven't really been productive. Is there an end to the task force? Because there's no end to the ticks and there's no end to the meetings. So I was wondering, is there an end to the meetings, at least, will there be an end? Because they haven't come up with any work product in over a year.

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

I know Gwen's been at a number of these meetings, I think you've been at a few as well. I've been at most of them and, you know, I think it's really a highly qualified group of professionals. Dominick Ninivaggi is there, we have representatives from Parks, we have the head, Dr. Benach from Stony Brook University -- let me just finish. So the idea was to help give input to Vector Control because we're requiring Vector Control to -- we're mandating Vector Control to develop a plan for combatting tick-borne illnesses. And, you know, Dominick Ninnivaggi isn't here today, but I think he would agree that the information that has come out has been very helpful to him in developing a plan. He is our staff member and he's tasked with this. And, you know, I believe that this committee will probably go on for quite some time until we, the Legislature, have adopted a Vector Control Plan that includes a section on tick-borne illnesses, which we have not done yet.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

You are quite the optimist, Legislator Schneiderman. I mean, I will support this, and there's no question about the quality of the people who are on the committee. I just hope that we can move forward with some sort of resolution in the near future, because where this is -- where you see that, *Oh, okay, three mosquitoes tested positive for West Nile*, how many people actually contracted Lyme Disease or other tick-borne illnesses this year? A lot more than three.

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

I can't disagree with you. I feel we have not -- I would love to see this committee move quicker. It clearly was a more complex issue than the West Nile Virus, you know, where they have the tools in place, they had to develop the tools. And there's a lot more coming, there's probably a whole environmental impact study involved with whatever programs that they put together; if there are chemical treatments, there may be hunting and things like that, deer management. It's an enormous task and it's just the nature of it. The ticks may be small, but the problem isn't ours. It's also going to require significant funding and this Legislature is going to have to wrestle with that as well.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I'm sorry. Anyone else have any questions? No? Okay, we have a motion and a second?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Yes, we do.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Opposed.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Opposed: Legislator Barraga).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, ***I.R. 1651-15 - Authorizing a Lease Agreement for use of a portion of County premises located at County Center, 300 Center Drive, Riverhead, New York by Hudson River Healthcare, Inc. (HRHCare) (County Executive).***

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Mr. Presiding Officer, please note my recusal on the record.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Krupski, do you want to make a motion?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

*(Raised hand).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Krupski. Second by Legislator Schneiderman. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Sixteen (Opposed: Legislator Trotta - Recused: Legislator D'Amato).*

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Recused.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1658-15 - Designating the month of September as "Mitochondrial Disease Awareness Month" in Suffolk County ("Eli's Law") (Spencer).*** Motion by Legislator Spencer.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

*(Raised hand).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Krupski. On the motion?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Briefly on the motion. That was the young man who was here earlier tonight, and you could see he's just an inspiration. You know, I really like to subtitle this *Eli's Law*. I think he's proud, his family is proud and he has inspired a lot of young people to get involved. So I appreciate your support.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right, Legislator Barraga.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Doc, can you do me a favor? Can you explain what that disease is again? And I'll tell you why I'm asking. When you make presentations or proclamations, you have a habit of speaking to the audience, and some of us, most of us can't even hear what you're saying because you're away from the microphone. In the future, maybe you can face us when you give your proclamation. You know, I'm just trying to --

**LEG. SPENCER:**

That's great advice, I will definitely do that.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

I know you want to speak to the group; unfortunately at times I can't hear you, you know?

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Fair enough.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

It's the age thing with me, you know?

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**LEG. SPENCER:**

I should know better as a hearing doctor, right?

*(\*Laughter\*)*

Absolutely. So this young man has Pearson's Disease, and it's a Mitochondrial Disease. Mitochondria are an organ in each of our cells that help the cells produce energy, and so when you have a defect in the Mitochondria, it's hard for these cells to function properly. And so anyplace where there's a lot of energy needs within the body, muscles, organs, that tends to be where these young people would have failure. And Pearson's is one specific one, but it's so rare, I made it Mitochondria Awareness Month because there are other diseases. And unfortunately, they are almost uniformly fatal very young in life, and so when you see someone that has had the support and the fight and the ability to fight to survive, it really is a miracle. And I wanted to be able to celebrate with him while he is vibrant and this is very important to his family and it allows me to create awareness.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right, so we have a motion, a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Thank you, everyone.

**Human Services**

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1634-15 - To appoint member to the Teen Pregnancy Advisory Board (Shannon Rigney).***

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Spencer. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1635-15 - To appoint member to the Teen Pregnancy Advisory Board (Claudia Delgado) (Spencer).*** Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**Parks & Recreation**

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1600-15 - Authorizing use of Indian Island County Park by Birthright of Peconic, Inc., for a Fundraising Walkathon (Krupski).***

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Krupski. I'll second. Actually, what is this? Who wants to second? Second by Legislator Anker. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1628-15 - Authorizing the transfer of a landscaping utility trailer to the Long Island Native Plant Initiative (Krupski).*** Motion by Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

*(Raised hand).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**Public Safety**

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1613-15 - Accepting and appropriating federal funding in the amount of \$7,000 from the United States Department of Agriculture, Office of Inspector General, for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in fraud investigations involving the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) with 79.14% support (County Executive).*** Motion by Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes, sir.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**Public Works, Transportation & Energy**

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1566-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with Building Safety Improvements (CP 1603)(County Executive).*** Motion by Legislator Krupski. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1566A, Bond Resolution (of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$100,000 Bonds to finance the cost of building safety improvements (CP 1603.313),*** same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Here.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1567-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with modifications for compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) (CP 1738) (County Executive).***

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Krupski.

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

**P.O. GREGORY:**  
Second by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**  
*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**  
***I.R. 1567A, Bond Resolution (of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$50,000 Bonds to finance the cost of modifications for compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (CP 1738.315), same motion, same second. Roll call.***

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

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**  
Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**  
Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**  
Pass.

**LEG. HAHN:**  
Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**  
Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**  
Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**  
Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**  
Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**  
Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**  
Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**  
Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

No.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Seventeen (Opposed: Legislator Trotta).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I.R. 1576-15 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget & Program and appropriating funds in connection with --

**MR. NOLAN:**

He passed on the last one.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Oh, I'm sorry.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

I passed on the last one.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

I'm sorry, I thought you said yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I thought you said yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

All right, we'll leave it at yes.

**(\*Laughter\*)**

**MR. RICHBERG:**

So we're good with *seventeen (Opposed: Legislator Trotta).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1576-15 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Planning and Design of Nitrogen Reduction Projects (CP 8197) (County Executive).*** Motion by Legislator Hahn. Second by Legislator Krupski. Anyone on the motion? Legislator McCaffrey.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes, what is this? I just want to ask a few more questions about this.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We're on 1577?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventy-six.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Nitrogen reduction projects.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This resolution is requesting \$2 million to initiate the design phase for the four Nitrogen Reduction Projects that Suffolk County has received the \$383 million in Federal and State aid for -- \$2 million is looking to initiate the design phase of the projects. We would come back in next year and look for the remaining money to complete the design, which is about a little over 20 million. The projects include the Forge River which is a one million gallon per day treatment area, including a treatment plant, at 181 million; the Carlls River up in North Babylon, the area will treat about 780,000 gallons per day at 126 million in construction costs; the next one would be the Connetquot River, \$29 million construction cost treating 150,000 gallons per day; and the last part of this is the Patchogue River Project, it's \$16.5 million in construction costs which would treat about 300,000 gallons per day.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Okay. Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

You're welcome.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Kennedy?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Gil, these are waste treatment plants, the equivalent of waste treatment plants?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

It's going to be nitrogen reduction?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right, yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

And we will hook private homes, etcetera, into those?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yep.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Thank you.

General Meeting 9/9/15

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay? All right? We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, *I.R. 1576A, Bond Resolution (of the County of Suffolk, New York authorizing the issuance of \$2,000,000 Bonds to finance the Planning and Design of Nitrogen Reduction Projects (CP 8197.110)*, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***J.R. 1581-15 - Amending the Adopted 2015 Operating Budget to transfer funds from Fund 620- Suffolk County Ballpark, amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds in connection with improvements to the Suffolk County Ballpark (Bethpage Ballpark), Central Islip (CP 6425)(County Executive).*** Motion by Legislator Martinez.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I'll second.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion, Legislator D'Amaro?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yeah, Commissioner Anderson, just -- this is 1581, right, we're on?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

This is -- again, it's amending the Operating Budget and transferring funds. Is there a cost overrun? Is there an unanticipated need that arose? Why the amendment?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

There's -- as part of the agreement to build and run the ballpark, we're responsible for major capital improvements and recent developments -- or I guess with time, the thing's over ten years old -- certain work is required of the facility. The railings need to be replaced, the HVAC system and the electrical system needs to be upgraded, the super structure needs painting, scraping and painting, and there's a number of sidewalks and curbs that need to be replaced. So this would look

to do those improvements.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right, but the amendment --

**MR. NOLAN:**

Legislator D'Amaro? I think the amendment is -- it's in the Capital Program right now to use bonded monies, and this is going to use cash instead, I believe, from a transfer from the Operating Budget, a dedicated fund to the ballpark. So it's changing it basically just from bonding to cash, it's the same amount.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So there's funding that can only be used for the ballpark in the Operating Budget, so to avoid the debt service we would just pay cash.

