

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

GENERAL MEETING

FOURTEENTH DAY

December 15, 2015

Verbatim Transcript

MEETING HELD AT THE WILLIAM H. ROGERS LEGISLATURE BUILDING

IN THE ROSE Y. CARACAPPA LEGISLATIVE AUDITORIUM

725 VETERANS MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

SMITHTOWN, NEW YORK

Minutes Taken By

Alison Mahoney & Lucia Braaten - Court Stenographers

Minutes Transcribed By

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

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

*(*The meeting was called to order at 9:47 A.M. *)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Good morning, Mr. Clerk.

MR. RICHBERG:

Good morning, Mr. Presiding Officer.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Can you please do the roll call.

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

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present).

LEG. D'AMARO:

Here.

LEG. STERN:

Here.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

(Not present).

LEG. TROTTA:

Here.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Here.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Here.

LEG. CILMI:

Here.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Here.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Here.

LEG. CALARCO:

Present.

LEG. ANKER:

Here.

LEG. HAHN:
(Not present).

LEG. MURATORE:
(Not present).

LEG. BROWNING:
Here.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Here.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Here.

P.O. GREGORY:
Here.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Here.

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen (Fifteen - Not Present: Legislators Spencer, Hahn & Muratore).

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, good morning. Next we'll do the salute to the flag led by Legislator Tom Cilmi. Please rise.

Salutation

Please remain standing. Legislator Cilmi will introduce Savannah Beckford who will sing the National Anthem.

LEG. CILMI:
Good morning. It's a great pleasure this morning to introduce Savannah Beckford. I had the honor of listening to her sing *God Bless America* recently at a function at Islip schools where she is a senior and she is pursuing an academic career in either musical theatre or biology, we haven't decided yet. But you're all going to be very blessed to hear her sing our National Anthem this morning. Savannah?

National Anthem Performed by Savannah Beckford

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:
Excellent job, Savannah.

The opening prayer will be given by Pastor Mark Kreemer from Christ Lutheran Church in Islip Terrace, also guest of Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
How about another big round of applause for Savannah Beckford, everybody.

Applause

I know the pride of Islip Schools.

It's a great delight for me to introduce this morning Pastor Mark Kreemer for our invocation. This is a tradition that this body has been involved with for many, many years and it really serves to underscore the fact that we are, indeed, now, were always and will always be one nation, under God.

So Pastor Kreemer, Pastor Mark Kreemer received a Bachelor of Music Education from the Ohio State University in 1990. Upon receiving God's call to ministry, he graduated from Trinity Lutheran Seminary in Columbus, Ohio, with a Master's of Divinity Degree in August of 2000. Pastor Kreemer has served congregations in Wichita, Kansas and St. Petersburg, Florida. He is currently serving Christ Lutheran Church in Islip Terrace which is celebrating this year its 100th Anniversary. With that, I give you Pastor Mark Kreemer.

Applause

PASTOR KREEMER:

I want to thank Legislator Tom Cilmi for the invitation to come this morning. It is an honor to be asked to offer a prayer this morning in this body. As he said, Christ Lutheran is celebrating its 100th Anniversary of being called to serve the people of Islip Terrace and to spread the good news of Christ coming in the form of a child.

It was interesting for me to learn that this County has been calling leaders to serve for over 330 years. John Stewart Mill once penned these words; *"Those only are happy who have their mind set on some object other than their own happiness. On the happiness of others, on the improvement of others, on the improvement of man kind, even on some art or pursuit. Not as a means, but as itself an ideal end."* Let us pray.

Gracious Lord, in this holiday season, help us to set our minds on the needs of others. Give us the wisdom and the tools to end hunger and disease. Give us the courage and compassion to overcome the hatred that leads to violence. Turn our complacency into action. Open our hearts and transform our despair into hope. You have blessed us with so much; help us bless others through our discussions and our decisions this day. Amen.

"Amen" Said in Unison

P.O. GREGORY:

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

Moment of Silence Observed

(Banged Gavel)

Proclamations

Okay. Again, good morning. And those of you who are new to our proceedings here at the Legislature, this is the portion of our agenda where we make presentations and we have several today. Many congratulations to those who we're recognizing.

First will be Legislator Martinez, she will present a proclamation to Maryalice Koch, a nurse from the Brentwood School District, for reviving an unresponsive 10-year old boy on November

27th.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Good morning. It's a privilege and an honor to be here today. And with us, not only do we have our nurse, but we do have the President of the Board of Education of Brentwood School District, Helen Moss; we have one of our other Trustees, Paula Moore; we have the Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Schools to the Brentwood School District and that's Dr. Aurelia L. Henriquez. We were also just -- sorry, Dr. McIntyre, I didn't see him; but we're also here with our Superintendent of the Brentwood School District, Dr. McIntyre; and Principal Snell of Laurel Park Elementary School. So thank you for being here.

We're here because a couple of weeks ago, right -- the day before Thanksgiving, there was a little boy at the Brentwood School District who was out, just like every child, on recess playing, and unfortunately was found unresponsive and barely had a pulse. As soon as our nurse was notified of the incident and the emergency, she ran outside without even thinking, just ran out and started doing what is in her job. And she's very shy, and this is what gives me even more of a pleasure to do this. Because she just says she's doing her job; and yeah, she was doing her job, but even with that, it takes a lot. When people are under emergency circumstances, you know, sometimes the mind gets clouded and that did not happen with you. And you were joined by one of our 3rd Precinct Officers, Officer McAuley who unfortunately is not here today with us but will be honored at a different date. But both of you together, as a team, revived this little boy, a 10-year old boy who has so much to be thankful for. And just the fact that it happened right before Thanksgiving, it's even more of a special moment. And you made that family's life so much better, you and that officer, and it was a team effort.

So because of your being humble and your shyness, you are a true hero. And I know it's very hard for you to understand this, but we don't thank our school nurses enough and they are such an important part of our school system. I, as a former educator, know that so well because I would go down to the nurse's office, while I was a teacher and administrator, and I said, *Can I just please sit here, just for a little while?* And they just -- they're a counselor, they're a nurse, they're everything under the sun. So I thank you. And on behalf -- she already has her proclamation, but on behalf of the 9th Legislative District and my colleagues here today, I thank you. And I thank you for making this little boy a happy little boy, once again. And because of your efforts and the efforts of the police officer, this little boy will now be able to live a longer life. So thank you.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, congratulations. Thank you, Ms. Koch.

Okay. Next, myself and --

LEG. MARTINEZ:

I'm sorry, Presiding Officer, if you don't mind, Dr. McIntyre would like to say a few words.

DR. McINTYRE:

Thank you, Legislator Martinez. We just want, again, to thank the Legislator for recognizing Ms. Koch here today, because she did an outstanding job. I just wanted you to know that the student life has been saved. The student had to undergo surgery regarding his heart and so the student is currently home, and we are very, very pleased that we have such outstanding individuals on board that's able to provide such a service. Again, we want to thank Ms. Koch, we want to thank the Principal, Mr. Snell, and I want to recognize our Board President as well as Board Member Trustee, Ms. Paula Moore; Assistant Superintendent Dr. Henriquez is also here with us, as well as our PR

person,.

Mr. Adeyeye. So again, thank you, Legislator. We appreciate it. Legislator Martinez, thank you very much.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Thank you.

Applause

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you, Legislator Martinez.

Presiding Officer Gregory and Legislator Kate Browning will now present a proclamation on behalf of the entire Suffolk County Legislature to Police Commissioner Edward Webber. Our sincere thanks for your dedicated service to the residents of Suffolk County over the past 43 years, and best wishes for a long, happy and healthy retirement.

LEG. BROWNING:

I know that the Commissioner has a very big support group this morning, so we'd like them all to make sure they come and stand next to us.

P.O. GREGORY:

There still are some people protecting our County, right?

*(*Laughter*)*

All right. It's my pleasure to stand before you with Legislator Browning, before my colleagues and the audience in attendance today, to recognize a fine officer and a gentleman who has committed decades of his life to serving and protecting Suffolk County residents.

Commissioner Webber is -- you know, has a long, distinguished career and has certainly left his mark on the department. A fine department, one of the best departments, I will argue probably *the* best department in the country. And that is -- that is something, certainly, to be proud of. You led it with distinction and honor. And we're sad to see you go, but I'm sure your family is happy to spend just a little bit more time with you, and we wanted to wish you congratulations. We have a proclamation signed by all members of the Legislature. And I'm going to give Legislator Browning, the Chair of our Public Safety Committee, a moment to say some words as well. Congratulations.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Thank you.

LEG. BROWNING:

And again, I think it was said well, but --

Applause

That's an Irish face (*laughter*). And again, it's a tough job and somebody had to do it and you stepped up and you did it, and I think you did a phenomenal job. I know, again, we have had conversations about family. It's not a 9 to 5, Monday to Friday job, it's 24/7. It takes away from your family, and I know you have a growing family, you have beautiful grand kids; look at that one right here. And I wish you a lot of luck. And take the time to enjoy your family, because -- and I have to say, you have to be proud of what you've done for the Suffolk County Police Department. And I know that my colleagues, and everyone in Suffolk County -- and I know that there are a few officers here, from Highway, POs who wanted to be here to support you and to say thank you also.

So again, myself, our Presiding Officer and the Legislature and the residents of Suffolk County want to say thank you for all of your hard work. And enjoy your retirement, enjoy your family. Thank you.

Applause

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:

Good morning, everyone. Thank you all for coming. I'm overwhelmed by the show up. I want to thank the Legislature for taking time out of their busy schedule to make this presentation possible.

Forty-three years ago this week, on a snowy, cold December 18th, 1972, I was sworn in by then Commissioner John L Barry, right across the street, which was the headquarters at the time which is now the DA's office. I never dreamed that I would stay 43 years, or I would be appointed Commissioner. The department has changed dramatically over the years. We have mobile data computers, we have 22 channel radios, we have on-line reporting. We now train to prevent or respond to things like 9/11 or Columbine. But one thing has not changed, and that's the hard work and dedication of the duty of our men and women of the Suffolk County Police Department. They put their lives on the line daily to support the people of Suffolk County. If I had to do it over, I would do it over in a heartbeat. It's an honor and privilege to have served for 43 years. Thank you very much.

Applause

(Photographs Taken)

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Congratulations. We're going to move on with proclamations. We have quite a number of them, so we're going to try to go through them as quickly as we can. Legislator Stern, I'll ask you to come forward to the podium.

Legislator Stern will be presenting a proclamation to Danielle Grimaldi for winning the 2015 Outstanding Athlete Award for Varsity Gymnastics from the Half Hollow Hills School District.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Presiding Officer. And good morning, everyone. Congratulations to all of the outstanding students who are going to be honored today. We're pleased to have you with us.

We have a special presentation this morning to Danielle Grimaldi who is joined by her parents who are here again, which speaks, I think, volumes to the special family. Danielle Grimaldi is a senior at Half Hollow Hills High School West. She's been a gymnast for many years, since age six. She's competed regionally reaching level nine, and she has persevered through injuries and other challenges throughout her career. She had an outstanding season this season, with dedication, with passion, and her enthusiasm was really infectious for her entire squad at Half Hollow Hills. And for being such an outstanding example to her teammates, to other young people and our entire community, Danielle Grimaldi was selected by her coaches to receive the Coach's Outstanding Scholar Athlete Award; very impressive. And she brings great pride, not just to the Grimaldi Family but to our entire community.

And so Danielle, on behalf of the Suffolk County Legislature and all 1.5 million residents of Suffolk County, it is a pleasure to present you with this proclamation to say congratulations and we wish you every success in the future.

Applause

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Next I would like to bring up Legislator Cilmi who will be presenting a proclamation to Probation Officer Daniel Buckley.

LEG. CILMI:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm joined today by Senior Probation Officer Dan Buckley, as well as President of the Probation Officers Association Matt Porter. And this sort of continues the tradition that we've had over the last couple of years of honoring some of the great work of our Probation Officers here in Suffolk County.

Senior Probation Officer Dan Buckley has been a member of the department since December 1st, 2001, and he was recently promoted to Supervisor and works out of the Edgewood office in Criminal Court Supervision. On February 19th of this year, Senior Probation Officer Buckley of the department's Special Offender Unit received a telephone call from a librarian at the Connetquot Public Library indicating that several patrons had complained of his probationer's activities while utilizing the library's multi-media center. John, we'll call him, was allegedly looking at Facebook pictures of clothed children, and it appeared that he was saving those images onto a thumb-drive. On February 20th, Officer Buckley received another call from the librarian stating that John was at a computer with thumb-drive in plain site. Without hesitation, Officer Buckley, accompanied by another Probation Officer, acquired a vehicle and set out to the Connetquot Library where it was intended -- where they intended to confiscate the thumb-drive and admonish the subject for activities. Upon arrival, John was observed viewing images that were the result of a search for "*middle school in little bikinis*".

A cursory examination of the computer revealed two other Internet browser tabs open on the computer, one for Google Circles, a social media page, and the other for a Gmail account, neither of which had been registered with the New York State Sex offender registry as required. The e-mail account listed correspondence that involved the exchange of images, as well as sexually explicit conversations. As a result of John's previous conviction for disseminating child pornography, Officer Buckley transported John to the Computer Crimes Unit at Suffolk County Police Headquarters. During the course of the interview and further examination of his e-mail account, a sent message was discovered that contained child pornography. John was transported to Suffolk County Police Department 7th Precinct where he was charged with one count of promoting a sexual performance by a child. This matter is also pending a Grand Jury examination where it is expected that John will face additional felony charges.

Had it not been for Senior Probation Officer Dan Buckley's dedication and commitment to his duties, John may have simply been admonished for looking at images that were likely in violation of his conditions but non-criminal. His swift action and follow-thru prevented the continued victimization of another child. All I can do after that is applaud Officer Buckley.

Applause

And I understand that is not your first time to this Legislature being recognized by this body. Officer Buckley exemplifies the great work that's being performed day-in and day-out by our Probation Department and we couldn't be prouder of what you've accomplished in your career and the good work of all of our Probation Officers here in Suffolk County. So God bless you and keep up the great work. Thank you.

Applause

I'm just being told that he went away on a 56-count indictment and he's Upstate, New York in jail right now, prison. Very good. Good job.

OFFICER BUCKLEY:

Thank you.

Applause

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right, Legislator Cilmi you can stay right there.

LEG. CILMI:

I want to get a quick photo first, if that's okay.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay, sure.

Photograph Taken

All right, next up is the **Islip Varsity Girls Soccer Team**; **Legislator Cilmi** will be presenting a proclamation.

LEG. CILMI:

Hi, Ladies. Well, we have a number of athletic teams that we'll be honoring today as a Legislature. It gives me really such tremendous pride to recognize the Islip Girls Varsity soccer team, our Lady Bucks, along with Coach Mike Reilly, Superintendent Schnebel, Athletic Director Bob Panariello.

It's been many years, Ladies, that I've been following this program. Many a time I remember watching Coach Reilly across the field at the County Championships as the school battled Southside, year after year after year and came up short, sometimes in penalty kicks, year after year. And as faith would have it, I couldn't make it to the game this year (*laughter*), you came up with a victory. So I'm not sure if that's going to keep me away in future years, but I wanted to say congratulations to all of you, and I'll just throw out some facts about the team.

Went 11-0-1 during the regular season in Division 5; overall was received 11-2-1 leading up to the championship. Including all the playoffs, overall record of 15-2. Suffolk County Class A Championship against Glenn, you won 2-1; you won the Semi-finals against Sayville. You won the Long Island Class A Championship for the first time in Islip Girls Soccer history against Garden City; score 0-0 and 4-3 on PKs. You won the first -- the program's first New York State Class A Championship ever in Islip girls soccer history with a score of 1-0 against Jamesville DeWitt.

In addition to that, Coach Reilly was named Long Island and New York Soccer Coach of the Year; and I know it's not the first time that you've been named Soccer Coach of the Year here on Long Island, Coach And, let's see, we have Mary O'Hara was named New York Class A Player of the Year; Mary, where are you? Raise your hand.

Applause

Good job. Mary was named as well to the NSCAA All-East Team and All Long Island Team; Mary, Hannah Franco, Cassidy Hock and Lyndsey Sparks all on the All-State Team. We have -- sure, absolutely clap for that.

Applause

Led by Captains Cassidy Hock, Kerri McDonald and Mary O'Hara, we have seniors Alexandra Bondi, Daniela D'Acunto, Hannah Flynn, Kamryn Hill, Taylor Pizzimenti, Jessica Rizzo, Perianne Smith here. We have juniors Emma Baumbusch, Gabriella Columbo, Ashley Giorgio, Delaney Kissane, Valentina Lopez, Emma Rafferty, Lyndsey Sparks and Katie Warnokowski here. We have sophomores Julia DeSantis, Julianna Eastwood, Hannah Franco and Kayla Multer; and we have freshman Dominique Bono, Hailey Franco and Alysa Sparks here. Ladies, God bless you. Congratulations.

Applause

Have a very Merry Christmas, Happy Holiday season and loads of success in the New Year. Coach Reilly, Superintendent Schnebel, Athletic Director Bob Panariello, congratulations to the three of you for running a terrific, terrific program and a wonderful school district. God bless each and every one of you.

Applause

Okay, Ladies. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Next, **Legislator Cilmi** will present a proclamation to the Connetquot Varsity Girls Volleyball and Hauppauge Varsity Boys Volleyball teams.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So we have next with us the **Connetquot Varsity Girls Volleyball Team**. Some of you may recognize this team, they were here with us last year as we recognized them as our Suffolk County Champions. They went a little further this year and now they're the team to beat in New York State.

We have with us Coach Justin Hertz; Assistant Coaches Karen Edwards and Ashley Marchese; Mark Dellecave, Athletic Director; and Kenneth Costa, the Principal of the High School, as well as Board Members Lee Kennedy and Milynn Augulis from the Connetquot School Board.

These young ladies played in League 2 and went 16-0 in the regular season; overall was 20-0. They won for the second straight year the Suffolk County Class AA Championship against Ward Melville; they won the semifinals against Smithtown West and quarterfinals against West Islip; they won the Long Island Class AA Championship 3-1 for the first time in Connetquot girls volleyball history against Massapequa; they won the first New York State Class AA Championship ever in Connetquot girls volleyball history with a game score of 3-0. Congratulations, Ladies.

Applause

And if that weren't enough, head coach Justin Hertz was named Long Island Coach of the Year. Nicole Migliozi, Cassandra Patsos, Mackenzi Cole all made the All-Long Island team. And along the way, by the way, as if the athletics weren't enough, along the way the team raised \$3400 for breast cancer research through an organization known as Sideout Foundation and our annual Dig Pink event. So congratulations for that as well. Thank you for your service to our community.

Here with us today we have seniors Lauren Ballinger, Katie Von Kampen; raise your hands, girls. They're probably the tallest ones of the team, the rest of you have to grow a little bit in the next couple of years. We have juniors Cory Carrara, Taylor Cole, Gianna DeRusso, Sophia Martin, Sarah McKeveny and Ashley Spencer. We have sophomores Daniella Balsano, Mackenzi Cole, Taylor Konzen, Nicole Migliozi, Cassandra Patsos, Skyla Schoppmeyer and Mackenzi Taylor. And we have

General Meeting - 12/15/15

an eight grader on the team, Diana Migliozi; where is Diana? Is she not here today?

COACH HERTZ:

She's in middle school.

LEG. CILMI:

Ah, she's in middle school, okay. Ladies, way to represent Suffolk County up at the States. Good luck in your next season and have a joyous holiday season. God bless each and every one of you. Congratulations.

Applause

Exit stage left. Well, it's right for you, sorry; my left, your right. Great job, Ladies. Keep up the great work.

And as the Connetquot ladies file out, I'd like to welcome to the podium with me Legislator Leslie Kennedy as we bring up the very well dressed Hauppauge Eagles Varsity Boys Volleyball Team.

Applause

Let's see, so I'm not sure if she made it here, but we were expecting Superintendent Pat Kriss. We have Head Coach Chris Varthalamis; JV Coach Greg Foster; Director of Athletics, Dan Butler; and the High School Principal, Christine O'Connor. Did I miss anybody? No? Okay, very good.

So we'd like to congratulate, Legislator Kennedy and I would like to congratulate our Long Island Class B Volleyball Champions. Great job, boys.

Applause

You know what comes next, right? State next year. Let's see, the team went 8 and 6 in the regular season with an overall record of 10 and 7; was the number one seed and advanced to the championship match automatically. Won Suffolk County Class B Championship against Sayville; won the Long Island Class B Championships against Bellemore JFK; and they were the New York State runners-up losing in the finals against Rochester Brighton. Get 'em next year, guys.

With us today we have seniors Kolbe Cordon, we have Captain Frank Cioffi, Bryan Seltenreich, Captain Andrew Tsororos, Marcelo SanRoman, Jimmy Connelly and Jackson wahl. We have juniors Carmelo Mattioli, Chris Burns, Michael Campi, Luke Shea, Kevin Michels, James Quartarao. And we have sophomores Adam Gorgone and Nicholas Crociata. Great job, guys. Great job.

Applause

Leslie, would you like to say something?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Excellent work, gentlemen.

LEG. CILMI:

All right. Happy holidays. Keep up the great work. Good luck in the rest of the school year and we'll see you guys next year. God bless. Congratulations to everybody at Hauppauge Schools for running a great program. Thanks, everybody. Appreciate it.

P.O. GREGORY:

Next we'll have Legislators Anker, Browning, Calarco who will present proclamations to the Longwood Lions Varsity Football Team who won the Long Island Class 1 Football Championship on November 29th.

LEG. CALARCO:

Good morning, everyone. As we are taking the time to recognize the skills and the prowess of some of our athletes in Suffolk County, it's a pleasure to be able to bring up the Longwood football team who are Long Island Champions this year. They went and put forth quite an effort this season, and I just wanted to make a couple of comments.

First, you know, on their way here they scored a victory for me personally in that they routed Lindenhurst on their way to the Long Island Championships. And there was a team that beat one of my Pat-Med guys last year in the championship, so thank you for getting comebacks for them. But in their victory this year, in the Long Island Championship they ran for 555 yards and scoring seven touchdowns on the ground. And let me tell you what that means, because football is a sport that is certainly a team support; you can't do it without all the team pulling together. And while that certainly means they had a talented tail back and running backs, that front five, those linemen certainly were out there doing their job as well. We want to congratulate them for their efforts, and so I have a proclamation. And I'm going to allow my colleagues, Legislator Browning and Anker, to speak and then we'll speak to one of our special athletes that we have; we have a Heisman candidate here in the room today.

LEG. BROWNING:

And again, like the Legislator said, congratulations. And this is my last term which makes me very happy, because I know we've had a couple of close ones and I've always said, I'd love to see the Longwood High School football team here. I am a Floyd parent, so -- however, you know, Coach Sipp, if you want to come forward. Let me tell you something; the name Sipp and football, they go well together, correct? The Sipp Family are a very well-known football family, so congratulations.

MR. SIPP:

Thank you.

LEG. BROWNING:

And because of your coaches is why you're here. You have a great coaching team. And I want to say a special congratulations to the coaches, because without your support and your hard work, these guys wouldn't be standing here. So congratulations to all of you.

MR. SIPP:

Thank you.

Applause

LEG. ANKER:

All right, I'm up next. So I used to work at Longwood School District. I don't know if you guys remember me, I took {Myra Voms} place. I went and I took pictures with you; you guys were probably in elementary and middle school at the time. But, you know, this goes to show you that you can do anything you want with your life. You are leaders right now. And I was teasing the girls as they were leaving, I said, "*I want to see some of those folks behind the horseshoe.*" I challenge you to take your leadership role right now and do the most with it, whether it's running for public office, running a business, being a social worker or a teacher. Do what you can with what you've learned being a Lion, and really keep that symbol in front of you. There you go, I can feel the love. But I also want to congratulate Dr. Lonergan, the Superintendent, and Dan Tomakowsky for -- if you

guys want to come up.

LEG. CALARCO:

Thomas.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay. I know Dan, I know you as Dan for many years. And I also want to thank you for providing what they needed to get the job done. You know, I sponsored safety forums and that's what this is about, it's protecting you guys so you can be safe, but also perform at your very best. So again, I want to thank everybody involved in providing the ability to be where you are right now. Congratulations. And I want to see -- I can't wait to see what you're going to do in your future. Congratulations.

Applause

LEG. CALARCO:

Coach Sipp?

MR. SIPP:

Yes, I would just like to personally thank the coaching staff, along with the players. They did a great job this year and the community support was awesome as well. Thank you.

Applause

LEG. CALARCO:

So we have certificates here for all of our players, as well as a proclamation for the team and a proclamation for our Coach Sipp.

But we also have a proclamation here for our Heisman Candidate,.

Sean Rausch. Sean, come on up. He is the 2015 --

Applause

He is the 2015 Wendy's High School Heisman Award Finalist, and we want to congratulate him for his personal effort, and I'm sure he had some big guys in front of him leading the way.

MR. RAUSCH:

Yes, sir.

LEG. CALARCO:

Congratulations.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Next we have Legislator Trotta will present a proclamation to Kings Park Girls Volleyball Team for winning their fifth consecutive Suffolk County Long Island Class A Championship in 2015. The Athletic Director and school Principal are also here with us.

LEG. TROTTA:

Over here girls. I just want to congratulate this team. It gives me great pleasure to invite them, once again. I mean, I've been here for a couple of years now and they've been here every year, apparently five years in a row they win the Long Island Championship. I've known some of these

General Meeting - 12/15/15

girls since they were tiny, they're friends of mine, their parents are friends of mine. And I just want to say we're very, very proud of you. I mean, to continually -- and your coaches, to be able to do this year after year after year for five years. I expect I'll see most of you again next year.

So on behalf of the 95,000, or 87,000 people in my Legislative District, and I'm sure the entire Suffolk County, we're all very proud of you. And I stand in awe and keep it up.

Applause

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Next, Presiding Officer Gregory will present a proclamation to Amityville Warriors Boys Varsity Soccer Team who won the 2015 New York Class A State Champions.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. It's my pleasure to stand here before you today to recognize the Amityville Warrior Soccer Team, as they enter the room. Okay. Again, this is the Amityville Warriors Boys Varsity Soccer Team and the 2015 New York State Class A State Champions. Congratulations.

Applause

It's their first victory in the history of the school. They won on November 15th with a 2-0 victory over Pearl River Pirates, and we're joined today with Coach Mike Abbondandolo -- did I pronounce that correctly?

COACH ABBONDONDOLO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Principal, Dr. Clinton Grant is here as well, and Superintendent Mary Kelly; she was due to be here, I don't see her. But congratulations, guys. The guy, the gentleman, the tallest one in the back is the goalie; you can see why they have resistance getting goals scored against them.

*(*Laughter*)*

I played soccer in college and certainly appreciate the efforts of what it takes to achieve the level that you guys have achieved, it's a remarkable accomplishment. You're not only the pride and joy of the Amityville community, but all of Suffolk County, and congratulations to you all. And we have a proclamation for the school.

Applause

Thank you.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Next, our Presiding Officer DuWayne Gregory will present a proclamation to Tysheem Griffin, an athlete from Amityville Memorial High School. Tysheem competed in the Global Rolling Thunder Games and placed number one in the 100-meter and second in the 200-meter race.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

It's my pleasure to stand here today with my friend and coach, Reynolds Hawkins. We've known each other, well, since I was a little boy. But Reynolds has an astonishing track record as an

individual, but as a coach as well. I mean, how many victories over the past --

COACH HAWKINS:

Nine losses in 20 years.

P.O. GREGORY:

Nine losses in 20 years under his direction and coaching. He's one of the most successful coaches in Amityville history, and probably in all of Long Island. And one of his greatest accomplishments is Tysheem, right next to me, Griffin, who went to -- I can't pronounce it, but I'll say Ecuador; Guayaquil, Ecuador, all right. Placed 1st in the 200-meter dash and 2nd place in the 100-meter dash in the Global Games, and that's a remarkable achievement. It's obviously a pride and joy for the Amityville School District and Tasheem and his family. Congratulations. We have a proclamation.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

You want to say something, Coach?

COACH HAWKINS:

No.

P.O. GREGORY:

No? Okay. All right. Your Mom and Dad. Is that your little brother? He's a future Global Winner? All right. Well, congratulations and best of luck to you.

MR. GRIFFIN:

Thanks.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right, thank you for coming today.

Applause

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Next I'd like to bring up Legislator Spencer and Legislator Trotta, they'll be presenting a proclamation to Police Officer Brian Nortillo. Brian performed CPR on his father-in-law and saved his life. Brian resides in Legislator Trotta's Legislative District; however, his wife Melissa is a physician assistant in Legislator Dr. Spencer's medical office.

LEG. SPENCER:

Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Presiding Officer. And I would like to invite Officer Nortillo and his family to please join me at the podium, his wife Melissa, his Mother and Father-in-law; Tom, come up, please.

I'm also very pleased to be joined by a lot of officers I think in the 4th Precinct, and also Commanding Officers, and thank you for being here. This is a really great moment for me to be able to share this story and recognize the actions of this brave officer. And I work with his wife who is a physician's assistant, but I've known Officer Nortillo for a long time and he is a good man, but that goes without saying. He's also a hero. And I recognize that he is a hero because, you know, he was doing his job, but in performing his job so well, he was able to perform what I feel is nothing short of a miracle.