**MR. NOLAN:**

That's the way it looks to me.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

That was the intent.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay, that's great news. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. There's a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen -- *Eighteen*.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. ***I.R. 1592-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with Bulkheading at Various Locations (CP 5375)(County Executive).***

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

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. Second by Legislator Krupski. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen*.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1592A, Bond Resolution (of the County of Suffolk, New York authorizing the issuance of \$500,000 Bonds to finance the cost of Bulkheading Improvements at Various Locations (CP 5375.318), same motion, same second. Roll call.***

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

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

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, *I.R. 1593-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with reconstruction of Culverts (CP 5371) (County Executive).*

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

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. I'll second. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

*I.R. 1593A, Bond Resolution (of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$600,000 Bonds to finance the reconstruction of culverts (CP 5371.114.322), same motion, same second. Roll call.*

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

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

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1594-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with reconstruction of Shinnecock Canal Locks, Town of Southampton (CP 5343)(County Executive).*** Motion by Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1594A, Bond Resolution (of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$1,500,000 Bonds to finance the reconstruction of the Shinnecock Canal Locks, Town of Southampton. (CP 5343.315), same motion, same second.*** Roll call.

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

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

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1595-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with Replacement of Dredge Support Equipment (CP 5201)(County Executive).***

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

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Second.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1595A, Bond Resolution (of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$350,000 Bonds to finance the replacement of dredge support equipment (CP 5201.521), same motion, same second. Roll call.***

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

**LEG. ANKER:**

Cosponsor.

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

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1596-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with Construction of Sidewalks on Various County Roads (CP 5497) (County Executive).*** Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, second by Legislator Anker. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Opposed.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Wait, hold on. I'm sorry.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

1596, sidewalks.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
Sidewalks. Okay.

**P.O. GREGORY:**  
Okay? All right. Did you call the vote?

**MR. RICHBERG:**  
*Seventeen (Opposed: Legislator Barraga).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**  
***I.R. 1596A, Bond Resolution (of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$500,000 Bonds to finance the construction of sidewalks on various County roads (CP 5497.336), same motion, same second. Roll call.***

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

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

**LEG. ANKER:**  
Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**  
Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**  
Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**  
Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**  
*(Not present).*

**LEG. CALARCO:**  
Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**  
Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**  
Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**  
Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**  
No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**  
Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Schneiderman?

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

Again?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

I'm sorry.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

*Sixteen (Opposed: Legislators Barraga & D'Amaro).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

***I.R. 1597-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with Improvements to Environmental Recharge Basins (CP 5072) (County Executive).*** Motion by Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion, Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

What exactly is this, Gil?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This is an annual Capital Program that we use to supplement our forces in repairing and upgrading recharge basins. In this particular case, we're looking to appropriate 305,000 in construction and 20,000 for equipment. The locations we're looking to do the work at right now are on CR 16, Horseblock Road at Oakdale Avenue; CR 93, Lakeland Avenue at Piper Lane; CR 46, William Floyd Parkway at Winston Drive; CR 47, Great Neck Road at Edmond's Place; and CR 2, Straight Path at CR 95, Little East Neck Road.

What this does is we go in there, basically remove the vegetation and the debris that essentially clogs the water and doesn't allow it to drain and recharge into this strata below it.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I mean, I see the town do this, my town do it all the time. They put a bulldozer in, they bulldoze it out, they take the stuff out and they're gone, like, in a day.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Less than a day.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, it's more than a day. Usually we do it -- we try to do it on weekends when we can.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So is this -- are we subbing this out to somebody?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It's done -- it's kind of split; we do it ourselves, and in some cases, if the project's too big or we're just too busy to get to it, we use contractors. We'll do it both ways.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

And how many did you say there was?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

In this particular case, for this money we're looking at one, two, three, four, five; five locations.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Three hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars to clean out five sumps?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This was based on a bid that we let the contract, yeah.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

How many people returned that bid? How many people bid on that?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I don't know off-hand. I mean, it's not -- generally it's -- I can get you that information.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I want you to think about that; 325 -- I watched this. I lived on a sump growing up; every couple of years they'd come in with a bulldozer, they'd drive down the road, they'd clean the vegetation, it literally took a half a day. Now, are these bigger sumps, is there something I'm missing here?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

In some cases they are bigger. In some cases it's been so long since we've been able to scarify the basins that they need significant amount of work. In some cases the groundwater has risen to a point that -- you know, we actually lost one of our machines a couple of years back because the groundwater raised during a storm and, I mean, it was an old traxcavator, but it sat there for a couple of months before we could actually pull it out. So yeah, it's not just a matter of getting in there and, you know, spending half a day; it does take some time to do that, and a significant amount of enforcements.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I'm baffled. I mean -- all right, whatever.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Cilmi?

**LEG. CILMI:**

I didn't have a question.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, I thought you raised your hand. All right, Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Okay. I thought the County had a policy of letting the recharge basins naturalize. I thought that was a -- I know there's one near me in Southold there and, you know, it's full of frogs and dragon flies.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It depends on the actual basin. In certain case there's sedimentation basins, there's a natural treatment and, you know, a lot of storm water quality improvement projects, that's one of our preferred ways to do it; you're creating wetlands to allow the treatment of storm water. In a lot of cases, though, they're the standard highway recharge basins, and what will happen is initially sediment and debris and detritus will collect at the bottom and the side walls essentially act as the recharge mechanism. After a while they start to backup, too, and you've got to get in there and kind of break it up.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Just one of those -- it is a lot of money, in light of everything we're doing, that it seems like if there's any place that we could not spend -- not borrow money, this would be -- it seems like it would be one of the places we could not spend money. I mean, a recharge -- I've never lived in a recharge basin or a sump --

*(\*Laughter\*)*

-- but I know how they operate. *(Laughter)* I couldn't let that one go. But it seems like, you know, if we had to cut back somewhere -- I mean, are these in danger of -- unless it backs up to the point where it's flooding the highway, it seems like these are the places we could let go for another year.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

In many cases they are -- and I can't speak specifically on these basins, but these are situations that we feel are needed. They're part of the storm drainage system. They could potentially impact and flood back in to the -- you know, back on to the road system, possibly neighbors if it got that bad. But, you know, we don't -- we don't do this lightly. This is something we'd prefer to do ourselves, but in many cases we're doing other things and, you know, the need is there. So in this

particular case, our staff has identified these five and feel that they need to be done.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

You're welcome.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Thank you. Commissioner, how many recharge basins does the County have responsibility for, roughly?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

You know, I wish I had an answer for that. Let me see if it's in here. Okay, we maintain over 250 recharge basins.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Two hundred and fifty.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes, sir.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Two hundred and fifty. And when we have to maintain them, clean them out or, you know, bulldoze them, whatever it is that we do, do we always get bids to do that? It would seem if we have 250, maybe we should do it in-house, it might be more cost effective.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We used to do it mostly in-house but, you know, as staffing levels reduced and time -- we have over 15 -- you know, over 1500 miles of roadway that we maintain. You know, there's a lot of work that has to be done, so we're splitting that time or --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I understand, yeah.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

-- it becomes quite a problem.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So how many recharge basins do we address on an annual basis?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Somewhere between generally five to ten. Most of our basins are over 25 years old, and we really only go in there when there's a need, if there's standing water, if it's not functioning as it should be.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Oh, really? So it's not on a regular maintenance schedule.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Back in the old days you could do that, but now --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Not anymore.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So now you identify what may be a potential problem, or close to a problem.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

And try and get to it.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Uh-huh. I mean, will it cost any more to address these five recharge basins if we waited a year to do them?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I don't know when the contract expires. Generally when you have to renew a contract the price always seems to go up.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

What do you mean renew?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, if we had to renew, if we had to rebid the contract. Normally, depending on how long the contract extends for, if it's a five-year contract -- if it's one year, the rise in the cost is probably minimal, but if it's a multi-year, a five, ten-year contract, it could be substantially --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Oh, I thought I heard you say that this had just recently gone out to bid.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We started doing this in my tenure here, so in the last ten years we've started doing this. I couldn't tell you exactly when we started, but to me it's recent.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. I mean, I know you as the Commissioner of DPW want to address them, but just from a budgetary perspective --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Understood.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

-- you know, it's a little problematic for me. All right, thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Lindsay.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Just to some of the points that were made already. I could speak from personal experience, we just had the recharge basin on Lakeland Avenue in Bohemia that was just redone. My understanding was it hasn't been redone in the last 20-odd years.

The project took exactly five days to complete, there was a crew of probably ten people there. And last year we had that incredible rain storm, last August, we had flooding like you would not believe in an area that is not prone to flooding whatsoever. So what was found was that the recharge basin was overgrown with vegetation which was blocking all the access pipes, and I think just to leave it in its natural state didn't work, at least in this particular instance, and created a really large issue for not only the homeowners but the cars that travel on Lakeland Avenue which is very heavily traveled. So for the amount of work that had to be done, at least on that specific location, it doesn't -- it's not, I don't think, out of the norm in terms of the funds that were needed to complete it. So, Gil, you might be able to speak more on that specific situation, how much it cost, but if those -- the recharge basin that we're talking about here are in the same condition as this one, to me it's not an amount that's out of the realm of possibility given the amount of work that could possibly need to be done.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I mean, given that we're looking at five recharge basins at 300,000, I mean, just simple math is at 60,000 a basin. You know, it's a minimal cost, but it does -- especially given the storms we had earlier in the summer and last year, these oddball storms that drop a high density of rain, you know, you want to make sure you can get as much recharge back into the ground as you can. We monitor the basins, as I said, at some point. You know, we do monitor our basins on a regular basis, just like our roads, we know the problem ones and we're looking to address them. As much as we can do in-house we do, the rest we farm out.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Gil, am I correct; the one we lost a piece of equipment was ours?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yep, absolutely.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I have to say that while the neighbors were not thrilled with taking down the trees in that area, that is our highest, one of our highest groundwater level areas and it did make a substantial difference. I didn't think it would, but in groundwater, when the levels go up, it has been able to maintain the flow. So while I hate having to bond out another \$325,000, if these are in high groundwater areas, I think it's essential.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right, so we have a motion and a second?

General Meeting 9/9/15

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Yes, we do.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

*(\*Opposed said in unison by various Legislators\*)*

**MR. NOLAN:**

Do a roll call.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Let's do a roll call.

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

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

No.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

No.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

No.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

*(Not present).*

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

No.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

No.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

No.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

No.

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

Yes, so DPW can do its job.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

*(Not Present)*

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Nine.

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

Can we wait for Cilmi to walk in?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right, let's move on.

***I.R. 1598-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with Dredging of County Waters (CP 5200) (County Executive).***

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Krupski.

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

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Schneiderman. Anyone on the motion?

Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes. Commissioner, on this bill, I was just curious what areas are targeted for dredging.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The current plan is we're looking to dredge Champlins Creek, about 15,000 cubic yards; Shinnecock Inlet at -- sorry, Shinnecock Inlet East at 107,000 cubic yards; and the remainder would be used for some planning fees as well as various sites at the Great South Bay. And those

are dependent on what permits we're able to get; right now we have a number of permits with DEC.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Is the dredging that you're speaking to subsidized by the State or the Federal government?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No, it isn't.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

It's all always on the County's dime.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes, sir.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yeah. And the need's been identified or is this part of a recurring maintenance program?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah, this is -- these are needs identified. Champlins we did a couple of years ago, the need is there to open it up again; Shinnecock Inlet we know we've had to do -- try this in English; we know we've had to do it for some time.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

It's a big price tag.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes, it is.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yeah. When does the dredging take place?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The very short window would be, say, from August -- sorry, October 1st generally to about January 1st.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yeah, a short window; why is that again?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The piping plovers. You also now have the winter flounder stock limits, what you're able to do. Flounder limits what you're able to place, you could only place prior to April 1st and after September 1st.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I mean, the lack of dredging poses a safety risk, a health risk?  
You know, what --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It's a navi -- we dredge primarily for navigation.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Navigation.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We have been -- this Legislative body has directed us to also consider environmental improvements, you know, flushing and things like that. Primarily we do navigation, though.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So we -- like various areas in the Great South Bay, do we actually dredge the channels, the boating channels?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We do the interface. We go from the main channel to the -- either to -- into a water body. If there's a public, say, marina, we'll go into a canal or a stream, but generally we usually go up to that face of the water body, we don't necessarily always go up.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right. So if we fail to do that, you would -- over time you would start to close up some of those channels.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

To be accessible for boaters.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay, thank you.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

You're welcome.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**

So my question regards, again, the money. Okay, so we have \$4.3 million, this is going to a piece of equipment, is that where this money is going to?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No, 625,000 is our estimate for Champlins Creek; \$2,654,400 is what we estimate Shinnecock Inlet East will take; and then we're leaving roughly a million in there to deal with -- we expect to get a permit or two in the Great South Bay, but we don't know specifically which one at this point.

**LEG. ANKER:**

So my question is we're spending millions and millions of dollars on dredging, basically, and I'm saying this in a very simplistic way; we're picking up modern dirt and we're moving it and we're putting it somewhere. Are we -- is there a way that we can purchase the equipment -- this is what I was thinking -- to maintain? Because that's what we're doing. We always have to go back and redredge, so you're talking about more millions. Mt. Sinai Harbor alone at Cedar Beach, you're holding some funds for me, millions of dollars, five million; you know, we're waiting for the jetties to be repaired. But is there a way that we can buy the equipment to do the work?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The County -- we have our own dredge crew. Our dredge is a relatively small dredge, we deal with Peconic Bay, primarily, we will go into other areas like the Great South Bay areas that don't require a larger dredge. Generally, yes, you could hire -- we could purchase a larger dredge or two, but then you would have to staff it. What we do now is along the north shore and along the Great South Bay, we hire out contractors to do that work at this point.

**LEG. ANKER:**

So I guess the \$64 million question is, is it cheaper to hire -- you know, to use our County employees and buy, invest in a dredge -- dredging equipment, or to keep contracting it out? Even over a 5-year, a 10-year, a 20-year plan.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The County, many years ago, decided to get out of the larger dredging projects. We actually sold two of our dredges, one of which I believe is still operational, to maintain a smaller fleet and deal with the areas out on the East End. Yeah, I mean, that's something that can be looked at. We've looked at it, but then the issue becomes, because it is a relatively small window, what do you do with the staff during the off season? Right now our guys essentially take and break down our equipment, maintain it over the off season, or they're helping bridge crews do work with that. So we looked at it a few years ago, it became pretty problematic so we just stuck with the current formula.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Okay. But again, it was more economically sound to contract out for dredging.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

At this time, yeah.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Okay. Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

You're welcome.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Bill Lindsay.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Gil, the various locations in the Great South Bay, do you know specifically where those locations are?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Not off the top -- no. We have a number of permits pending right now, we're not sure -- generally, when it gets a little closer -- well, pretty soon we'll start to press DEC to give us a permit or two down at the Great South Bay. And we don't know which one we'll likely get, so that's why it's very vague down there, but we have -- I want to say at least ten, if not more, permits pending with the Great South Bay.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Is it more based on which permits come through or on need? It's more on the permits.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yep.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Because there's many benefits from the new breach from Sandy, but one of the detriments is it's creating a lot of new sand bars on the Great South Bay which is wreaking havoc for navigation. We've got a couple of areas specifically just outside of Green's Creek that is almost unpassable at this point at low tide, and we've gotten a number of constituents asking, begging, pleading for that to be dredged. So I'm not sure if that's one of the locations on there, but I'm hoping that it is.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I'd have to look at it. If you can send me the location, I'll take a look at it.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I will.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It also depends on whether it's -- we have -- we're only able to dredge certain navigation channels and those are identified in the report, but if you give me the thing, give me the name of it, I'll take a look at it.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I'll send it to you, but it's right at the mouth of the river, which is the entrance --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

-- in and out and the exit out of the river. So I appreciate that. Thanks, Gil.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, Legislator Schneiderman.

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

Gill, all this dredging, it's all navigational dredging, right?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

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

These are all inlets where it becomes unsafe, or it's getting close to the point where it's unsafe for boaters to pass. Four point three million? I think that's actually less than we've spent in some of the preceding years as we were doing the Forge River, I just remember like six million and more on some of those years. The permits -- this is for this coming dredge window, is it not?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes, it is.

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

So you got -- I know this process, it takes like three years or more to do all the studies and get all the approvals from all the various regulatory agencies, from the Dredge Screening Committee, which is our process, the DEC, Fish & Wildlife; I mean, there are so many agencies that are involved. This dredge window is about to open, right, it opens in October?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yep, October 1st.

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

Right. So -- and we have, you know, all the soundings in place, all the permits in place to do this work, which will change by next season if this were delayed.