General Meeting - 12/15/15

On September 23rd, while at his Smithtown home, Brian's father-in-law Tom, who's here today looking good, went into cardiac arrest due to complications from chemotherapy. Brian, being there, immediately started CPR. And we know that when appropriate life-saving measures are initiated, we improve the chances of survival, but in a case of CPR with complications from chemotherapy, the chances of survival are less than 1%. When you look at the amount of time until vital signs returned, the chances of survival are astronomical. And because of Brian's heroic action and the fact that he was there, he acted calmly, he relied on his training, he was able to not only perform CPR but to perform it to a level to where his father-in-law almost had complete recovery. And that is nothing short, in my opinion, of really what I consider a miracle.

It goes a lot further because every day Brian performs his job with integrity and he performs it with passion. And so it gives me great privilege to be able to recognize Brian and his family, and his family of police officers, and say thank you and to present you with this proclamation. Thank you very much.

Applause

Legislator Trotta, he's Trotta's constituent, he wants to say something.

LEG. TROTТА:

You know, in recent days we've seen a lot of bad press about the police, and no one knows better than I that 99.9% of the cops out there do this hard work every day. And I applaud you, guy, for doing a great job. And this exemplifies what's great about this Police Department. Every single day, no matter what, these guys are out there. And do not be discouraged by what you're hearing, because this is a great department.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Next we'll have Legislator Lindsay will present a proclamation to Jamie Atkinson who was awarded the 2015 Member of the year by the International Association of Financial Crime Investigators for his involvement in law enforcement, EMS, north shore, LIJ and community service.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. Thank you, colleagues in the Legislature. It's my privilege to present this proclamation to a constituent of mine in the Sayville community, Detective Jamie Atkinson. He works for the MTA Police; he started his career in 2002 and has worked through the department since that time.

Jamie has a very unique experience within the department. He has a very long bio here, I don't want to take too much time reading it all, but just to go through some of the interesting cases that Jamie has worked on. And it surprise -- it surprised me, even, to read this information, as the MTA Police are not very well-known as much as some of our other law enforcement communities. But it seems like, Jamie, you've gotten into some really interesting crimes, not only while you're investigating for the MTA, but also just going, it seems, from one location to another.

So in November of 2009, Jamie conducted a car stop on the Southern State Parkway of a vehicle matching the description that was used in the commission of several bank robberies. The vehicle was stopped and the suspect was apprehended and linked to 12 open bank robberies. Then in September of 2012, Jamie did apprehend and arrest a suspect who slashed three commuters with a knife on an escalator in the Jamaica Train Station.

General Meeting - 12/15/15

In May of 2012, Jamie was awarded the MTA Police Cop of the Year. While driving down Sunrise Highway, Jamie observed a male standing on the ledge of an overpass with a hangman's knot tied around his neck, tied to the guardrail at the Oakdale Merge and Montauk Highway. The subject was attempting to jump off the bridge onto the tracks approximately 40 feet below upon an oncoming train to commit suicide. Jamie went over to the wall, grabbed the subject, prevented, aided -- and prevented him from jumping, then aided him in lifting him over the wall safely and removing the rope. The aid that he provided -- I'm sorry, the individual was transported to Brookhaven Hospital in good condition.

Then in 2014, Jamie Atkinson also was involved in a sophisticated counterfeiting scheme, investigating and arresting a forger who produced 74 forged Long Island Railroad tickets that were sold to Long Island Railroad commuters in Suffolk and Nassau Counties. The forger created a business enterprise using dealers for a loss of over \$30,000.

If that wasn't enough, recently, on December 2nd, 2015, Detective Atkinson was the lead investigator for a fraud investigation conducted throughout Suffolk, Nassau and Queens counties. The defendant is charged with creating on-line mail-and-ride account tickets for the Long Island Railroad using their website fraudulently and creating gift cards and credit cards. The defendant did obtain 120 Long Island Railroad monthly tickets for a loss of \$50,000. The tickets were sent via U.S. Postal Service mail using fictitious names to 86 different homes throughout Suffolk, 70 in Nassau and 16 in Queens between September of 2014 and November of 2015.

Now, here's where the case gets even a little bit more interesting and kind of touches us all. The defendant then went to the homes to pick up the envelopes delivered, interacted with the homeowners introducing himself as the created name stating the Post Office delivered the mail by accident. The tickets were then sold to people on a customer-based list established through Craig's list for a profit.

The defendant was also linked to e-mail, Paypal, merchant fraud. Starting on April of 2014 through May of 2014, the defendant was placing high-priced Nike sneakers for sale on E-Bay and then using two fictitious names. Defendant did not send the items to the winning bidders; he withdrew the funds taken and used them for other purposes. So it's amazing some of the different crimes that you've gotten into and how diverse some of them have been.

Also, in addition to his busy job as an MTA Police Officer, Jamie is also an active member of his community serving the volunteer -- serving the Volunteer Community Ambulance Corps, and is also their ex-Chief. He's a current Board Member, and they serve the Towns of Bayport, Bohemia, Oakdale, Sayville, Cherry Grove and West Sayville. He holds the title of Safety and Emergency Management Officer for the North Shore LIJ Health System. He is also on the Board of Directors for the Youth Enrichment Services, and Jamie sits on the Suffolk County Citizens Corps Council through the Suffolk County Department of Fire, Rescue & Emergency Services. And somehow he still managed to get married recently, so we congratulate you for that. And I really am not only proud to present you with this proclamation, but I'm proud to call you not only my constituent but my friend. Jamie, congratulations on your service.

Applause

(*Photograph Taken*)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Next we'll have **Legislators Stern, D'Amaro and Spencer** will present a proclamation to

the **Walt Whitman High School Boys Soccer Team**. They are the 2015 AA Soccer Champions.

We're getting to you guys in the middle, there. I know you're getting restless, but it's coming. Sorry. Thank you for your patience.

LEG. STERN:

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. And I'm joined with Legislator D'Amaro and Legislator Spencer to welcome and congratulate the Walt Whitman Boys Soccer Wildcats, the New York State AA Champions.

Applause

Led by Coach John DiGiacomo, the champions had a record of 21-1, not only making them New York State Champions, but making them No. 11 in the entire nation. They bring great pride to our entire community and it really is a pleasure to welcome them here to the Legislature today. Legislator Spencer.

LEG. SPENCER:

Nice job, guys. You make us all proud. Enjoy this day.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Good morning. 21 and 1 is quite impressive. I'm just curious, who was the one loss?

UNKNOWN STUDENT:

Central Islip.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Central Islip. Okay, well, they must be a tough team, huh? You guys have an awful lot to be proud of. Becoming State Champs is an achievement of a lifetime, it's something you're going to remember forever. And, you know, it really sets a fine example for all the other students in the school. You're becoming roll models. Believe it or not, it's something that the other students will look up to and always remember and you set a fine example for them. I'm sure you also made your families very, very proud of you. So keep up the good work and congratulations. Thank you.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Congratulations, guys.

Now, Legislator Muratore. All right, you guys are up, you're ready? You're excited? You're sleeping? What you are you doing over there? (*Laughter*). All right, **Legislator Muratore** will present a proclamation to the **Newfield High School Football Team**, the County Champions.

Applause

LEG. MURATORE:

Okay, guys. Make sure you line up in alphabetical order because I want to read your names off, okay?

(**Laughter**)

Nah, I'm not going to do that, I'm only kidding. Just gather up there, and if the coaches can just step in front here. Look, as soon as these men leave, the place is going to be empty, we got no

General Meeting - 12/15/15

audience now. That's why we held you hostage.

But no, I want to congratulate the team. You know, we've heard a lot about football players and about teamwork, so I'm not going to go over that. We all know what you do and how you do it and why you do it, and you're all great men in your community. You're all leaders, you're all winners. You had a great season. We'll start with Coach Picc; he was voted the 2015 Coach of the Year in Suffolk County, okay? So there's a first for Newfield. Undefeated, 12-0, another first. Division II Champs? You've done that a few times. Long Island Class II Champs, the 69th Annual Rutgher's Trophy, so that's a big congratulation. And you know, they were also first here at the Legislative building today, you know, so they're first, in anything they do they're first.

You know, I want to congratulate them and go over just a few things. I promise I'll be brief. Like I said, the Wolverines won 12 games, went undefeated for the first time in the 58-year history of the school.

Senior Halfback Elijah Riley; Elijah, where are you? Raise your hand. Okay, he was the first Newfield player to garner the Carl A. Hansen Award which is presented to Suffolk County's top player. So let's give a hand for Elijah there.

Applause

LEG. MURATORE:

And Elijah also won the school's first Tom Cassese Award presented to the top defensive back. So you went both ways, huh, offense and defense. Great job.

Senior Jelani Green won the school's first National Football Foundation Award given to Suffolk County's top wide receiver. And to top it off, like I said to you, Newfield earned the most prestigious award of all the teams in Suffolk County and they were awarded the 69th Annual Rutgher's Trophy.

Newfield set a couple of records, too. The most points scored in a season with 518. You beat Half Hollow Hills West, 58-34 where you won the Suffolk Division II Title. A week later, you earned the school's 2nd Annual Long Island Class II Champion with a 41-33 over McArthur; you guys can score points. Defensive end Dylan Ferrari earned the Rob Bennet Award given to Suffolk County's top defensive player.

So the celebration of awards went on all evening. But when it was time for the Rutgher's Trophy, guess what; our team in Newfield got it in Suffolk County. That's what we do here in Suffolk County. You know, we raise winners, we have winners. We have great young men, we have great coaches. You know, the team is great, but you know you need leaders. And you know what? I want to give a round of applause to Coach Picc and his great team of coaches. So thank you, Coach.

Applause

Here's yours, Coach. We'll go outside and take a picture, okay? And this one's for the team. Okay, that's for the trophy case, okay? Again, guys, thank you very much. God bless you. Have a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year, a great holiday season. God Bless America. Thank you so very much.

Applause

Next we have **Legislator Stern** who will present proclamations to the Half Hollow Hills School Legislation Committee.

LEG. STERN:

No.

P.O. GREGORY:

No? That's what I have. All right. And/or to the *Elwood-John Glenn High School Girls Volleyball Team* for winning the Suffolk County Long Island championship this year, being the State runner-up.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. It is really a pleasure to welcome back, actually, the Elwood-John Glenn Lady Spiders Girls Volleyball Team, the winners of the Suffolk County and Long Island Championships.

This is an outstanding program and we really love the opportunity to congratulate you guys fairly often, actually, which is very, very cool, led by Coach Kevin Harrington. And they're joined today by their Athletic Director Lou Tuorto.

These young women are not only outstanding on the court, but off it as well. Their passion, their dedication, their commitment not just to their support but to their community, they really serve as a great example for all of their fellow students and, again, you bring great pride to the Elwood community. So it's a pleasure to welcome you here to the Legislature. As you can see, they all have proclamations that say, among all the other things, on behalf of the 1.5 million residents of Suffolk County, we say congratulations to all of you and wish you every success in the future. Thank you.

Applause

***Commemorative Pinning Ceremony
Honoring Volunteer Firefighters, EMS Medical Service Volunteers who also served in the
Armed Forces of the United States***

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Next on the agenda is October 15th -- excuse me, October 15th of this year, Legislator Browning sponsored a resolution for the Suffolk County Legislature to create a program for commemorative pins to honor our volunteer firefighters and emergency medical service volunteers who have also served in the Armed Forces of the United States. The contributions and sacrifices of the men and women who served in the Armed Forces have been vital in maintaining the freedoms and way of life enjoined by the people of the United States. Today's ceremonial pinning will recognize the West End volunteers. Several Legislators will announce a member of the fire department, a volunteer ambulance company to be recognized and receive the pin they have earned. We have several Legislators; Legislator Stern, Lindsay, Martinez, Kennedy, Muratore and Anker will be recognizing individuals in their respective districts.

LEG. HAHN:

I thank Legislator Browning for doing this. I apologize to our fire fighters how long you had to wait today. It's the last meeting of the year, we save the best for last here in my mind.

Day in, day out, what our volunteer firefighters do. And we are recognizing them for having served our country, and they chose, upon return, to continue to serve our country every single day of the year. And, you know, we can't say enough for what you all do and the sacrifices you have made throughout your lives for everyone here.

And with that, I hope you don't mind, I'm going to --

LEG. LINDSAY:

General Meeting - 12/15/15

Bob Holly is here from the Fire Academy.

LEG. HAHN:

Oh, Bob Holley from the Fire Academy is here, I don't know if he wants to come forward, too, to be a part of these presentations.

We'd like every single one, as we call the firefighters, to come forward and to stand in front of the horseshoe for us.

I have invited from Stony Brook Fire Department, Walter Hazlitt (World War II Veteran), Pete Gustafson (Korean War Veteran) and Richard Wulforst (Vietnam War Veteran). If the three of you can come forward and we'll start, everyone here will add their firefighters to our group. So thank you for your service to our country and for your service to our community.

Applause

LEG. MARTINEZ:

I have the pleasure and the honor to have selected Mr. Glenn Mungo who happens to also be the father of Glenn Mungo who I also had as a student a long, long time ago. So when I heard the name, it gave me even more of an exciting opportunity to do this for you, and I thank you for taking this. Mr. Mungo served in the U.S. Air Force and now also serves in the Brentwood Fire Department. So thank you for your service and thank you for having two beautiful children that I had the pleasure of having as students in my classroom. Thank you.

Applause

LEG. ANKER:

Okay, I'm going to go ahead and mention my nominees. I have Don Nimphius and Michele Devaux. And, you know, I've known Don for quite a while and they're both with the Miller Place Fire Department. Don had served as veteran in the Korean War and Michele had served in Vietnam War. And I just found out, little did I know Michele, you have two Purple Hearst.

MR. DEVAUX:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

And a --

MR. DEVAUX:

Silver Star, Bronze Star.

LEG. ANKER:

A Silver Star, a Bronze Star.

MR. DEVAUX:

Air Medal with Valor.

LEG. ANKER:

Air Medal with Valor. Now, these are our community members that continue to serve the residents, and I just want to honor them again with my veterans pins and also just thank them for their service, not only to our communities but to our country. Thank you.

Applause

LEG. KENNEDY:

I am honored to bring today two wonderful public servants who serve not only our country, but our fire departments, our ambulances and work for the County, one of them; **Tommy Buffa** and **Ed Springer (United States Army)**. Thank you, gentlemen, for your service.

LEG. MURATORE:

The representatives from the 4th Legislative District are both from the Selden Fire Department, it's Jay Matthews and Arnold Reyes. Gentlemen, come up here. And also, we have with us the Chief of the Selden Fire Department, Chief Mike Matteo. So guys, come up here.

Applause

Congratulations. Just a short history, I'll be very brief.

Jay Matthews, like I said, is a member of the **Selden Fire Department**. He's a member of the Heavy Rescue Company Fire Fighter and he's an EMT. He's a Veteran from the **United States Army** where he served as a specialist. Again, Jay, thank you for your service to your country and thank you for your service to your community.

Arnold Reyes, again, a member of the **Selden Fire Department**. He's in the ambulance company, EMT critical care. He's a veteran of the **United States Army** and Arnold was a Sergeant Major in the Army. Arnold is married with two children. So Arnold, thank you for your commitment to the community and to this country and God Bless you and God Bless America. Thank you so very much.

Applause

LEG. LINDSAY:

Mr. Presiding Officer, Members of the Legislature, my colleagues, my veterans pin this morning I'm presenting to **Bryan Mastrangelo**. Brian serves in the **U.S. Coast Guard**, he's also a **Suffolk County Police Officer in the Marine Bureau** and serves in the **Sayville Ambulance Corps**. In addition to that, he's also one of the instructors and leaders of the Michael Murphy Sea Cadets which serves our young men and women throughout not only the community which I serve but throughout all of Suffolk County. Bryan is a great steward, not only to the Sayville community but our country as a whole. I just want to thank you for your service and thank you for all that you do for our community. Thanks, Bryan.

Applause

LEG. STERN:

Mr. Presiding Officer, my colleagues, it's really a great personal privilege to present two of the best of our entire community.

Alan Berkowitz is **2nd Assistant Chief at the Dix Hills Fire Department** where he served for the past 15 years as an advanced EMT/CC, a firefighter, and was deployed at Ground Zero by the Fire Department in the aftermath of 9/11. In 2014, he was awarded the Town Chief of the Year. In the military, he's presently a **Major in the Air Force Reserves JAG Corps** where he provides legal advice to the military and defense and provides legal assistance to service members. While in the Army Reserves, he deployed for 15 months where he led a unit that aided in the prosecution of Iraqi Terrorists and provided advice to national military leadership, the Army Operations Center of the Pentagon. Currently, he serves as an Administrative Law Judge for the United States Social Security Administration where he adjudicates claims for disability benefits. Previously he had served as

Assistant Attorney General at the New York State Attorney General's Office for 20 years. He was also an Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Suffolk County Office. It is really a privilege to congratulate Alan Berkowitz.

Chris Schiavo is a 26-year member of the Deer Park Fire Department, having served as Chief from 2000-2008, and currently is elected as a Fire Commissioner. In the military he serves as a Lieutenant Colonel in the United States Airforce, starting his 31st year as Liaison Director for the Airforce Academy in Colorado Springs. He's a Suffolk County Police Department for 23 years, assigned to the Aviation Section serving as a pilot. He is the President of the Suffolk County Police Veterans Association and a member of the Sons of Italy and the Knights of Columbus. It is, again, a personal privilege to congratulate Chris Schiavo and, once again, to recognize both of these outstanding gentlemen; again, as I said, two of the best of our entire community. Congratulations.

Applause

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

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Mr. Hazlitt asked to say a few words.

MR. HAZLITT:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Forty-five years ago I was sitting where you people are sitting today. The budget at that time for the County was \$298 million and I couldn't fathom that kind of money. Fifty-two percent of the budget was taken up by the Police and Social Service at that time.

And I want to congratulate each and every one of you who's starting a new term in January. You've got problems that we had no idea in those days that we would face, and you do a great job. Then it was an experiment, the first County Legislature, and I didn't even know at that time where to go to sit down. But you've evolved into a great governmental activity, and I want to congratulate you again, and wish everybody a happy holiday.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Next, we will have Legislator Stern present proclamations to the Half Hollow Hills School Legislation Committee.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer and my colleagues. This is a special presentation to a very special group of outstanding young people. Many of them I've had the opportunity to know, and to work with, and engage with, and participate with for four years or more. They are the Half Hollow Hills Legislation Committee.

Let me first say, first of all, they've been watching everything that's been going on here today, so they've had the opportunity to see so many of our outstanding young people come up and be recognized before all of their neighbors all throughout Suffolk County. They will also be here to listen to some of the public hearings and some of the debate of the day. They've also through the years had the opportunity to participate in some of their own debates right here in this chamber, and many of the laws that we have implemented along the way, and some of the ones that we haven't implemented along the way have been the subject of their debates.

It's interesting, because when we're here, sometimes the mics will be on, and as we know here in

General Meeting - 12/15/15

the Legislature, that even if you're not in the room, you can hear throughout the building what's going on. And so there have been many times where colleagues have come up to me to say, "I wasn't here in the room watching, but I've been listening to some of the debate going on," and they've been very impressed.

So it's great to have them here again with us this year. They are -- first of all, right, you don't get to just join the Legislation Committee. There is a process that they go through, they are selected, it's competitive. They do an awful lot here locally, and they spend some time with our elected representatives up in Albany talking about some of the issues that are important to them as young people and to our education system overall.

They are joined here today by some of their advisors. They have the opportunity to work with some outstanding parents and administrators in the Half Hollow School District, and it's great to have them with us here today. So we hope that you enjoy the rest of your day, and I look forward to spending many more of these occasions, both here in the Legislature and back at the high school, with you in the years to come.

So we say to all of you, welcome. And, of course, to each and every one of you here in the Suffolk County Legislature, we all wish you every success in the future. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

*(*Photograph was taken*)*

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Now we are done with proclamations and presentations. We will go into the Public Portion. But before we do so, I will make a motion to extend the Public Portion, which is --

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, yeah, got a second. You got me. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Ten -- 12. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Calarco, Cilmi, Kennedy, Trotta and McCaffrey)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. First up, we have Mr. John Rogers. I will remind all speakers that we have three minutes. John Rogers. Okay, let's see. Jason -- okay. And Jason Neal on deck.

MR. ROGERS:

General Meeting - 12/15/15

Good morning, Presiding Officer Gregory and Members of the Legislature. I'm here to speak in regard to Resolution 1944, reauthorizing the lease for HELP-Suffolk.

I've had several friends who, once they lost their housing, benefit from being able to stay at HELP-Suffolk. We still have a homeless problem in Bellport and Suffolk County as a whole, and as such, HELP-Suffolk provides a much needed service. They do an excellent job supporting the residents and families that live in the facility and helping them to achieve permanent housing.

Additionally, they've also been a good and active community partner in supporting Bellport in its redevelopment efforts. For these reasons, I support the reauthorization of the lease of HELP-Suffolk. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Jason Neal, and then on deck, Stephen Ruth.

MR. NEAL:

Good af -- good morning, I guess it's still morning, County Legislators. Thank you for your letting me speak today on behalf of HELP-Suffolk and renewing this important work that they're doing there. HELP-Suffolk has been an excellent community partner.

When they were first put there, there were many community members who thought that they would be a burden to the Bellport area, and they have not been a burden. In fact, they have been quite helpful in the area, and not only that, they have a good relationship with the schools, a good relationship with the Boys and Girls Club in Bellport. Several families that I know of personally whose children belong to the Boys and Girls Club of the Bellport area live at HELP-Suffolk, and some of them, it's because of, you know, an eviction, some of them it's for other reasons. But whatever the case may be, those families still need help, and HELP-Suffolk has been providing them with that help. And just like I said before, they've been a good community partner. They have not been a burden to the area, and I wish to see their work continue there. So I am definitely in support of this. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Stephen Ruth, and then on deck, Kathryn Gutleber.

MR. RUTH:

Okay. My name is Stephen Ruth. I live in Legislative District Number 4. I stand in opposition of the Red Light Camera Program.

I was wondering if any of the Legislators looked into how many people passed away in accidents in front of these cameras. I've been asking for a list of people who died in front of these cameras since I started this, and I've yet to find out exactly how many people passed.

Also, I have a question as to the revenue produced by the camera program going from 1.5 million to \$16 million in one year without the shortening of yellow lights. We know that that's not the case. The only reason you increase your revenue 16 times or 15 times is by shortening yellow lights.

As we go into winter, the number of accidents in these intersections, especially involving commercial vehicles, is definitely going to skyrocket, because there's just not enough time to stop. Whether it be in the left-hand turn, the right-hand turn, or the straight-away, there's still not enough time to

stop.

Anyone with enough common sense would realize that someone my son's age could retime the lights and do a better job than these traffic engineers. It's really not fair to have a three-second yellow turning arrow, especially where we have hills, increases, degrades in pitch, as well as turns. It's not fair to drivers to have to make a three-second left-hand turn.

Also, I want to talk about the -- I want to talk about 45 miles per hour. If you're traveling at 45 miles per hour, you're traveling at 66 feet per second. If you divide that by eight, you have six. You add a 2.2 second commercial reaction time and you have about 8.2 seconds. If we had a universal conforming yellow light time of around eight seconds, there will be no accidents in these intersections, they'll increase safety, pedestrians won't be getting hit by cars. I know nobody wants to talk about it, but, really, when you're going from five to eight seconds, you're only talking about three seconds. If we could just change the light time three seconds, I'm sure we're going to save lives. It's not about money, it's about saving lives. We're only talking about a few seconds.

Also, when an intersection goes red, if we could have an all red clearing time for maybe five seconds, three second, that would save lives. If someone was accidentally or not accidentally blowing a light, it would prevent other drivers from being in the intersection at that time. So these are things I'd like to touch on.

I'd appreciate any kind of feedback anybody can give me. We still have 30 seconds left. If anybody can interact with me a little bit and let me know if they feel that the yellow light time is good or if it's too short.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can't interact.

P.O. GREGORY:

Can't interact. It's -- Public Portion is for you to make a statement.

MR. RUTH:

Okay. Well, I wish everybody a happy holiday. I hope everybody has a safe, wonderful, joyous holiday, and I hope they all enjoy their family time. Thank you very much for hearing me.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. All right. Kathryn Gutleber, and then on deck, Bob Bontempi.

MS. GUTLEBER:

Good morning. My name is Kathryn Gutleber and I am the Real Estate Development Project Manager for Habitat for Humanity of Suffolk, and I'm before you today in support of I.R. 1942, authorizing the sale of County-owned real property pursuant to 72-h.

This resolution, in conjunction with the Town of Riverhead's resolution, the intent would be to donate this property to Habitat Suffolk to redevelop for affordable housing purposes. So your support of I.R. 1942 will allow us to replace an abandoned blighted structure in Town of Riverhead with an opportunity for affordable housing for a working class family in Suffolk County. Thank you, and happy holidays.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, and same to you.

MS. GUTLEBER:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Bob Bontempi.

MR. BONTEMPI:

Good morning, Presiding Officer Gregory, Members of the Legislature. My name is Bob Bontempi. I'm the Vice Chairman of the Huntington Township Chamber of Commerce. I'm joined by my two colleagues, Brian Yudewitz, who's also Co-Chairman, and Ellen O'Brien, the Executive Director. The three of us collectively together run the Long Island Fall Festival in Huntington. I'm here today to respectfully ask you to support the resolution requesting the approval of our 2015 omnibus grant for \$40,000 in support of that festival.

Although many of you may be aware of the history, let me provide you with a little bit more background. The challenge has been that on the current formula of the Chamber is at 27% administrative expenses versus program expenses, which is down from 38%. As you're aware, the guidance from the County is a 20% threshold. We got this number, the better number, by diligently working with our accountants to get a better understanding of what comprises these categories. Please be aware that in this case, the grant funds are designated specifically for the stand-alone four-day event, the Long Island Fall Festival at Huntington, and the grant is only used consistent with the purposes that it was allocated as related to art and culture.

When you look at the stand-alone P&L for the event for the past two years, we clearly exceed the County's guidance, and are below the threshold of administrative expenses at 16 and 17% for the past two years. Moving forward, consistent with Legislator Cilmi's suggestion, we're going to -- we're going to create a separate entity, separate corporate entity to better reflect the true purpose of the allocation.

From the beginning of the process this year and all years, we are transparent with the Comptroller's Office and the members of our delegation in Huntington. Actually, in our opinion, the event is a great tourism investment for Suffolk County, and we would suggest that the event is actually revenue neutral when considering the sales tax it's generated. Four good festival days can draw in excess of 250,000 people that then outflow to the rest of Huntington, Smithtown, Babylon and Suffolk County. So considering that, I respectfully ask for your support. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Okay. That's all the cards that I have. Is there anyone else that would like to make a comment who has not filled out a card? Please come forward and state your name for the record.

MR. CLAMPET:

One of the Legislators confronted Stephen Ruth in an unprofessional manner, not mentioning names, due to a gentleman who became nasty with Stephen Ruth when Stephen Ruth was videotaping him. This is not a joke. There shall be decorum while in Hauppauge or Riverhead. No one in the public or elected officials should bully anyone. We talk about the children in school; am I right or wrong, students? No bullying in school or you'll be expelled. So we as adults should act the same way here, and be banned from future Legislative meetings.

My intent the last time I spoke was not to single out any of you, as far as the red light camera. I just don't want to see anybody being investigated by the FBI. I think we can handle this all inhouse, we don't need outside help.

Weekend Legislative meeting, can we have that? Can the public know about this? Nighttime

meetings. Ask the residents before you pass a law.

Long Island Alarm Association, were they asked about the false alarm? Did anybody on the County Legislature reach out to the Long Island Alarm Association? These people are putting in alarms. They're making money, they're paying taxes, they have bills they have to pay. Eighty dollars a ticket for the red light camera? Let's say it's \$960 for the year, one ticket per month. And I'm sure the students that are sitting in the back have heard their parents curse, yell, whatever, about the red light ticket that they received.

No one, no one is -- no one is perfect in this world, no one, whether you're a millionaire, whether you're a scholar, whether you're a poor person. The red light camera ticket, like Steve said, should be eight seconds, seven seconds, all around the whole thing. It's a Ponzi scheme, that red light cameras. Other states have banned them. Why don't you? Thank you for your time.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Thank you. We'll have you fill out a card.

MR. CLAMPET:

I did already.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, you did? Okay, gotcha. Thank you. All right. Anyone else that would like to speak who hasn't filled out a card or spoken yet already? Okay. I'll make a motion to close the Public Portion, second by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Krupski, Muratore, Barraga)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. If I can have all Legislators to the horseshoe, if they're not here already. Okay. We will get to the agenda, first being 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? Behind you.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen -- 17. (Not Present: Legislator Martinez)

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Resolutions tabled. ***I.R. 1516 - Approving Ferry License for Beachcomber Freight Service, LLC d/b/a Coastline Freight (Pres. Off.)***. Do I have a motion?

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

A motion by Legislator Muratore, and I'll second. Is everyone there, tabled resolutions? All in favor?

Opposed? Abstentions? It's tabled resolutions.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1517 - Approving Ferry Freight rates for Beachcomber Freight Service, LLC (Pres. Off.). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1621 - Approving 2015 Funding for a Contract Agency (Babylon Village Youth) (McCaffrey).