You know, dredging is a yearly function of the County. And like it or not, we're in this business and I just think it's critical that we maintain these inlets. A lot of the ones in the Peconic, as you said, we do those in-house; but the bigger projects, like there's one in Shinnecock and as well as the Great South Bay and some of these other ones that are listed here, we need to go outside to other contractors because we don't have the equipment.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

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

So I just encourage my colleagues to, you know, keep our navigational channels open and move forward with this important dredging work.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Gil, where are we at with the environmental reviews done by -- done under SEQRA?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

These -- the ones we're looking at right now would have already been complete and went through CEQ as part of the process.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay, so then we will be bonding directly.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay, thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Gil, is Water Island one of the locations and the Great South Bay we're looking for a permit that we're hoping to get into?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I can --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Because I know they've been waiting for a couple of years, they're very -- have trouble getting into the dock these days.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I'm not sure if that isn't a Federal --

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Nope, that's ours. That's absolutely in our wheelhouse.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Okay.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yeah, if you can let me know if that's one that -- I know we're supposed to be waiting on that permit, and if that's one we're hoping to be getting in soon. Because that community's been asking for a couple of years, very politely, if they can get that done and their ferry literally has difficulty getting into dock these days.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Okay, will do.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

How often do we do these, like every three, four years?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Essentially, the rule of thumb we use is about every five years we have to go in there. We get a 10-year permit, so once we get that 10-year permit we do it right away, then we come back in five years, and then hopefully we do it before the permit expires while we're trying to renew the permit.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I mean, we're doing it twice and we're doing it three times in the 18-year bond. So, you know, we're paying for it, then we're paying for it again and we're paying for it again, and then we run out and then we pay for it again. So we're always -- I don't know. It almost seems like we should maybe buy one of these, a bigger one and do it ourselves. Because, you know, we're paying a lot of interest over the years; it's like bonding police cars for a short time, it just keeps going. It's frustrating, because the Nissequoque needs it and I'm sure we're a couple of years off of that. Do you have any --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We just did it a couple of years ago.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Yeah, it really switched after Sandy.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right, that one storm that came through.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Yeah. All right, no problem.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, Legislator Spencer.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Gil, on a lot of these dredge projects there's both Federal and County channels, and I'm dealing with a situation in Northport right now. Is there any coordination -- you know, we get our approvals from the State, the DEC, but there was recently, I guess, this report that came out, too, that there was supposed to be 30-days to review. Have you had a chance to look at what the Federal recommendations are and is there any conflict in terms of responsibilities that they have? Like, for instance, in Northport, the Federal channel goes in to the Town docks and then the County channel picks up from there. So if the Feds aren't doing their job, it's difficult for us to do our job, and also the {sholling} that occurs that effects one part also effects what we do. How much does that come into play when we're spending money for dredging?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Any permit that we get for any dredging requires coordination through the Army Corps. They coordinate all the Federal bureaus, if you will, U.S. Fish & Wildlife, and actually I think they even bring in New York State, Department of State. We have a very good reputation with them, rapport with them. We meet with them on a quarterly basis to talk about projects. If we know that, in fact, the front end of a project -- and I think Northport is a prime example. If there's a Federal channel in front of the County channel, we will work to get that work done so we're not just doing one area and then the boaters have to stop. I know we did it I think in Nissequoque, too, where we went out to a certain point to make sure we got far enough that either the Federal channel was deep enough or they would have to do some type of work in their own area. So we do coordinate the work on a normal basis.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Do you know what determines -- what makes it a Federal channel versus what makes it a County channel?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I think it -- I don't know when it was decided, but there are just certain channels that -- and usually the Federal channels are the larger channels. Like in the Great South Bay, there is an east/west, a couple of east/west channels, I believe; they're deeper, they're wider. We generally try to do the interface in-between those larger channels to the mouth of the water body, whether it's a river, a canal.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

There's also usually a Federal mooring area associated with a Federal channel, so that anyone -- like there's one in Mattituck Inlet, so it's a Federal channel, there's a Federal anchorage, anyone in the United States can use it because it's a safe port in a storm or mechanical event that you could use.

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

*(Inaudible)*

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So the Federal government has taken over the ownership of that so they can use it.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

And so I guess that leads me to, you know, my question here, is that are we taking advantage of every opportunity to get Federal support for our projects? Is there other monies that we can apply for, is there -- you know, a lot of times we look at Federal support and matching grants and things of that sort. Are we taking advantage?

And following up with that, you mentioned that we decided that we were getting out of the dredging business. Do you know why we decided that we're getting out of the bigger dredging business when, you know, I think Legislator Trotta made the point that we're coming back sometimes two or three times, if you look at the interest and the money that we're spending. Is there a cost analysis? Was this done a long time ago? Is there something --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I believe this was done quite sometime ago, maybe in the 90s or earlier; but I don't really know, so I'm speculating. It was before my time. I know that when they talk about the two dredges that they sold, they, I believe, extended back many years, but they're still operational. So I don't know who made the decision and why, I just know that that's the one we've been faced with.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

And just my original question with regards to, you know, we see it with a lot of the law enforcement activities; are there any Federal funding opportunities?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We try to look for it wherever we can; if we're made aware of it, we will pursue it. You know, I don't know that we necessarily aggressively pursue it in that we don't have staff actively looking, you know, in the Federal regs and papers to see what's out there. I don't know that there's normally much Federal funding other than -- like we had Smith Point was hammered by that March Noreaster, I don't know, about seven years ago. We went and we pursued FEMA funding to get -- to help replace the dredged beach, and we were in the process of getting that approval, had it pretty much in hand, but it was never finalized and then Sandy hit, and now it's a whole different process. But that's one case that we knew about Federal funding.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

And generally, as far as -- Doc, as far as the Feds go, the Army Corps is the least responsive when it comes to just maintaining their own channel that anchorages. So they're really difficult to get to do any maintenance, historically.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Because of Sandy, are there outstanding grants that we haven't processed that we're looking for? You know, I keep seeing articles where a lot of things were not paid out appropriately as far as the individual homeowners. On the municipal level, are we seeing an opportunity to go back and -- or do we have grants that we apply for that we haven't heard back yet at this point?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

With regards to dredging, no. There are some other -- HGMP has a mitigation grant project that we still, I don't believe, have gotten fully processed from FEMA. But again, we try to keep our ear to the ground and when we hear about it we'll pursue it; otherwise, you know, we don't really do that.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

And my last question; with regards to when we see 4.5 million for various dredging projects, you guys have open dredge projects that are in place that you have to maintain on a particular schedule.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Is the funding set aside for those open projects, or year after year, when you're getting funding for dredging, you refund those projects that you have open dredge permits and then the remaining funds go towards new projects?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, generally when we have a permit in place, we will -- just as you would on a highway, we monitor those roads and if we -- sorry, those water bodies, those channels, and if we -- and we survey everything before we go out there, especially if we know an area is problematic, and if we determine that the ground height or the water depth has decreased significantly, that's when we go in and do it, but it's all dependent on whether we have the permits in place. And we do try to keep a program, but it varies as we go year to year because of differences in -- you know, as channels fill in.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Thank you. I'll yield.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator Kennedy.

*(\*The following testimony was taken & transcribed by  
Diana Flesher - Court Stenographer\*)*

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

All these projects we have the SEQRA on, do you feel that we can get them all done during this period unless we have another Sandy or whatever?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes, I do.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, Mr. Clerk, we have a motion and a second.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Yes, we do.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Opposed.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay **I.R. 1598A, Bond Resolution (of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$4,300,000 Bonds to finance planning, site improvements and equipment in connection with the dredging of County waters) (CP 5200.122 .452 and .514)** same motion, same second; roll call.

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

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. I got a request -- we have Holly Rhodes-Teague here. She has one resolution she's waiting for. I'd like to get her out. So at the request of Legislator Stern, I'd like to take **I.R. 1744, Accepting and appropriating 100% -- I'm sorry, it's in the manila folder -- accepting and appropriating 100% reimbursable federal grant funds from the New York State Office for the Aging for a NY Connects Expansion and Enhancements a Balancing Incentive Program, a BIP program.**

**LEG. STERN:**

Do we need a motion to take it out of order first, Mr. Presiding Officer?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

I'll make that motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I'll second. Does everyone have it? Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion to approve.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion to approve by Legislator Stern; second by Legislator D'Amaro. Any questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. Don't run too fast. All right. I.R. -- back to the agenda, page 10, **I.R. 1599, Appropriating funds in connection with Equipment for Public Works Material Testing Laboratory (CP 5141)** I'll make a motion; second by Legislator Krupski. I.R. 1599. On the motion, Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

My turn to ask Commissioner Anderson questions. Can you explain, Gil, Material Testing Laboratory.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah. Under Federal aid guidelines for design, approval and construction reimbursement, we're required to do quality assurance testing. And this is equipment that we need to test concrete and asphalt. The three pieces of equipment that we're looking to purchase is for \$80,000; is a concrete cylinder end grinder, an asphalt burn-off oven and an upgrade to our compression machine.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So -- and we're required by what guidelines to do this test?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Under Federal Highway Guidelines, the projects that we do with Federal Highway, we're required to test all the material. And rather than vet, this is something we do in-house with our own forces.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Are we required to test the material? Or is it required that the material be tested?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It's required that the material be tested.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. So, couldn't we ask our vendors to attest to the fact that these materials that they're selling us, you know, meet concern guidelines rather than us having to buy equipment and go through --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This -- this is -- these are not vendors necessarily. These are contractors.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Well, whoever; whoever's selling us the material.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Understood. And the contractors do attest that, when they submit a bill, that the materials that they've provided meet the specification, they've been installed according to plan. But the Federal requirements still mandate that it be tested. And generally it's -- and I can't speak for certain of this, but it's normally -- you would use an, I would say, an outside firm; a firm or a testing lab that's not connected to the contractor. So in this case rather than hiring a testing laboratory, a private testing laboratory, we do this work inhouse.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So it is safe to say that the Federal guidelines dictate or suggest that the testing be done by somebody other than the company that's providing the materials?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. So -- so we do that.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And we've done that for as long as you remember.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We've been doing it -- yeah. We have a testing lab in the back -- in the back of our offices right near Vector. And we do regular testing of all materials.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So how does that work? Every time we have a contractor that's fixing a road or fixing a bridge or whatever, we ask them for samples of the material that they're going to be using in advance and we test those samples to make sure they meet with whatever guidelines and then we give them the go-ahead?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

In many cases we'll do a core. They'll pour a section of road. They'll pave a section of road. We'll go in and we'll actually dig out a core sample, bring that back to the lab and we'll test it, however -- whatever test is required. Similarly when you're pouring concrete, you'll do slump tests, you'll do, you know, different tests take -- you'll take concrete cylinders and you'll bring those back to the lab, let them dry, cure and then you'll do the compression test or whatever tests are required by the, you know, by the specification on that material.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Now, what happens if, you know, they've done the road, they've done whatever the work is, we then take a sample and it doesn't meet with the criteria, then what?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Two ways of handling it. If you have material that -- look, if it's a little bit, you know, one out of five samples fail, you may reduce the cost of the price that you pay for that -- that placement of material. If it's a complete failure, you'll just have them go and rip it out and do it again. It hasn't been unheard of.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And is this -- would the towns be subject to these Federal requirements as well? Do the towns get Federal funding?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

If they -- if they're getting Federal funding, yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And is that common that they would get Federal funding?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No.

**LEG. CILMI:**

No.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No, they generally -- not that it's not unheard of, but most times because of the amount of requirements that are mandated in a Federal project, not only just in construction but in the paperwork end of it, they --

**LEG. CILMI:**

They walk away from the Federal funds and they do it themselves.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yep.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And we don't find that to be problematic? In other words --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No, we have -- we have -- I mean we've been doing --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Funding is more valuable than the cost of complying with the regulations?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right. And we -- you generally have larger staffs than the town does to do that type of work.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

You know, where the town may have one or two engineers or a handful of engineers, you know, we've got a department that deals with this on a regular basis.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Do you find that the Federal guidelines or the criteria that we have to meet are of value? Or are they silly guidelines that the Federal Government says we have to meet and they really have no import to the quality of the --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No, they certainly not only keep the contractors and suppliers on their toes, it is a way of making sure that, you know, one of the most -- whether it's design or it's construction, one of the most important parts is quality assurance and quality control; to make sure that the product you're getting -- you know, people make mistakes. It doesn't necessarily -- doesn't have some sinister, you know, approach to it; it's just somebody, you know, flubbed up, you know. So that -- it keeps everybody on their toes. It makes sure that the product you're getting is the product that you paid for. And that's really what you want to see at the end of the day, that you have gotten what you paid for.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. We have a motion and second.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Yes, we do.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

**I.R. 1599A, Bond Resolution, (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$80,000 Bonds to finance the purchase of equipment for Public Works Material Testing Laboratory (CP 5141.512) same motion, same second; roll call.**

General Meeting 9/9/15

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

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

No.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, **I.R. 1601, Appropriating funds in connection with Stormwater Remediation to the Yaphank Lakes and Carmen's River at County Road 21, Main Street/Yaphank-Middle Island Road (CP 8241)** Motion by Legislator Krupski; second by Legislator Muratore. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Opposed.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

**I.R. 1601A, Bond Resolution (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$750,000 Bonds to finance the cost of stormwater remediation to the Yaphank Lakes and Carmen's River at CR 21, Main Street/Yaphank-Middle Island Road) (CP 8241.310).** Same motion, same second; roll call.

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

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. **I.R. 1616, Calling a public hearing for the purpose of increasing and improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 23 – Coventry Manor (CP 8149)** Motion by Legislator Anker; second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

**I.R. 1617, Calling a public hearing for the purpose of increasing and improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 18 – Hauppauge Industrial (CP 8126).(County Exec)** Motion by Legislator Kennedy; second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Go ahead.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

It's calling for public hearing. Never mind.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. I.R. 1619 we did earlier. **I.R. 1631, Amending Resolution No. 511-2015, authorizing the sale of one surplus County Para Transit Bus to St. Michaels. (Schneiderman)** Motion by Legislator Schneiderman; second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

**I.R. 1632, Amending Resolution No. 512-2015, authorizing the sale of one surplus County Para Transit Bus to Camp Soulgrow. (Schneiderman)** Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. I'll second the Soulgrow. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

**I.R. 1638, Transferring Assessment Stabilization Reserve Funds to the Capital Fund, amending the 2015 Operating Budget, amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds for improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 2 – Tallmadge Woods (CP 8188). (County Exec)** Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. I'll second.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So for the Commissioner, spending the assessment stabilization funds on an improvement -- a capital improvement, aren't these currently used for rate stabilization?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

But if at the same time we use this where we have smaller projects that the ASRF can take without having to impact the local -- you know, so you don't have to bond it. You don't have to pay bond, minimize your interest. In this particular case it's a \$200,000 request to take -- to appropriate from the ASRF and it's intended to be -- to construct odor -- odor control system at the Tallmadge Wood Plant.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Did this go through sewer agency? I don't remember this.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I don't know. I know it went through Committee but --

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I just -- I just thought it was -- I -- you know, I saw it today, I thought it was odd that -- that they wouldn't just pay for it. It's in the district because it's their improvement.

**MR. NOLAN:**

They pay it back, I think, don't they, Gil?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I believe so, yeah. It's using the ASRF.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Oh, they will reimburse the ASRF?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Thank you, George.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

**I.R. 1645, Appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the improvements to Sew District No. 7 – Woodside/Farber expansion (CP 8194).(Browning)**

Motion by Legislator Browning.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

**I.R. 1645A, Bond Resolution (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$250,000 Bonds to finance the planning of improvements to Sewer District No. 7 Woodside/Farber Expansion) (CP 8194.110) Same motion, same second; roll call.**

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

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

On yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, I.R. 1653, Authorizing funds, amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program, amending the 2015 Operating Budget, and accepting and appropriating Federal and State Aid in connection with an on board origin to destination survey for the Suffolk County Transit Bus System (CP 5655). (County Exec)

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

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Second by Legislator Muratore.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion, Legislator McCaffrey.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

What's the amount of this?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It's \$150,000 with Federal and State aid at 80 and 10%. So the cost to the County would be 15,000.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

So we're going to be bonding 15,000.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Just the concern is that this is the kind of stuff, especially on these amounts, I know we're getting money back in Federal grants and this is just our portion, but we should be able to pay our portion, our 10% here of \$15,000. That's my concern.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Legislator -- I'm sorry, Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

If you look at this and the next two, we are bonding out for \$7,500, \$12,500 --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

There is no bond.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

It's a grant, I believe.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

How are we financing our share?

**LEG. CALARCO:**

There is no bond.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

It says the issue --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

We are bonding our share.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Let's focus on the resolution before us before we jump ahead.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

What was the answer? Is it cash or is it not?

**MR. NOLAN:**

I'd like to refer to Budget Review, but it says transfer from the Operating Budget to the Capital Fund of 15,000 so I'm assuming that's cash.

**MR. LIPP:**

Correct.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

It is cash. Okay.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. We can move on. All right, 1653, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

**I.R. 1654, Authorizing funds to upgrade the Paratransit Reservation System for the Suffolk County Accessible Transportation (SCAT) Program, amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program, amending the 2015 Operating Budget, and accepting and appropriating Federal and State Aid (CP 5659) (County Exec).** Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. I'll second. I'm sorry. Second by Legislator Anker. Does someone – Legislator Kennedy. Legislator --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Question for Robert. Robert, we have the 12, 500 cash non-bonding?