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator D'Amaro. On the motion, anyone?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Wait, wait, wait, hold on, hold on. You were going to withdraw it.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes. Yes, change that to motion to withdraw.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. I'm sorry. Legislator McCaffrey is going to withdraw I.R. 1621.

Okay. ***I.R. 1837 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the Reconstruction of CR 97, Nicolls Road (CP 5512) (Co. Exec.).***

Motion by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

On the motion.

LEG. HAHN:

Is Gil here? Well, anyway, we had a -- you know I tabled this at the last meeting. We had a meeting with the Commissioner, with our State representatives, with representatives from -- other representatives from DPW, and we will be -- any new plans will go back to the community. So I feel comfortable that I have the assurances from the Department that we will have adequate community notification when the time is right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Absolutely.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. *I.R. 1837A - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$50,000 Bonds to finance engineering costs for the reconstruction of CR 97, Nicolls Road (CP 5512.114).* Same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen.

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

BUDGET & FINANCE

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. ***I.R. 1992 - Authorizing the County Comptroller and County Treasurer to close certain capital projects and transfer funds (Co. Exec.).***

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator D'Amaro, I'll second. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 2000 - Authorizing the County Comptroller and the County Treasurer to transfer funds to cover unanticipated expenses in the 2015 Adopted Discretionary Budget (Co. Exec.).

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Same motion, same second. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 2001 - Authorizing the County Comptroller and the County Treasurer to transfer funds to cover unanticipated expenses in the 2015 Adopted Mandated Budget (Co. Exec.).

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Same motion, same second. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 2009 - Approving 2015 Funding for a contract agency (Huntington Chamber of Commerce) (Spencer). Motion by Legislator Spencer, second by Legislator Stern. On the motion, anyone?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Could we get an explanation on this from the sponsor?

MR. NOLAN:

This is a group that received funding in the 2015 Operating Budget. Their administrative expenses exceed the 20% cap that we have in the code. The Legislature can approve the funding to the group by a two-thirds vote and that's why it's before the Legislature.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Have they received funding prior to 2015?

MR. NOLAN:

That I don't know. Maybe Budget Review could answer that.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I can answer that. They did, yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So did they comply prior to 2015? Dr. Lipp? Thank you.

MR. LIPP:

We're looking it up now.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So is there -- and I had heard, and is this true, that they have changed their operations so that in 2016 they will meet the -- they will comply with the 20% cap?

LEG. SPENCER:

That's correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, just through the Chair. Legislator Krupski, the Chamber representatives that were here today also appeared at committee and we had an extensive discussion about that. And one of the issues that came up was going forward, does the Chamber expect to be in compliance with the County requirement for 20% and the answer was yes. Apparently, there's been some change or some decrease in the salaries that the Chamber is paying, so you'll have less administrative expenses, and that's the expectation for next year.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

How many -- do you know how many employees they have?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, through the Chair, if you'd like the representative to come up, I'll leave that up to Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

DuWayne, can we do that?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Mr. Bob Bontempi.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Good morning.

MR. BONTEMPI:

Good morning again.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Could you -- so could you explain your operation? And explain why we need to have a vote on really piercing the 20% cap.

MR. BONTEMPI:

So, yeah. So to answer your first question, we have three, three employees full-time, which is down from four. We had a retirement.

The reason for the grant is to support that stand-alone entity that I mentioned before, and it's the Fall Festival. You actually -- by giving us that money, you're actually helping enhance the event and

General Meeting - 12/15/15

draw more people into the community for the four-day event, and get -- subsequently getting more outflow and hopefully sales tax revenues into the community.

We've worked diligently with the Comptroller's Office to get that number down from what it was at 38% to 27%. To be in compliance next year, what we're going to do, and it came up in the committee meeting, we're going to create a stand-alone entity, so we don't have to roll the full 365 days of admin in. We're just going to have a one four-day entity and pay the staff stipends. And when you look at the P&L from the past two years, when you just look at the stand-alone entity, we come in at 16 and 17% below that 20% threshold.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Have you ever received this money prior to 2015?

MR. BONTEMPI:

There was one -- for the past six years, I think there was one gap year that we didn't. The year escapes me. Do you know?

MS. O'BRIEN:

It was 2012.

MR. BONTEMPI:

2012 we didn't get it. We got it in '10, '11, '13, '14.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No question, just on the resolution. As I take a look at the resolution, I do have some concerns with reference to this Huntington Chamber of Commerce in terms of its past track record as it relates to how they have spent money in the past.

From 1999 to 2005, the New York State Comptroller's Office, the Division of State Services under DiNapoli audited the Huntington Chamber of Commerce, because they had received something like ten different grants from the Department of Economic Development and from the Empire State Development Corporation. And the way the grants were designed, the money has to be specifically spent on the particular grant involved. And the Council was then reimbursed after they spent the dollars from the State of New York. And when DiNapoli did his audit of this Huntington Chamber of Commerce, they found that \$124,000 of the 496,000 in claimed reimbursable expenses, so about 25%, was not, in fact, reimbursable. These expenses were not reimbursable for various reasons. For example, some of the claimed expenses were not actually paid by the Chamber. They were either paid by another organization or not paid at all. Another instance is the same expense was reimbursed twice. Expenses were paid after the grant period had ended, and the amount claimed by the Chamber from the expense exceeded the amount that had actually been paid.

We know, according to the audit, that these inappropriate expense claims generally did not appear to be the result of errors, but, rather, the misrepresentation by the Chamber of the nature of the claimed expenses on many of these reimbursable claims. In addition, some of the expenses claimed by the Chamber were not supposed -- were not supported by records confirming the expenses had actually been paid and were related to authorized grant purposes.

General Meeting - 12/15/15

Just taking a look at some of the claims made by the Huntington Chamber of Commerce that were disavowed by the audit: \$9573 in claimed expenses was invalid because the expenses were never paid. Twenty-two thousand in claimed expenses was invalid because the expenses were never paid by the Chamber. Sixty-one hundred dollars, the time they claimed expenses for computer purchases was invalid because the expenses were never actually paid. Twenty thousand expenses were claimed twice and reimbursed twice under two different DED grants.

The point is this Chamber has, to be kind, a checkered history. It would seem to me, after going through the entire audit by the State Comptroller's Office, which ended ten years ago, and it was an embarrassment at that time even in Albany when this happened, this Chamber shouldn't have this problem at all today. They're getting up and saying, "You know, this particular money should go to this particular area." And the reality is the Chamber of Commerce, it's a group of individual business people in a given hamlet who form a chamber for their own economic wellbeing and to increase their profits. If they choose to have an event, they should pay for it. But if they're coming in to us and we're paying a portion, they should live within the guideline of 20%, especially this Chamber, and they have not. They're trying to rationalize it away. That this is a separate entity, but still, they're at 28%. And the rule, I understand, is pretty evident, 20%. If you exceed the 20%, you don't get the money.

I am not sure, frankly, when I take a look at our fiscal situation, why we continue to fund chambers of commerce, 40,000 for this one, even in the budget. It's all in the budget, about \$108,000 for chambers. Maybe the word should go out to these chambers, "We are broke." You got a whole year now to figure out where you're going to get the money that we've been giving you all these years to offset what you do in your particular hamlet. But based on the history of this particular group, and there's always rationalization for why something should or should not happen, there's no way they should be exceeding 20%. They should know better. And many in the group today are the same group that was there ten years ago.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Anyone else? No? Okay. Don't we have --

LEG. D'AMARO:

DuWayne, on the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes, Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Very briefly. Legislator Barraga, I hear your comments, and I'm a little perplexed, because this resolution is not about what happened in the past, 20 years ago, this resolution is about today. We've heard many organizations come before us where they've exceeded the threshold. Normally, what we do is we ask them to work with the Comptroller's Office, they go ahead and do that, and most of them are able to get below the threshold.

It seems to me like you're kind of mixing apples and oranges here, because, you know, I can't answer for what happened in the past in this organization, but, certainly going forward, the leadership is very conscious of this rule. They're committed to meeting the rule going forward. It's not something that was done intentionally. It's -- other organizations have not met the rule, they just simply -- you know, as the Comptroller's Office audits various companies and not-for-profits, they come up with some of them that simply aren't meeting the rules. So now we're in compliance, we plan on complying next year. So I'm a little confused about that. And then also keep in mind, this is hotel-motel money, so it has to go for this type of expenditure.

I'm with you 100%. I believe that we should re-exam hotel-motel, but that has to be done in Albany. Whether or not we should always be handcuffed into spending these funds a certain way, I agree with you completely. But until that changes up in Albany, this is exactly the proper expense for something like this. When you make this type of expenditure, it does filter back into the community in the form of sales tax. This is a great organization. This event is run very professionally, it's very, very successful, and I don't think it's tied to the past of the Chamber at all. I think this is a -- I think this is an aberration where, just like many other organizations that have come before the Budget Committee, and we've worked with them because we want to get them the funding. We want them to have the funding, because we want to have the multiplier effect in the community. So I hope you consider that.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I certainly understand your point of view, but I think, in this particular case, because we really don't have a research arm here in the Legislature like Albany does --

LEG. D'AMARO:

We don't.

LEG. BARRAGA:

-- there are times where you have to look at the past, and you have to wonder why, you know, these things happen, and maybe they're forgiven. But, certainly, why, based on their history, they shouldn't be complying with the 20%, I have to question that.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, if I could --

LEG. BARRAGA:

If it was a clean, straightforward record, I wouldn't be bringing it up, but I have some concerns about it.

LEG. D'AMARO:

That's fair enough, but the reality is that the 20% rule, most not-for-profits are not aware of it. And as we've gone through these hearings in the budget committee with the various not-for-profits, more and more organizations are becoming aware of it, and I think it's good policy.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Then maybe, based on what you're saying, we shouldn't have the rule at all.

LEG. D'AMARO:

If you want to consider that, too, we can talk about that.

LEG. BARRAGA:

What's the point of having the debate and having a rule if we're going to waive it?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, the point here -- the point here is that it's not often waived. And I've been in the forefront of really trying not to waive this rule. I agree with you, but we have -- we have waived it in the past, where an organization comes in, makes a good faith effort, brings their expenses to -- in the proper format, working with the Comptroller, and then after that, they're aware of the rule, and going into next year, of course, they will be in compliance. And I think -- I think the rule and the policy is having the intended effect, if that's what we're accomplishing.

On top of that is the fact that this funding was given for a specific purpose. One hundred percent of

that funding went for that purpose. It did not go towards administrative expenses, it went towards the festival itself. And if you look at the festival as a stand-alone, which is not something that's mandated under the bill, but if you want to look at it that way, they're below the threshold. Now it's the organization that has get below the threshold, I will grant you that, but I think they're aware of that policy. I think they're going to move in that direction next year. And I think the festival, which is a \$300,000 event, is below the threshold, which means that funding went exactly for the purposes that it was intended.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I think we have an honest difference of opinion here, but I appreciate your comments.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. Let me just -- and I hear Legislator Barraga as well. There are organizations and there are chambers that are operated on different models. There are chambers, many in our districts, that operate on the model that Legislator Barraga is suggesting. It's a few business people and they get together and it's a volunteer organization, that's how that operation is administered. The model here is different. There are employees. There is a level of services that are provided that might be different than other chambers. So I don't know if you can just look at the -- what we consider to be the standard chamber model and arrive at the same decision.

Here, also, we are talking about a particular event, and that particular event, first of all, is exactly the kind of event that hotel-motel money of this type was meant for. In addition, this is an event that does have a longstanding proven track record. It is a successful event, not just for the Huntington area, but for the region and really all of Long Island as well. As we've heard, and as many of us who have been there through the years, you know, thousands and thousands of people, not just from Suffolk County, but from Nassau County, and even beyond, attend, and it is a major economic development and quality of life effort. It happens to be a chamber that is the sponsor, but the funding goes specifically and directly for this event. It's not used for any other services or operational expenses. And again, let me agree with Legislator D'Amaro, it is exactly the kind of event that this money was meant for.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Schneiderman.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

You know, the 20% cap has come up a number of times since I've been here, and a lot of great groups have been hung up there, and this is another case. We've seen, you know, not every group is created the same, and sometimes that 20% cap is hard to meet because of the nature of the work that they do. For instance, let's say a local not-for-profit is organizing performances for the community and using local talent, you know, that they're showcasing, they're not paying the musicians anything. So they don't have a lot of programming costs, but they have administrative costs. They could be doing a great service, but they can't comply with the 20% cap.

I think in this case it's fair to look at the event itself, which is, you know, a festival, which not only helps the members, as they are a membership organization, but goes way beyond and helps the local economy, drives a lot of sales tax. And the chambers are doing really a service to the County in terms of our economic development, so, you know, we do want to support these things. And I think it's fair to look at this one as the event itself. And, clearly, the administrative costs are well below the cap for this event, but when you have to -- you know, we're giving it to the chamber, and

you have to look at every other thing unrelated to this particular event, they exceed the cap. So that will be fixed next year.

And I'm going to support it this time, because, you know, I think that the chamber, whatever their past is, they're clearly doing a valuable service for the County. And they've been through the vetting process. Either they'll get their super-majority or they won't at this horseshoe. I hope that they do, because this event clearly is something that's good for all of us.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Spencer.

LEG. SPENCER:

I appreciate the -- having a rule. And I understand that we're making very difficult decisions, and there's a lot of people that need funding. And I'm glad when we have a situation like this that we can give it further consideration.

And there's a couple of other things that -- you know, I know the statement was made that it seemed that the chamber existed to kind of enrich itself. But a lot of the leadership in the chamber actually don't have direct benefit for them, so they volunteer to be able to promote small business. And many of you know that, for instance, during the Christmas holidays or during the holiday season, a lot of businesses derive a substantial part of their revenue for the entire year.

And in Huntington, when you look at the western townships, the event, the Fall Festival pulls a lot of residents from the city, from surrounding areas, and it brings that tourism into Suffolk County, it kind of kicks off the fall season. But there are many, many small businesses that live or die by this four-day event. It's a chance where they get their names out there in the community. And I witnessed it personally where this Fall Festival goes beyond that. It brings in sales tax revenue, it brings in jobs, it promotes small businesses. And the chamber -- and I know that there are different chambers that are structured differently, but with the three employees, they service over 720 different constituents. Is that in a -- over what period of time, a year, typically?

MR. BONTEMPI:

Calendar year.

LEG. SPENCER:

And you'll see these activities that are doing exactly what we're trying to promote, and we're doing it in a lot of different ways through our startup programs, our IDAs. But this Fall Festival is critical for small business, it's critical to support a lot of jobs. It helps businesses that have a handful of employees to keep the lights on.

And so there's a much bigger picture here. I get it, I understand the rule, but this goes to kind of what we are trying to promote and what one of our biggest challenges are. So I hope you will understand the circumstances and I hope that you will support it. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So I don't want to -- I don't want to debate the merits of this one event. It seems like a great event. Everyone seems to understand that and appreciate the benefit to the community there and to the County, etcetera. But I'm going to go back to the structure of the financing and how -- how this is somehow -- is it -- is it circumventing the 20%? And if so, could this be used as a precedent for every other contract agency and every other not-for-profit to say, "Well, we're going to cut out

part of our operation and we're going to cut" -- and we're going to -- so in order to comply with the 20%, we're going to do the -- we're going to do the math here. We're not going to count that as part of our operation. This is going to be -- because we want to comply, we want to get the County's money. Is that -- is this something that could -- I mean, is that fair -- is that fair to characterize that as a financial mechanism to circumvent the 20%? And could this be used by every other contract agency who doesn't make the 20%, or who, you know, benefits not to make the 20%?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Through the Chair.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes, Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah. Legislator Krupski, I appreciate that, and that is something we should think about. However, I think, first of all, that suggestion was more from the Comptroller's Office to perhaps on larger events to have separate entity running that event, and the purpose for that would be then it would even further assure that the funding provided by the County was going for that particular event, and that's the way this funding was provided in our budget.

I would say that most not-for-profits or many not-for-profits, I don't know the number that receive funding from the County, don't have a separate event such as this where you would pigeon-hole the funding into a particular event or festival, or something like that, and they would not ever form a separate entity, because it just wouldn't make any sense. But here, when you have the larger events and -- excuse me -- when we're sitting a budget meeting and we're looking at Hotel Motel Tax allocation, my intention, and I think my colleagues from Huntington's intention was that this funding must go to this festival. So it probably is a good idea to look at that for these larger type events, so that we can ensure that that funding goes directly for the purpose it was intended, and the administrative expenses for that particular event are kept below the 20% threshold. That doesn't solve our problem here today, that's something we can consider in the future, and that is just brought up here today to shed light on the fact that this funding did go for its intended purpose, and when it went into that intended purpose, that the administrative expenses were kept below the threshold.

But I agree with you, that for the chamber, if this policy is not adopted where you can do the separate entity, to going forward, what I needed to hear in this entire debate was that going into next year, that this chamber is going to meet the threshold. And that's the precedent that we've set in the past with other organizations that have come before the Budget Committee and this Legislature where we've granted the exception to the 20% threshold, but with the understanding that going forward, we will now be in compliance.

So that's a different policy to look at next year. Whether or not this stand-alone entity is the right way to go or not, I tend to believe that it might be a good thing, but we can talk about that another time. Right now, I would urge everyone to support this on the basis that the Huntington Chamber not only does all their good work, and not only runs this festival, but at the end of the day, they're aware of this rule. As other organizations have come before us, they've been made aware of this rule. And going forward, they are going to be in compliance next year with the rule, so I ask you to consider that.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Just as a follow-up question, if I may, just to be sure what I'm voting on. You say they'll be in compliance with the rule in 2016. Does that mean as a whole organization, including the event, or

does this mean the event still at a -- standing on its own?

LEG. D'AMARO:

All right. My understanding is that the whole organization going forward will be in compliance with the 20% rule, which is the standard that we've set. Now, next year, if we want to start debating a different type of policy, or as Legislator Barraga seemed so eager to repeal this rule, I might want to consider that, but I think, ultimately, that's a policy decision whether or not the County would even permit this type of stand-alone analysis or a separate entity. We can talk about that next year, that's not really the issue here today.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Schneiderman.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Just to respond to Legislator Krupski, because, you know, that was my first thought, too, is maybe this is an attempt to circumvent the process. We didn't always have the 20% rule, it's only been a few years that we've had it. Before that, there was no threshold for administrative expenses. I think in this case, where we're funding -- you know, we're granting funds for a particular festival, it makes a lot of sense for them to separate it out, as Legislator D'Amaro said, and have a separate entity.

You know, this Huntington area is a major producer of hotel tax, significant, Melville as well, and it's good to see money going back to those areas. But I think, you know, the real question is does this violate the spirit of that threshold, that 20% cap? And I don't think it does. I think it actually honors the spirit of that 20% cap by saying, "Okay, we are funding this event, and for that event, it is within that threshold." Now whether they, you know, create this new entity next year, whether their entire organization complies with it, you know, if they separate it out, and we are granting the Huntington Chamber of Commerce money for something else, they may not be able to meet that threshold, they may not be able to get funded. But if they separate out the festival, that might be able to get funded because of that 20% cap. But we have a process in place that allows for funding if there's a super-majority supporting it, and, you know, we'll see if it does, but I think it does meet the spirit of the law.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Yeah, thank you. When I consider that question, and I look at something similar, I look at what's coming up ahead of us in just a few moments out of the Economic Development Committee, I.R. 1925, which is essentially the County of Suffolk creating a separate corporation, a separate entity for the purpose of receiving and then distributing the monies received from the marathon and the half marathon. Why is that an effort? It's so that we have a separate and transparent and open process, so that as policy-makers we can see specifically the monies that are raised through that effort, the monies that have been deposited in the separate entity, and how the monies are going to be utilized going forward. This is analogous to that very same issue that's about to come before us.

And so while I would tend to want to consider the point that was raised, let me agree with Legislator Schneiderman. I see the possibility of a separate entity doing nothing more than providing greater transparency, greater openness and a greater ability for us to make that determination in the years going forward, that the monies from the hotel-motel revenue that is to be used specifically for this

type of an event are utilized for that very purpose.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Yes, we do.

P.O. GREGORY:

Let's do a roll call.

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

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Pass.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

No.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Pass.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

No.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTТА:

No.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Thirteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. Motion passes. ***I.R. 2017*** --

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you, guys.

P.O. GREGORY:

-- ***Amending the 2015 Operating Budget and appropriating funds in connection with bonding for an order for attorney fees as part of a Class Action Suit (Co. Exec.).*** |

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Vote Amended to 18)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 2017, same motion, same second on the bond resolution. Roll call.

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

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***I.R. 2020 - Approving County funding for a Contract Agency (Gerald Ryan Outreach) (Pres. Off.)***. I'll make a motion to approve, seconded by Legislator Schneiderman. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. ***I.R. 1925 - A Local Law authorizing the establishment of a local development corporation known as the Recreation and Economic Development Corporation of Suffolk County (Co. Exec.)***. Motion by Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. STERN:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Stern. Anyone?

LEG. HAHN:
On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
On the motion, Legislator Hahn. Okay.

LEG. HAHN:
I just want to -- just if you don't mind, if you just give us just a quick explanation. I thought, you know, the marathon was an extraordinary event for our County. I was thrilled to coordinate a Legislative relay team to be part of it. We, you know, worked and trained hard to participate, and know that folks from all over the County, you know, also did the same to reach an extraordinary goal in their life, and that helped towards the betterment of health. And I'm sure as this grows and, you know, gets bigger and bigger, it will have a wider impact on not only the health of our residents, but on the health of our economy for local businesses. But if you could just give us a little explanation.

MS. SANTERAMO:
Yeah, absolutely. We were very -- and thank you to all the Legislators who participated in the marathon last year. We were very happy with the success of the event. Because of that success, we are hoping to make this an annual event. And having the LDC structure we think will allow the event to become an annual event, to continue from year to year, and sustain and grow itself with the LDC structure. We were fortunate last year that the -- when we did an RFP, the vendor was a nonprofit. The LDC will also be a nonprofit, so it allows us to track sponsorships and make sure all the money is then donated over to Veterans. So we're very excited about this and we hope to have your support.

LEG. HAHN:
Have you picked a date yet for next year?

MS. SANTERAMO:
We are considering. We are going to be moving it from the beginning of September, due to the heat concerns that a couple of people raised. That was the only -- one of the only negative comments we had gotten back, because people had wished it was a little bit later in the calendar year. I can

comment it will not be October 23rd, but we are looking at some other early October dates.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you. Thank you. We're really excited to participate again. Hopefully, we'll have -- we had nine Legislators in 2015, and we're looking to make that 10, 11, 12, get us all involved, so thank you.

MS. SANTERAMO:

We welcome that.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Thanks, Mr. Chair. Lisa, so just a quick question on the marathon, and then we'll get into the merits of the bill here. The -- have you decided on a location for the marathon yet for next year?

MS. SANTERAMO:

We anticipate using a similar route. We will probably tweak the route, but we believe that the route will probably stay the same, for the most part.

LEG. CILMI:

Because I recall one of the -- one of the purposes of the marathon was to showcase the downtowns throughout Suffolk County, and, certainly, we have many more downtowns than what the existing route showcased.

MS. SANTERAMO:

Yeah.

LEG. CILMI:

You know, Babylon comes to mind, Port Jefferson area comes to mind, the Hamptons come to mind, you know, Huntington, Smithtown. It's just -- you know, it goes on and on and on. We have some great downtowns here in Suffolk County, and I was just wondering if that's no longer, you know, considered as a purpose of the marathon, or if you're just -- if we're going to ignore those other downtowns.

MS. SANTERAMO:

I do not believe we're going to ignore those other downtowns. I think when picking the route, there's a lot of things written. So we had looked at going into Babylon. There are hospitals on that route. When we were looking at it, there's different impediments with the route. We can look at changing the route, but I just want to caution, you know, we have to work with P.D., because, again, there's a lot of different factors that go, especially public safety factors that go into looking at exactly what roads will be closed and what times.

LEG. CILMI:

Sure, but we have lots of roads here in Suffolk County, and, you know, it seems to me that we should give other areas the benefit of, you know, the attention that this area got with the last marathon, that's all.

Let me move to the merits of this bill. So you said that this will give us access to some sponsorships and allow for sponsorships, and without this, how did we do it this year?

MS. SANTERAMO:

General Meeting - 12/15/15

We did it -- we did it with GLIRC, which is the Greater Long Island Running Club. They were our -- we contracted with them and they handled it. But we did an RFP for that, so I --

LEG. CILMI:

Right, but who was the money -- who were the checks made out to?

MS. SANTERAMO:

GLIRC, I believe, and then GLIRC -- we have -- we had a holding account at the Treasurer's Office.

LEG. CILMI:

Right, right.

MS. SANTERAMO:

So on a -- in the contract that we had with GLIRC on an annual basis, I think it was monthly, you know, the money that they received from registration, sponsorships went into that account. And once we -- we also have a bill before you today to do the Veterans appointments, because once we know exactly which Veteran groups are receiving that money, we're hopeful to bring a housekeeping bill in February or March to rectify all that. So they're going to -- you know, they're going to cut the final check, we're going to accept it, bring it back into our General Fund for any overtime expenses, and then disburse the Veterans funds as well.

LEG. CILMI:

So were we unhappy with the partnership with Greater Long Island Running Club?

MS. SANTERAMO:

No, not at all.

LEG. CILMI:

Do we intend to use them again?

MS. SANTERAMO:

That is not -- I mean, I'm confident that they'll be part of it. If this LDC is formed, it really would be up to the LDC, so I can't commit to something. I anticipate that they will -- they will be a part of it, yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So my first question, which I don't think you've adequately answered for me, is why?

MS. SANTERAMO:

The LD -- we aren't mirroring what Nassau does with their race, because the way we did it last year, we did it as a one -- you know, as a one-year contract with GLIRC. To have to -- in order to build a marathon like this, we would hope to have something that would sustain and pick up. You know, this way, the minute you were done -- with the one that we did in September, we would right away start preparing and getting ready for the following year.

LEG. CILMI:

Didn't with he do that already?

MS. SANTERAMO:

No, we did not. We actually -- our registration for the marathon next year is not open yet. We're really scrambling to try to get it open, we're waiting on the LDC to do that. We would have to do an RFP, basically, every year to restart this, and I can't guarantee that GLIRC would get it. You know, I don't know what the outcome of that RFP would be. So you then could potentially have a for-profit

who would in essence win the RFP, at which point we wouldn't have a nonprofit doing it anymore.

LEG. CILMI:

So the LDC allows us to avoid the RFP process?

MS. SANTERAMO:

No. The LDC would be a -- it's a nonprofit is what I'm saying. So the LDC is a nonprofit. So then the checks would be made out to the LDC. The sponsorships --

LEG. CILMI:

They have to go out for an RFP, though?

MS. SANTERAMO:

Their procurement, their procurement is decided. Once this LDC, hopefully, is approved, there are three appointees that in essence incorporate the LDC. It's two appointed by the County Exec's Office and one by the Presiding Officer's Office. They create the procurement rules, and they basically set up the bylaws of how the LDC will run.

LEG. CILMI:

Without oversight of this body?

MS. SANTERAMO:

I don't -- I mean, I don't know what the reporting requirements are with an LDC. Maybe Lynne --

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah, I know. I mean, there would be no reporting requirements. No -- it would take any authorization away from the Legislature and give it to the Board of the LDC, basically.

MS. SANTERAMO:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Right. So in terms of the LDC's activities, fundraising activities, that would all be up to the LDC in terms -- with respect to what the LDC does with the funds that it has raised? That would be exclusively up to the LDC?

MS. SANTERAMO:

We are -- we are committed and we have --

LEG. CILMI:

Is that true, is that correct?

MS. SANTERAMO:

We are committed that this race will be for Veterans, that the funds will always be going towards Veterans. That is our --

LEG. CILMI:

But it's nice for you to commit to that. But the fact of the matter is if we have an LDC, technically, we don't really have any say in the matter any longer, except that we have representatives on the Board.

MS. BIZZARRO:

General Meeting - 12/15/15

Right. And by having the LDC, it's just they can do more than the County can do. Yes, and you have your representatives on the Board and they're going to put together the bylaws, they're going to have meetings, they're going to have meeting minutes, and they are going to do what the Directors direct it to do. And the marathon is just one component of it, it's looking to be broader. It's a whole, you know, recreational group that is --

LEG. CILMI:

Could they potentially hire people?

MS. BIZZARRO:

They -- when you say hire, you mean --

LEG. CILMI:

Employees.

MS. BIZZARRO:

As long as they have funds.

LEG. CILMI:

If they had funds, they can employ -- they could get an Executive Director as an example.

MS. BIZZARRO:

Right, they can get members --

LEG. CILMI:

Hire a fundraising company, as an example.

MS. BIZZARRO:

They can go out and procure for that, yes. And if they have the funds, right, and they can gather more money. They'll just have more -- there's more resources with the LDC. But, otherwise, it is an arm of you. You're creating it and that's what the Directors are being -- you know, that's what they're going to be charged to do.

LEG. CILMI:

Right. Okay. I mean, I can see why one would want to do that, but I could also see why we would not want to do that. I mean, you know, there's a certain level of control that I think is appropriate, and I think this body is capable and assigned that responsibility. And so to abdicate that responsibility by creating an LDC I think is wrong.