**MR. LIPP:**

Correct.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

**I.R. 1655, Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and amending the 2015 Operating Budget, authorizing the purchase of 3 Support Vehicles for the Suffolk County DPW/Transportation Division and accepting and appropriating Federal and State Aid and County funds (CP 5658). (Co. Exec.)** Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. Second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

**I.R. 1656, Authorizing an Intermunicipal Agreement with the Town of Southampton to accept funds associated with the strengthening and improvement of CR 80, Montauk Highway, Hampton Bays and amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program (CP 5014) (County Exec)** Motion by Legislator Schneiderman; second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

**I.R. 1624, Directing the Suffolk County Department of Social Services to establish a helping our veterans (HOV) Lane Program to expedite applications from veterans for financial assistance and support services. (Cilmi)** Motion by Legislator Cilmi; second by Legislator Barraga. Are you fine with that, General?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Fine.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Almost finished. **I.R. 1569, Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law - Town of Brookhaven - (SCTM No. 0200-611.00-03.00-017.000). (County Exec)**

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Stern; second by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

**I.R. 1574, Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 U.S. Bank National Association, as trustee, successor in interest to Wachovia Bank, N.A., as trustee for Park Place Securities, Inc., asset-backed pass-through Certificates, Series 2004-WWF1 (SCTM No. 0209-021.00-03.00-004.001 f/k/a 0200-978.90-03.00-004.001) Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?**

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

**I.R. 1580, Authorizing the County Executive to enter into an Intermunicipal Agreement with the Town of Brookhaven for the demolition of undesirable, unsafe or uninhabitable structures on property taken by the County by Tax Deed. (County Exec) Motion by Legislator Hahn. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?**

**LEG. HAHN:**

Cosponsor.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Cosponsor.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

**I.R. 1622, Authorizing certain technical corrections to Adopted Resolution No. 330-2013. (County Exec)**

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Stern. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

**I.R. 1622A bond resolution, amending the restating bond resolution number 331 -- okay -- bond resolution number 331 of 2013 adopted on May 7th, 2013 relating to the authorization of the issuance of -- issuance of \$380,000 bonds to finance the cost of acquisition of integrated financial management systems. I'll make a motion. You want to second that, Legislator Kennedy? Second by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor?**

**LEG. TROTТА:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Oh, I'm sorry. Roll call.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

On the -- what is this?

General Meeting 9/9/15

**P.O. GREGORY:**

1622A. If you want more information, there is -- there's more information in the manila folder. It's the bond resolution.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Just if you could remind us, what is this?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, so what are we doing? You got a question? No, okay. Roll call.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I have a question. Can we call in some department head from home and have him come in and explain it? No, really, is there anyone who can offer any explanation on this? It goes back to 2013.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Legislator Krupski, it appears that it was a -- the underlying resolution had a -- needed a technical correction basically in the title and then throughout the bill -- like the title of the project. So the bond counsel, I guess, determined that he had to correct the bond resolution that had gone with the earlier underlying resolution back in 2013 to state things properly. That's my understanding of it.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Legislator Stern.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

1622A roll call.

**LEG. STERN:**

It's the same one we've been on.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

It's the roll call.

**LEG. STERN:**

Right.

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

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Yes.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Yes.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, **1623, Authorizing the reconveyance of County-owned real estate pursuant to Section 215, New York State County Law to Alice Cruz Soto a/k/a Alice Soto Rodriguez (SCTM No. 0100-200.00-03.00-045.001) (Gregory)** I'll make a motion to approve; second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

**I.R. 1633, Authorizing the reconveyance of County-owned real estate pursuant to Section 215, New York State County Law to Virgilio Vaden and Mary Jo Vaden, his wife (SCTM No. 0200-032.00-04.00-019.005)** Motion by Legislator Anker; second by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

**I.R. 1649, Reappoint member to the Suffolk County Board of Ethics (Linda A. Spahr)**

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Stern; second by Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. STERN:**

Just very quickly on the motion. Although Miss Spahr was not required to, because it's a reappointment, she did make herself available for members of the Committee. I just wanted to put that out for the record.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, if we can go back to page eight, Tom Ronayne is here to answer any questions on I.R. 1618. We had a -- we had a tabling motion. We had approval motion. Anyone still have any questions for --

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

Tom, if you could come up so --

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Sorry to drag you back out.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

Good evening. Is this the long version or the short version? Should I stand or sit?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**  
Stand.

**P.O. GREGORY:**  
Well --

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
Tom --

**P.O. GREGORY:**  
To be determined.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
Tom, first of all, thank you for coming out tonight. And thank you for the work you do for our vets. We had some conversations earlier. First, I want to make it very clear, you know, as the son of a veteran, active duty World War II, active duty four years in World War II as well as the Korean Conflict, I don't want our vets to be homeless. I care very deeply about our veterans and I'm proud to be the son of a vet.

I had some questions, because I think the backup had been incorrect and I wanted to vet one of the properties that was in my district next to a school and a Long Island Head Start facility; and just make sure that it had been -- that the Committee was aware of the location of this house being so close to the school. And I wasn't familiar with the organization, the Association for Mental Health and Wellness. I've had an opportunity to go to their website. They do have case management; they do have job training. They do a number of great things for these vets so I'm more comfortable with the organization. But in terms of how the house is going to be used and monitored, is this going to be a group home or is this going to be a family?

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**  
Are we referring to 19 Randall Street in Riverhead?

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
Yes, we are.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**  
That home is intended to be used as a single-family residence.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
That's wonderful.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**  
And if I could just further clarify a statement that you made, the Association for Mental Health and Wellness is a new name. It's actually a name that was a result of a rebranding. Most of you are familiar with Clubhouse of Suffolk.

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

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**  
Suffolk County United Veterans.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
A-hum.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

Mental Health Association of Suffolk County. This was a consolidation of all those other organizations. The management remains the same, their mission remains the same. But they felt it more manageable for -- to operate under the umbrella of one name as opposed to having multiple entities within -- within their scope. So everything that you knew about Clubhouse of Suffolk, everything that you knew about Suffolk County United Veterans, nothing has changed other than -- other than the brand; other than that name.

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

Thank you for clarifying. Just because they have the mental health piece in their name doesn't necessarily mean that each individual that they're placing has mental health issues, although some may.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

Not even remotely. There are many, many folks that they serve within the community, some with, some without mental health issues.

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

But either way they provide the support and the caseworkers for those individuals even if they do have mental health conditions that need to be addressed.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

They have a sterling reputation for their case management. And I will tell you that there was some very specific -- very specific intent with using the words mental health in the name of the new organization. And that was in part to serve -- to help destigmatize the -- I think part of what we're dealing with here. When people hear the words mental health, there's an anxiety that goes along with hearing that when it relates to our communities.

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

You know, and this is the organization that Mike is involved in, right?

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

Mike Stolz.

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

Mike Stolz, okay. And he came to the Committee so I guess --

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

-- of the new organization, yes.

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

Okay. And do they have offices on the East End at all or no?

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

They have offices in Yaphank; they have offices in --

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

Yaphank. That's close to -- that's not far from where this house -- so they'll be able to --

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

They're also establishing in Riverhead.

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

Oh, they are. Oh, great.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

Yes.

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

So this is close -- very close to Riverhead so they'll have an opportunity to monitor and interact with whatever individuals they place. Is this going to be long-term in terms or are they going to -- is this transitional or is this --

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

This is permanent housing.

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

This is permanent housing.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

That house will be permanent housing.

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

Okay, it will be rental or will it be transferred, too?

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

My understanding is that the placement for that property will be done through a HUD-VASH voucher, which is a VA HUD partnership subsidized housing for veterans. There are some -- some of the aspects of HUD-VASH, I think, are very positive, not the least being that in order for a veteran to be the recipient of a HUD-VASH voucher, they must, in fact, be employed or have a significant -- an income capable of sustaining their needs. Thirty percent of the veteran's income would be applied to the rent and the subsidy would be the remaining two-thirds of the rent.

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

Okay. On the tax rolls, not on the tax rolls, this property? Or -- they're not.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

The Association is a not-for-profit. The property -- upon transfer of the property would remain on the tax rolls and they would pay full taxes for the first year. Subsequent to the first year, then it would -- after their due diligence, after their application processes and so forth, then they would go back to a tax exempt.

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

Property tax exempt. All right. And so the property will stay in the ownership of the not-for-profit. It won't transfer to the vet. The vet will be basically a renter of the property.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

Correct.

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

Okay. Thank you, again, for coming out. And it's a great program. I'm happy to support it.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

Thank you for your interest. I appreciate that.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. So you just -- Legislator Schneiderman just asked one of my questions about the property being tax exempt. Now these people are basically running a business. So what do you tell the rest of the businessmen in Suffolk County "well, they don't have to pay property taxes but you do. And now you have to pay their share also."

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

Well, as a registered not-for-profit organization, they provide a great deal of good to the community. Certainly I think it would be difficult to argue, certainly with me, that the good -- the value to the community by providing for a veteran and their family is, I think, in some ways incalculable. These families need places to live; they need the ability to restart their lives. Some of them have tremendous skill sets and abilities that they can offer to the community.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Certainly I'm not questioning the value of the service they offer. Just saying that if they are running a business, they're taking money in and they're paying employees. So they're running a business. So the other question is --

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

On a not-for-profit basis.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

They're not volunteers.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

No, no. I said on a not-for-profit basis.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

And I said they're not volunteers. Right. So you said they're going to establish an office in Riverhead. Do you know the location?

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

I do not.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Will that office be paying taxes?

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

I can't answer that question. I don't know. I don't know the specifics of the -- of their search in Riverhead or what the -- what the disposition of that would be.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Is it in Riverhead or like the other location, is it in Flanders?

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

I believe it to be Riverhead.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Because the other location's marked as Riverhead on the paper but it's actually in Flanders. Thanks.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

I don't know.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, anyone else? I wrote it down, too. Sorry. Sorry, Kate.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay, Tom. If we could start, because, again, one of my concerns is taking the property off tax rolls, like many others in my district -- in the William Floyd School District, there is not enough tax base from businesses. So the majority of the school taxes come from residential properties. Okay. So now this is going to come off the tax rolls in a year, which means -- it's not saying that, you know -- I'm not saying that this is a bad thing that we're doing helping the veterans. However, when you guys were looking at these properties, were you looking at the communities and saying, okay, how many -- if you ask Beacon House, Concerned for Independent Living, and I told you, I've had problems with them in my district. And I have another organization, non-profit organization, that I'm having problems with, with their clients.

So when I look at these organizations and I say, okay I know Mike Stolz. I know he does a good job. I know Beacon House. I know they do a good job. But, again, when you're taking the properties off the tax rolls, what's the impact on my school district? Because now you're just distributing that burden on all of the homeowners. It's not a wealthy community. It's a working class community, people who are struggling to make ends meet. And it's becoming more and more difficult for them because we don't have a wealthy tax base.

I have Longwood School District. And I know that Gordon Heights is no longer mine; however, what's the impact to the Longwood School District? And I think that this is something that needs to be looked at when you're looking at properties and saying what's it going to do to that district and to that community when you take it off the tax rolls?

And I would appreciate if you could maybe -- there are, what, eight properties? There's one in Central Islip, Copiague. We have -- obviously we got the Flanders one, Smith Lane in Medford. If you would be able -- can you tell us who is going to be living in each of these homes? Is it going to be a group home, single-family home with a family, you know. Yes, you told me it's going to be senior citizens that are going to be in the one in Mastic. So can you give us some information as to who is going to be living in each of these homes?

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

As I understand it, and I verified this this evening on my way here, I'll go through the list in the order that I have them listed. This shows two vacant lots at Bridge Road and Sycamore Lane in Central Islip. That is, in fact, three -- my understanding is three, there will be three single-family homes constructed on that property and they will be occupied by three individual families.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

And the same situation as Flanders. We're going to be subsidized rental.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

Is that the Riverhead address?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

No, the Central Islip ones, the same as Flanders, they're going to be subsidized rentals, right?

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

Yes. Okay, Copiague, 165 Beach View Street in Copiague is presently a legal two-family home that will be occupied as a two-family home; Smith Lane in Yaphank is a one-family home. It will be occupied as a one-family --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Actually Smith Lane is not Yaphank. It's Medford. And it's actually Gordon Heights Community.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

Mastic Boulevard in Mastic. The intent is to place four senior veterans at that property. As I said, Randall Street, as I have it here, it says Riverhead, is a single-family residence intended to be occupied by a single family.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Last one Hawkins Avenue.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

I'm sorry. That is a four-bedroom home that will be occupied by four individual veterans.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. So that's going to be a group-type home.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

I don't know if I would use the word group home.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

It will be four individual veterans. They will be case-managed. And, you know, it'll be four individuals.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. And you did say intended. So I'm hoping that the intention is what it's actually going to be. Okay. And, again, one of my issues with Mastic Boulevard, I've had so many problems on that street, at 177 there's a sex offender; 180 is an unregulated sober home with a lot of drug activity, a lot of problems. And I've had a lot of issues on that block. And we're finally getting to the point where it's gotten better. I'm not saying that this home is going to wind up being a problem, however, I don't want to subject the homeless veterans, who many of them have substance abuse problems, that now we're going to subject them to having to live where there's drug activity going on.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

Well, I can appreciate that concern. But I'd also say that in my view I see this as an opportunity to place veterans, who I view -- look, we're people. We're human beings like everybody else.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Right.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

We have our problems like everybody else. But I'd like to believe that placing these veterans in these communities, if nothing else, would provide a stabilizing presence that we would have people who have a strong work ethic and the commitment to community and they value service. They

pride in their surroundings and themselves, that this would be a stabilizing factor for the communities.

I'd like to go back to one of the other points that you made and just clarify that the homes that we are looking to place these veterans in are all subject to local zoning. As they are presently zoned, they will continue to be zoned. No variances will be sought. So as a property exists, it shall be occupied. And I think -- I think that may go to one of your concerns from what we had discussed earlier.

This is really an effort to address a long standing problem in our nation, certainly here in Suffolk County. And we very often with the assistance of this body have been ahead of the curve. Certainly in New York, very often nationally, to identify and address the sometimes unique needs of our veterans. And I think this presents a golden opportunity for us. And while I can appreciate the apprehension on some level, I'm excited about this. And I think that the surrounding communities will largely benefit from this. We'll have homes that are no longer blighting their communities. That would result in, I believe, if anything, an improvement or an increase in the valuation of the homes surrounding these homes that are largely presently vacant.

There are just really so many upsides to this. And when I consider the fact that the concerns, while they are valid, I just don't believe that they outweigh the positive impact on the community at large, the veterans and our County as a whole. When these homes sit vacant, you're right, when they go to these not-for-profits, after one year they will become tax exempt again. They'll come off the tax rolls. I think it's fair to say that while the homes are sitting empty, the taxes are being paid with this -- the school districts are being made whole by the County. Nobody's paying those taxes. So the impact is still being felt across County with paying these costs associated with the homes. I don't think that that shifts significantly by occupying them. I think that this is an opportunity for us to -- let's make lemonade. You know, we got a lot of these homes, we need to address the issue of the homes, we need to address the issue of the homelessness and the needs of these veterans. Why can't we put this altogether and find a way to do it effectively, efficiently and appropriately so that -- for the good of all.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

And I -- I don't disagree with anything you're saying. However, it's when you continue to move forward with this program, where are you going to go? Is it going to be an equal distribution in every single Legislator's district? Probably not. Probably not. Because I know those districts. I know the communities and I know where the tax liens are, I know where the foreclosures are. I know the communities that get hit hardest. And that's -- my concern is that you can't continually have non-profit organizations moving to the same communities over and over again. And I know Robert's looking at me and probably saying, yeah, I think he'd probably agree, that the tax impact on a community when you continually do that is going to be a problem. And the people who live in that community, who are struggling, and they're working class people, they're not wealthy, they're not making a ton of money, that are going to say, "I can't continue to afford to pay the school taxes" because that's -- that is what the burden is to them, is their school tax. And they're going to say "I can't live here anymore."

I've talked to people. My son was looking for a house to buy. And when he was looking, he said I'm looking on the East Moriches, but I'm looking on the Southampton side because the school taxes are lower. And that's what our kids are doing today when they come here, when they're buying a house here. They look at the property values and they say -- they look at the properties and they don't look at necessarily *how much is that house to buy*, they're looking at how much are the taxes. And that's -- that's a fact.

So if you keep having nonprofits, and I can -- I am going to talk to the Town of Brookhaven and find out how many properties are not on the tax rolls in Brookhaven because of nonprofit organizations. And I can guarantee I know the communities where they're going to be.

So we have to do an equal distribution. I've said it time and time again, my district says we will take our fair share and they won't. They won't say no, but they will say no when they see some other community is not doing their fair share. And that's where the concern is.

So as we move forward, if we approve this today, I want to see that every Legislator here would be more than open to say, hey, I gotta piece of property in my district and I'm willing to support putting homeless veterans in my district in my community where maybe some of them are maybe a little wealthier. And I don't think that's unfair. I don't think it's unfair.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

Over the years you and I have worked together on many, many cases involving veterans and I think we've done some very good work together.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yep, we have.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

To the extent that I have even a small vote, I would say to you that I'm always happy to discuss what the geographic allocation of future properties might be. But I'd also like you to consider that while I'm sensitive to your concern with the taxation or the lack of tax revenue into your district and your school districts, many of the veterans who are going to be occupying these homes are also becoming the beneficiaries of programs, Federal programs that are helping us to support and assist them. And in many, if not all cases, that results in removing them from many of the County paid for social services that they may be receiving in lieu of having an opportunity to move into a residence with some of the Federal support.