MS. SANTERAMO:

I just want to clarify, we created the Veterans Grant Marathon Advisory Board. We anticipate that we still -- that in the by-laws, when they're written, it will still -- it's going to be in there that how the money is spent is still coming back to this Legislature for approval for appropriation. That will be written into it. That's why we took so much time to put that Board together.

LEG. CILMI:

Will be written into the bylaws of what?

MS. SANTERAMO:

The LDC.

LEG. CILMI:

So are we adopting the bylaws of the LDC at this point, or is this just the creation of the LDC?

MS. SANTERAMO:

The creation of the LDC.

LEG. CILMI:

Who would adopt the bylaws of the LDC?

MS. SANTERAMO:

The Directors.

LEG. CILMI:

Again, that would be out of our control.

MS. SANTERAMO:

Correct.

LEG. CILMI:

I'm opposed to this.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Anyone else? Okay. We have a motion a second?

MR. RICHBERG:

Yes, we do.

P.O. GREGORY:

Can we have all Legislators to the horseshoe. All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. CILMI:

Opposed.

LEG. TROTTA:

Opposed.

LEG. KENNEDY:

(Raised hand).

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Raise your hands if you're opposed.

LEG. CILMI:

(Raised hand).

LEG. KENNEDY:

(Raised hand).

LEG. TROTTA:

(Raised hand).

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. Sorry, I didn't see Legislator Kennedy's hand.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. *1929 - A Local Law to amend Chapter 155 of the Suffolk County Code, clarifying funding sources for the operation of the Suffolk County Landbank Corporation (Co. Exec.).*

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

I make a motion to approve.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. TROTТА:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

On the motion, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

I think we talked about this. Just give me a little overview of this real quick.

MS. LANSDALE:

Sure. So the Suffolk County Landbank was created in 2013 to address the backlog of tax delinquent environmentally sensitive parcels with back taxes owed to the County in excess of 35 million, and an ongoing annual burden of approximately \$3 million to the County General Fund. There are an average of 133 properties with seven years of tax delinquency.

This resolution would create a capital fund of 500,000 upon the sale of tax liens from the Landbank to be used for environmental -- environmental remediation, Phase I, Phase II investigations on these parcels. That information will help facilitate the transfer and redevelopment of these parcels.

Since the founding of the Landbank, the Suffolk County Landbank Corporation has generated \$4.5 million in back taxes owed that have gone back to the General Fund.

LEG. TROTТА:

How many pieces of land are in the Landbank?

MS. LANSDALE:

I'm sorry?

LEG. TROTТА:

How many pieces of land are actually in the Landbank?

MS. LANSDALE:

None. There's been no transfers to date. And each transfer would have to be approved by the Legislature, each and every one single parcel.

LEG. TROTТА:

So you're going to take \$500,000 from the future sale or the tax money that you got back?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Future sale, not the tax money.

LEG. TROTТА:

Did we sell one of those things in Kings Park, or whatever? And this is basically so we can do the study of how polluted it is?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes. And that information, Phase I and Phase II environmental site assessments are essential when we're looking at transferring these liens to the private sector to people interested in redeveloping that. It's essential to have that information for folks interested in purchasing these liens.

LEG. TROTТА:

So we don't have any money to put in here yet because we didn't sell anything.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

That's right. This would just create the mechanism to create that reserve.

LEG. TROTТА:

Was there any thought given to having the people who are interested in buying it pay for that?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

We -- these properties would require a lot of environmental restoration to bring them back to productive use. Having people pay for Phase I and Phase II environmental site assessments might not generate the level of interest in acquiring these liens.

LEG. TROTТА:

If someone were to want to pay for it, would you allow them to?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Absolutely. And then we would have to make that probably available to everyone else so that they're interested in acquiring it. And it's also, quite frankly, part of due diligence that property owners may want to do down the road on properties that they do acquire, to do additional environmental investigations.

LEG. TROTТА:

Do you foresee us getting anything in this Landbank in the near future?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes. We are teeing up at six properties, if not eight, for the first quarter of 2016 to transfer.

LEG. TROTТА:

I'm not -- these are Brownfields, not like houses that's --

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

That's right.

LEG. TROTТА:

All right, great.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

And prior to transfer from the County to the Landbank, each and every parcel would be authorized by the Legislature.

LEG. TROTTA:

So we're going to have to pay for these environmental studies up front now?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Currently, the Suffolk County Landbank Corporation has been very successful in receiving grant funding through the Environmental Protection Agency and the Attorney General's Office in conducting these environmental site assessments. We've received more than \$675,000 in grant funds to conduct these various site assessments that are preparing these six to eight properties and more in the future for the market.

LEG. TROTTA:

Can we continually get these grants, or are they going to end?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Well, we're always applying and we've been -- our Landbank team has been working round the clock in submitting another grant application. It's uncertain, though, and what we do want is some certainty in acquiring and having funding in the future.

LEG. TROTTA:

Do we expect to make a lot of money off this selling this, because, you know, I don't want --

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I don't have an estimate on how much will be generated on the sale of these tax liens, but we have been successful in receiving -- in generating \$4.5 million for the County General Fund so far.

LEG. TROTTA:

But my concern is that we're going to spend \$600,000 on property to study it and it's worth 200,000; is that going to happen?

LEG. D'AMARO:

No, you don't spend that kind of money.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

These properties are a continual drain on -- if we don't transfer these to private entities --

LEG. TROTTA:

I gotcha.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

The County is making the local jurisdictions whole on those back taxes.

LEG. TROTTA:

All right. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. I have a list of several Legislators. Legislator Stern first.

LEG. STERN:

Yeah, thank you. So I can certainly see where the potential purchaser we would want to incentivize

by having the funds available for that phase of the study that needs to be done. I think that's important to provide, that's the incentive, at least to get things started. Would there be -- have there been, or potentially have there been situations where the potential purchaser would want to conduct that study at his or her own expense?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Well, we haven't transferred any liens yet, but my understanding is part of the due diligence of property owners, when they're looking -- or potential property owners, is that they would do a preliminary assessment if they want anymore environmental information that's not already provided by the County.

LEG. STERN:

And with having received \$4 1/2 million dollars, and perhaps more on the way in the coming here year, what's been the average timeline from the time when you first notify an owner or a potential purchaser of property or an owner of property until the time where at least on the tax side you've been able to receive that kind of revenue?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

So the \$4.5 million figure is a cumulative figure since 2013, and it depends on -- it depends on each property, there's not a specific formula. As the option that the Landbank can exercise becomes more real, for instance, after we conduct a paper search of a Phase I environmental site assessment, and then we ask to access these properties and conduct soil borings, water quality testing, it's usually then that property owners agree to pay their back taxes and become whole with the Treasurer.

LEG. STERN:

So has that usually been the case after the first real notice that they receive?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

It takes -- it depends on each property owner. It can take a couple of notices, it could take one notice.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah. So I think it's important to note here that this resolution does not really materially change at all the operation of the Landbank, its mission, how it spends its money. All it really does is provide for some working capital for the Landbank. Presently, the way a Landbank was created is such that whatever revenue the Landbank receives in return for the sale of properties, once the Landbank takes those properties, has to be transferred first to the County to make the County whole for the expenses associated with running a Landbank, and some of those expenses include legal counsel, some of those expenses include the work that Sarah Lansdale and others in her department contribute to the Landbank.

All this does is allows the Landbank to retain up to \$500,000 of working capital from the proceeds of those sales that would happen anyway, as opposed to giving it right over to the County, and eventually the County gets it anyway. But, you know, this -- again, all this really does is it provides the Landbank with some working capital, so the Landbank Board is not sort of handcuffed to waiting for grants that we might or might not get from the State or from the Federal -- from the Federal

Government. And I might add that Sarah Lansdale and her team have been very, very successful in accessing grant monies, and I'm sure that will continue from a variety of different sources.

The -- in terms of transferring the properties over to the County, as she said, we are currently -- the County is currently making all these other taxing jurisdictions whole for these properties. They're costing us millions, literally millions of dollars. I think the property that is the first priority for the Landbank is a property in Bay Shore, and if I'm not mistaken, Sarah, correct me if I'm wrong, but the back taxes on that property amount to more than \$5 million. So this is all money that the County is paying out to all of these different taxing jurisdictions, the school districts, the towns, etcetera, and that we're not getting any return on.

When we -- when we take these properties and then market these properties and sell these properties, there's costs associated with these properties that includes not only the back taxes, but any investments that the Landbank has made to the -- you know, to studying the environmental contamination that may exist. Obviously, the Landbank is going to do its best to try and recover -- you know, to recover whatever amount of money has been invested in these properties, and that will be limited to some extent. But, nevertheless, it's something that the Landbank will do, and then once we do, we transfer that money to the County. Again, the key phrase here is all it does is provides working capital for the Landbank.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. I do have two more Legislators. I just want to remind everyone -- well, actually several. We are at the lunch hour. So if you want to debate now, or I just have three more speakers.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

I'll be willing to pass for the sake of lunch.

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Well, Legislator D'Amaro was before you. Legislator D'Amaro?

LEG. D'AMARO:

I don't know if I'll be coherent after lunch.

*(*Laughter*)*

But I'll be very quick. Sarah, I just had a couple of questions.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Sure.

LEG. D'AMARO:

The Landbank, when it was originally created, didn't contemplate having this type of expenditure, because I think that the intent was to acquire properties that we already knew were contaminated or brownfield properties. So what I'm -- what I'm asking is why now are we deciding to do a Phase I or a Phase -- if needed, a Phase II when going in? These properties have previously been identified somehow or through Federal law, however it's been done, and we know going in that these are already contaminated. Why do we need to conduct this type of environmental review of the property? Certainly, when a buyer looks at this property, once the County has acquired it, right, that's the intent of the County, or this Landbank will acquire the property, a purchaser will come in and do their own environmental assessment anyway, so you don't need it on the back end. Why do we now need it on the front end when that wasn't originally contemplated in the legislation?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Right. Thank you for your questions. The list of properties that we're working off of remains the same. It's the Suffolk County Brownfield Interagency Work Group. It's the 133 properties that the County has identified as environmentally challenged, and that's largely based on information that we've received in working in partnership with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, as well as our own Suffolk County Department of Health Services. What we have and how these properties landed on the list is just very -- it's preliminary. It's drive-bys where there could be visual inspections of 55-gallon leaking drums, or it could be more in-depth information from the -- our Federal and State partners, U.S. EPA and DEC. So the level of information varies quite dramatically on each property.

And I agree with you on your point, that private property owners will want to do their own environmental due diligence as well. What we want to do is make these properties attractive to people interested in buying these liens, and providing as much information as we can up front, understanding that they're going to do additional information to fill in any data gaps to provide their lenders and their own development team with any gaps of information that we haven't provided. But it provides a baseline of information so that there's actual interest in these properties.

Many times Brownfields are -- there's a level of uncertainty about what's actually happening on that site, and we want to, as the Landbank, provide some baseline information to provide prospective property owners, prospective bidders on preliminary baseline information. We're not looking at doing in-depth environmental delineation.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But here's the thing: Usually a Phase I environmental review is only going to identify the need for further testing, which the County has already done in effect just by virtue of putting these properties onto the list. So are we -- is the intention here for these 130 properties to go and conduct a Phase I for all of them?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Not at all.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. So you're going to, or whoever's in charge of this Landbank is going to say and say certain properties where maybe it was this drive-by, but, yet, there's no real hard evidence of possible contamination, which is all that a Phase I is going to tell you anyway, but you don't even have that on some of these properties.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

That's right. For some of those properties, we don't have that, and we would never duplicate efforts if there's already a Phase I --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

-- that's out there or a Phase II.

LEG. D'AMARO:

If that -- would the County ever do a Phase II? Probably not, right?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

We've been very successful. The Landbank Corporation, through funding --

LEG. D'AMARO:

The Landbank, I mean.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

-- has already conducted several Phase II's on properties with funding provided by the New York State Attorney General's Office, and sometimes that is -- many times that has actually led to the payment of those back taxes owed, because it becomes very real for these current property owners that the Landbank and the County have now a real entity and a mechanism for taking these properties.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So more information in that case just moves the process along. I could see that, also, if you're going to put the property out to bid, you may be more successful in selling if you have enough information available so that a potential bidder would know exactly what remediation is needed --

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

That's a very good point, yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- on the property. All right. So how did you arrive at the figure of a half a million?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

We looked at the inventory of properties that we have left based on and understood that this 500,000 would cover about half of the remaining properties that we have left, understanding that we are continuing to pay -- look for grant funds to continue the Phase I and Phase II investigations.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So you're looking for grant funds also?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

We are, yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And would the 500,000 come off -- out of the first sale, or are you going to take a proportionate --

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Those details have not been -- not been finalized.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Where does the funding -- where do the proceeds go ultimately that are realized by the sale of these brownfields?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

These would go back to the General Fund.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So the bill doesn't -- the bill doesn't provide any mechanism to how to build up to that 500,000?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

No, it doesn't, it just creates the mechanism for that 500,000 working capital funds.

LEG. D'AMARO:

What's the value of the properties in there now, far in excess of that?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah. And you have six to eight that you anticipate putting through the procedures and, hopefully, selling?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes, during the first quarter of 2016.

LEG. D'AMARO:

What's the total amount? What did you say that amount was?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I don't have the -- I can look up the value of the back taxes owed on those properties and provide that to you.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And who decides who does the Phase I for the Landbank?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

It's the -- it's the -- it's the Department of Health Services in conjunction with the Department of Economic Development.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Would that be by a bidding process or RFP process?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Or is it a list or something?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

We have a specific approved policy by the Suffolk County Landbank Corporation.

LEG. D'AMARO:

All right. My only point is that I hope that the Landbank would consider building that fund up over time. Obviously, taking enough from the initial sale or two to get operations up and running, but also the County budget could use the relief as well.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Absolutely.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So if you could keep that in mind, I'd appreciate that.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. We're at ten minutes past. We're going to break for lunch and then we'll get back to this after the break.

LEG. CILMI:

Why don't we just get it done?

P.O. GREGORY:

It's already 12:40. We've got to make a presentation, then we got to --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

If I'm the only one, I would pass and vote on it.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Legislator Krupski does not want to speak or ask his questions, so --

LEG. CILMI:

Is there a motion? If not, I'll make one.

P.O. GREGORY:

There is a motion.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. So we'll vote on it. All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? On I.R. 19 --

LEG. CILMI:

29.

P.O. GREGORY:

29.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. We -- before we recess for lunch, I do have a presentation to make.

Okay. Today it's -- we are saying farewell to one of our colleagues, our Deputy Presiding Officer, Jay, Jay Schneiderman, who will be going on to be Supervisor of the Town of Southampton after 12 committed years of public service to Suffolk County, and 12 excellent years. He's been a great partner and a friend. And I must state that I believe that he will be the first person probably in New York State to be the Supervisor of two Towns. And, Jay, we love you, we're going to miss you, and I'm going to miss our long chats.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

And -- but, certainly, we know that you're going on to do better things. And your colleagues and I have signed this proclamation to present to you today for your 12 years of committed service.

(*Applause*)

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you. I've handed out a few of these in my day, so it's nice to get one.

Well, thank you so much. It's been my honor. And 12 years ago, the voters of my District, the Second Legislative District, put their faith in me and chose me to represent that area, and it's been a great 12 years. I've learned not only about my region and tried to be a strong voice, but also about the whole of Suffolk County and what a great County we are. And we saw a snippet of it today as we honored our vets, our firefighters, our law enforcement officers, student athletes, student scholars, just a glimpse at our County, which I have come to love. And we have seen many challenges throughout those 20 -- throughout those 12 years. We've had many debates at this horseshoe. We don't always agree, but somehow we've learned to respect each other and the needs of each other's districts. You have become in many ways family to me, dysfunctional as it may be, but still -- but still family.

I want to thank a number of people. First, my staff. Christina Delisi is here and Jason Hann.

(*Applause*)

Jackie O'Neill, who's not here, who will be coming to work with me in Southampton. Catherine Stark, who worked for me for many years and now is an Aide to Legislator Krupski.

(*Applause*)

All those who support the Legislature, and especially George Nolan, but all of the Clerk's staff. And it's been really an honor for me to work and get to know all of you.

It's been great to work with our County Executive, Steve Bellone, to get to know all the Department Heads and the Commissioners. I had the honor to serve as Public Works Chair for a number of years, to work with Gil Anderson and his predecessor, Charlie Bartha, and with Commissioner Dawson as -- when I served as Park Chair.

It's -- you know, we are so blessed with so many great people serving this County. And, of course, to serve as Deputy Presiding Officer has been a great honor for me, working with our Presiding Officer, DuWayne Gregory, I, you know, really respect, and he has become a friend, as he said.

And I hope to not be a stranger. I'll be back here as Supervisor on occasion. I believe that the East End will be well represented. We've got Legislator Krupski, who's an excellent voice for his District.

(*Applause*)

And if you haven't already met her, Bridget Fleming will be sitting in my seat, the one over on the left.

(*Applause*)

And I know Bridget is going to be a great representative.

So, to all of you, I'm going to miss you. It's been a great honor to have served the County as the Legislator for the Second District. And I thank all of you for all that you do every day for this County.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

We also are pleased to have a special guest here amongst us today, our Suffolk County County Executive, Steve Bellone.

*(*Applause*)*

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. It is an honor to be here today. It's always an honor to address the Legislature, but particularly a pleasure to be here to say a few words about a good friend and somebody who's been a great leader for a long time in this County, as both an Executive and as a Legislator, and now will once again be as an Executive. Typically, going down a path that is completely unique, I wouldn't expect anything else from Jay Schneiderman --

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE:

-- who I believe may become the only person to serve as Town Supervisor in two different Towns in one lifetime. And, again, I wouldn't expect anything less from Jay, because he is someone who has brought, I think, a unique style, and perspective, and caring to government that is uncommon.

And it's been a great experience for me over the past four years. I was able to serve with him as a Supervisor, even though we were on opposite ends of the County, but a pleasure to really get to understand what a truly great public servant this is and a great man this is. And I am incredibly thrilled about the upcoming prospect of working with him as a Town Supervisor now to really tackle some of the big issues that we are facing in this region. And I know that he is going to be -- continue to be a leader on the things that face us as a County. The environment, water quality, bringing young people back to our region, transportation, these are all the things that Jay cares about. And I know from my experience as County Executive, when he cares about an issue, I'm going to hear about it a lot.

*(*Laughter*)*

And the end result of that, though, is, is better things for the people he represents and better things for our County.

And so, Jay, I want to present this proclamation from me and my office on behalf of all the people of Suffolk County to say thank you for everything that you have done for this County, everything you've done for your constituents, and we look forward to the great things ahead for you. And I'm sorry this isn't framed like the Legislative proc.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

We don't have any money left.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE:

We're being thrifty.

*(*Laughter*)*

Congratulations, Jay, and thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you, everybody.

P.O. GREGORY:

We stand recessed for lunch.

*(*The meeting was recessed at 12:53 p.m. and resumed at 2:34 p.m. *)*

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

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Mr. Clerk, let's do the roll call.

MR. RICHBERG:

Good afternoon, Mr. Presiding Officer.

*(*Roll Called by Jason Richberg - Clerk of the Legislature*)*

LEG. SPENCER:

Here.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Here.

LEG. STERN:

Here.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Here.

LEG. TROTТА:

Right here.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Here.

LEG. BARRAGA:

(Not Present).

LEG. CILMI:

In the words of Rob Calarco, present.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Here.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Here.

LEG. CALARCO:

Present.

LEG. ANKER:

Here.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present).

LEG. MURATORE:

Here.

LEG. BROWNING:

Here.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Here.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Since it's time I'll say present as well.

P.O. GREGORY:

Here.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. There are several public hearings. I do not have any cards, but we have to go through them anyway. First being ***IR 1564 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law establishing a Drug Stewardship Program for Suffolk County (Hahn).***

Is there anyone here that would like to speak on this public hearing? Please come forward. Okay. Seeing none, Legislator Hahn, who's not here -- I make a motion to close or motion to recess I'll make. Okay, motion to recess by Legislator Hahn. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Amended to Sixteen - Not Present: Legislators Anker and Barraga)

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1691 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law to strengthen the Code of Ethics (Trotta). I don't have any cards. Anyone in the audience that would like to speak, please come forward. Seeing none.

LEG. TROTTA:

Motion to recess.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Barraga)

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1815 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law establishing a Domestic Violence Fatality Analysis Commission (Hahn). I don't have any cards for this matter as well. Is anyone here that would like to speak on this matter? Please come forward. Seeing none, Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

Motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Barraga)

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1822 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Charter Law to increase oversight of park violation determinations (Hahn). I don't have any cards on this matter as well. Is there anyone that would like to speak on it? Please come forward. Okay. Seeing none, motion to recess by Legislator Hahn, second by Legislator Schneiderman. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Did you find this person?

MR. RICHBERG:

Not here.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Let's get back to the agenda. We were on page six.

LEG. CILMI:

We finished 1929.

P.O. GREGORY:

Actually I have a request from Legislator Krupski to take several IR's out of order. We have some folks.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

IR 2007 and 8 on page -- on the last page.

LEG. CILMI:

Under what committee, Ways and Means?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Under Ways & Means. Page 11, IR 2005 and 2008.

LEG. CILMI:

You can only do one at a time, right?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yeah.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'll second.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

We have people here representing those and it's a long ride home. I appreciate the consideration.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Krupski makes a motion to take ***IR 2005 - Amending the 2015 Operating Budget and amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the Sewer Infrastructure Program to provide funding for the Sylvester Manor Educational Farm Pilot Non-Proprietary Vegetated Gravel Recirculating Filter Water Treatment System (CP 8710.328) (Co. Exec.)***. All right.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'll second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Schneiderman to take out of order. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Stern)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. IR 2005 is before us.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I'll make a motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

A motion by Legislator Schneiderman -- second by Legislator Schneiderman. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

List me as a cosponsor.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, IR 2007.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Eight.

P.O. GREGORY:

Eight, I'm sorry. ***IR 2008 - Amending the 2015 Operating Budget and amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the Sewer Infrastructure Program to provide funding for Nitrogen Reducing Constructed Wetlands Sanitary System at Jean W. Cochran Park (CP 8720.311)(Co. Exec.)***. Motion by Legislator Krupski to take out of order. Second by Legislator Schneiderman. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Hold it, hold it.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. NOLAN:

Just taking it out of order.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I'm sorry.

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Stern)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. IR 2008. Motion by Legislator Krupski, second by Legislator Schneiderman, to approve. And on the motion, Legislator D'Amaro.
Page 11.

LEG. D'AMARO:

This is an amendment to the Operating Budget. Just -- I would like an explanation. It seems like we're amending the Operating Budget and the Capital Budget for funding for nitrogen reducing constructive wetland sanitary system. I'm not quite sure why this wasn't contemplated within the original budgets and why it's part of the Operating Budget.

MR. NOLAN:

This is money that's coming out of that Sewer Infrastructure Fund that we created for like sewer projects. So to get that money you have to amend the Operating Budget and it goes into a Capital Project, because that's the Capital Project type of item and it's for \$20,000.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And it's for a County park. County park?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No. If you'd like any -- Mr. Presiding Officer, if you'd like any explanation of what's happening there on a technical basis, the town engineer, Michael Collins, is here. He'd be happy to answer any questions.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. The town engineer is here?

MR. COLLINS:

Yeah, this project is -- we have -- Cochran Park is Southold's largest and most well used park. We're proposing to construct a new bathroom, and in keeping with the nitrogen initiative put forth by the County Executive, we have a proposed project to put constructed wetlands to treat the waste from this new bathroom, which will significantly reduce the amount of nitrogen going into the groundwater.

LEG. D'AMARO:

What exactly is being constructed? Thank you for coming today, by the way.

MR. COLLINS:

Sure. Basically it's something -- think of it as a man in the middle system. You have your traditional septic system is a septic tank and leaching field. This is a small, probably 20 by 20 or 20 by 25 area that's about four-and-a-half deep and shot through with slotted piping. The idea is that the waste will recirculate through these layers of gravel and plants over and over and over again, polishing the water before it's discharged to the ground.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I see. And so the town is ready to go forward with this -- the County is going to fund that portion of this particular installation.

MR. COLLINS:

Yes. The town is going to fund -- going 50-50 on that portion with the County. In addition, we're putting up the funds for the bathroom and the traditional system as well.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I see. Okay.

MR. COLLINS:

This funding would also pay for a year's worth of monitoring, which will allow you to get results that you can then use to prove that this works.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I see. Very good. Thank you. Thank you, Legislator Krupski. Appreciate it.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. Any questions? Any further questions? We have a motion to approve and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. AI, there was one more, 2007?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

You could do that. I don't see anyone here from the Nature Conservancy. I requested --

LEG. SPENCER:

They're here. They're waiting. The Nature Conservancy is here.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Okay. Then I would like to have you consider taking 2007 out of order, please.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. ***IR 2007 - Amending the 2015 Operating Budget and amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the Sewer Infrastructure Program to provide funding for the Nature Conservancy Nitrogen Reduction Wastewater Wetland Project (CP 8710.330)(Co. Exec.)***. Motion by Legislator Krupski, second by Legislator Spencer, to take out of order. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 2007 is before us. Motion by Legislator Spencer or second by Legislator Krupski. Anyone on the motion?

LEG. McCAFFREY:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

On the motion, Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

So just for clarification. So this is we're going to be spending money to install sewers. Who owns this property? Is it ours?

MS. LANSDALE:

So this is privately owned property by the Nature Conservancy, and these are similar to the 19 innovative alternative septic systems that are being installed, and almost all installed, across Suffolk County that the members of the Legislature selected last year. This is similar and expanding that by expanding our number and types of technologies that are available to different kinds of institutions. So the 19 innovative alternative septic systems that were installed were installed this year at private homes. What we've done is through these two resolutions, IR 2006 and IR 2007, this would be expanding that number of pilots using constructed wetlands, similar to what was described in Southold Town in the previous resolution. And there would be -- I'm sorry.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

No, go ahead.

MS. LANSDALE:

There would be an educational component as well. There is quite a number of visitors to the Nature Conservancy's Headquarters in Cold Spring Harbor and there would be an educational component to that as well.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

I just want to get this straight. This is not -- this is not County-owned property then, right? This is --

MS. LANSDALE:

No, it is not.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

General Meeting - 12/15/15

Have we in the past used this Sewer Infrastructure Funds on private property or something, non-County-owned property other than a park?

MS. LANSDALE:

We have used the Sewer Infrastructure Funds to fund wastewater sewer upgrades at the Village of Northport, the Town of Riverhead, Town of Babylon. We have used the funds for those purposes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

I mean other than a municipality have we used those funds for this?

MS. LANSDALE:

Not the Sewer Infrastructure Funds, but we are contemplating, the committee, other types of projects as well that have to go before the Legislature for approval.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

So this is the first time that we'll, outside of municipality, that we're using the Sewer Infrastructure Funds for something other than a municipality; is that correct?

MS. LANSDALE:

That's my understanding, yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

This is going in a building I'm assuming? Is it a house? What is it?

MR. COLLINS:

This installation is going to take place at our Uplands Farm Sanctuary as Sarah had mentioned. It's our main office complex out in Western Long Island. So like what was previously described --

LEG. TROTТА:

How many bathrooms are hooked up to it?

MR. COLLINS:

There are five bathrooms, six bathrooms, that will be tied into this system. So there are four existing cesspools, all of which will be -- turn into septic and tied into this one system. So it will service the entire complex.

LEG. TROTТА:

How many people work there?

MR. COLLINS:

There are 15 folks that actually work in the building. We also have a number of visitors throughout the season coming in, checking out the facility, and we also have a couple of private residences on-site as well.

LEG. TROTТА:

And they're going to be hooked into it?

MR. COLLINS:

That will be tied in, yes.

LEG. TROTТА:

I mean, the system is supposed to cost \$20,000, so if it's twice as big, why is it \$128,000?

MR. COLLINS:

Well, a lot of the money is going toward education. We're going to do a series of, you know, videos, education, that kind of thing.

LEG. TROTТА:

So the taxpayers are going to pay for the Nature Conservancy's videos?

MR. COLLINS:

Well, it's not just videos. It's a whole component. We're going to have -- it's basically at our parking area so people can go and it can be showcased. It's basically just another tool that we can use on Long Island to show what people can use, once these systems get passed, as a way to take nitrogen --

LEG. TROTТА:

Where is this place?

MR. COLLINS:

It's in Cold Spring Harbor.

LEG. TROTТА:

Where?

MR. COLLINS:

250 Lawrence Hill Road. It's called Uplands Farm Sanctuary.

LEG. TROTТА:

Is it by the fish hatchery?

MR. COLLINS:

No, it's actually up the hill from there. It's adjacent to the Cold Spring Harbor Lab.

LEG. TROTТА:

That's just Suffolk County, like by 100 yards.

MR. COLLINS:

No, it's more than that. The Suffolk County line goes right through St. John's and Franklin Pond, so that's where the Suffolk/Nassau --

LEG. TROTТА:

Is it that walking hill where you go up and down that hill there?

MR. COLLINS:

It connects to the greenbelt trail, that's correct, into Cold Spring Harbor Park.

LEG. TROTТА:

How many visitors do you get