So I think that there are -- there are valuated aspects to this that we may not have been -- been able to discuss that are worthy of consideration as well. Much of the responsibility financially for these veterans shifts to the Federal government. And that results in a net savings to Suffolk County as well.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

And I think you know, but, you know, we have homes in my district, in fact, two in Mastic Beach, one a couple years ago, where we had a lady who was a homeless veteran and she now is a homeowner. And that's what people want to see also, is that we take some of those tax lien properties that the County had to take, that we are turning them into the hands of first-time homeowners. Because we, you know, there's just a disproportionate amount of rentals and bad rentals. And we want to try and change the makeup of the community. And part of it is homeownership. That's what we need to do.

And, let me tell you, Mastic Beach community, the Village, the new Village has said, they want to work with the veterans organizations. They've encouraged Habitat, the Housing Partnership, with all of the properties that they're receiving is, let's get some veterans in here, whether they've been homeless veterans who have been through the programs, now got back on their feet and they're saying, we'll support them, get them into our community, we'll take them.

General Meeting 9/9/15

So it's not that we're not taking our fair share. We are. But to take them off the tax rolls is the biggest concern that, I think, my school district is going to have and I'm sure the Town of Brookhaven.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

So is that -- you're going to withdraw your tabling motion?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I'll think about it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Legislator Martinez, you had a quick question.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Hi, Tom, how are you? Just a quick question. Well, a couple. In terms of the Sycamore and Bridge Road, that's going to be a straight up development, you said, right? From what I saw on the map, it's straight shrubbery and greenery right now so that'll be developed.

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

Yes.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

And then the three-family homes, what's the timeframe for these homes to be built?

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

I don't know what the construction schedule is. My apologies, I didn't prepare for that.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Okay. And then what method is being taken to decipher which veterans will be occupying these homes? Will they be strictly community-based veterans or are you -- you have a list, how is that working?

**DIRECTOR RONAYNE:**

The assignment of veterans would -- it would begin with assessment of eligibility for veterans who are in the pool or who are on the list waiting for these types of placements. That would be a joint effort on the part of the social work department at the Northport VA. Each veteran has a social worker assigned. The management or executive team and the social work team at the not-for-profit who would be building and operating these homes, and to some extent we have a -- input into that process as well. We provide a lot of the case service work and so forth for these veterans as well. So it's a pretty thorough, it's a pretty efficient service, ah, process.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**

Okay. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

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

Okay. I'd like to withdraw the second on my motion -- on the motion to table. You already have it, but I had second Legislator Browning's motion to table and I'm going to withdraw that second.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Make a motion to approve.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, Mr. Clerk, we have a motion and a second to approve. And a motion to table with no second.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I'll second it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

You'll second motion to table.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. I withdraw the tabling motion, but I would like to have further conversation with all of the organizations involved. And before -- again, I don't think it's fair that we should sit here and now just find out today that homes in our district are -- have been chosen. And I think that there should be a better process before we have to vote on something that we should have -- some kind of a heads up. I'd said earlier that some of the developmental organizations, when they want to put a house in your district, they have to reach out to the local municipality, like, IGHL. If they want to open up a home in your district, they have to notify, like for my example, Town of Brookhaven and say "this is the address, do you have objections?"

And I did have one in Yaphank. And I supported it. And it's a good home. Not a problem. But there is a requirement for them. And I believe that's under the Padavan Law, that they're required to notify. So when we get this handed to us tonight and no heads up on it, yeah, there's going to be a lot of questions. So I think moving forward there has to be a better system.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. So we have a -- just a motion to approve with a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. There is a grant I.R. 1684 that was handed out, another one for Holly. We'll try to get her out of here. All right, **I.R. 1684, Accepting and appropriating 100% reimbursable new Federal grant funds from the New York State Office for the Aging for a Medicare Improvement for Patients and Providers Act Program (MIPPA) (County Exec)** I'll make the motion; second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, if you go in your manila folder, we have resolution number 644, a local law to protect privacy in Suffolk County. Oh, I'm sorry. It's the veto of Legislator Muratore's drone bill. Okay, we have no motion to override. **Procedure Motion number 24 of 2015, resolution apportioning mortgage tax by the County Treasurer.** I'll make a motion; seconded by Legislator Schneiderman. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, red folder. We have a couple CNS. **I.R. 1698, Authorizing use of Cupsogue Beach County Park by Barrier Beach Preservation Association for its Cruzin in the Dunes 5K Race Fundraiser (County Exec).**

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

Motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

**I.R. 1736, Accepting and appropriating U.S. Department of Agriculture - Natural Resources Conservation Service – Hurricane Sandy EWPP-FPE Grant Funds in connection with the acquisition of environmentally sensitive lands in the Mastic/Shirley Conservation area to protect floodprone areas against future flooding and storm damage (County Exec).**

Motion by Legislator Browning; second by Legislator Muratore.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I'd like to thank Director Lansdale for her work here. This is -- this is really important to get Federal money to preserve land in sensitive areas. And it was -- it was a great effort and we didn't have to spend our money on it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Thank you, Sarah.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, **I.R. 1751, Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law to protect public safety in Suffolk County Parks. (Muratore)** Legislator Muratore makes a motion; second by Legislator Spencer. All in favor of good drone usage, say aye.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

On the motion.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

On the motion, Legislator Trotta

**LEG. TROTТА:**

What's the change here?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Any drones with cameras will only hover over your home 24 hours a day. (Laughter)

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Do we just take the cameras out of it? Was that it?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Well, that was always the case.

**MR. NOLAN:**

No, this covers the part about the drone having had a camera. That's out. It's all drones, but it's basically, if you are landing or launching a drone from a County park, you are supposed to get the permit from the departments. So that is the essence of the bill. If you're landing or launching the drone, or any other device like that, then you have to get a permit. And then when you operate in the park, it has to be within your line of sight.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So it's at the park --

**MR. NOLAN:**

The Parks Department -- the Parks Department is going to develop rules and regulations and the application. Before they do that, they're going to have two public hearings. They have to those hearings by February of next year. And then if people violate the law, it could be a misdemeanor and they're also subject to a civil penalty.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Do we have any say, like, is there a fee for the permit? I mean don't want -- if a fifteen-year-old kid wants to drive a little drone, are we going to charge him?

**LEG. MURATORE:**

I hope so. No, it's -- in the resolution it said that the Parks Department will be working on this for pricing of the permits, if there is even a price. There may not be a price moving along with this. You know, I think it's a -- I appreciate what the County Executive did. You know, George's hard work and Doc Spencer in putting out the first one, we saw some problems with it. And he brought some -- the County Exec brought something to our attention so we changed it a little bit. But I see this as the beginning of -- I mean look what's going on with drones. More and more issues are happening day in and day out.

Just the other day one crashed at the US Open. You know, listen to Doc Spencer. Those things can do some serious harm, particularly young children. You know, those blades whirl around. So, you know, I don't want to say it, but down the road we may say, well, we told you so. So let's see. This is a good kickoff for it. We got our feet wet. We can move along from here. So I think it's a step in the right direction and I thank the County Executive for his help with it.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I don't want to be charging people -- you know, is it free?

General Meeting 9/9/15

**MR. NOLAN:**

The law does not address that. If -- I believe that the Parks Department wants to establish a fee after they do their due diligence and hold the public hearings, I think they would have to come back to us to establish a fee. We typically approve all fees.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

All right, that's fine. As long as we do that, that's fine.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. All in favor? Am I good? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Eighteen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

No, seventeen. Legislator Anker's not here.

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, we have late starters. I'd like to waive the rules and lay the following resolutions on the table: I.R. 1745 Public Works, set public hearing October 6th 2:30 PM, Riverhead; I.R. 1746 Public Works; I.R. 1747 Ways and Means; I.R. 1748 ET -- excuse me -- Education and IT; Introductory Resolution 1749 Public Works; I.R. 1750 Public Safety; I.R. 1752 Government Ops, set the public hearing for October 6th 2:30, Riverhead; I.R. 1753 Public Works; I.R. 1754 Public Works; I.R. 1755 Public Safety; I.R. 1756 Ways and Means, set the public hearing for October 6th, 2:30 PM, Riverhead; I.R. 1757 Public Works. I have a second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. RICHBERG:**

Seventeen.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

That's our agenda. We stand adjourned. Thank you and good night.

**THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 10:51 PM  
{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY**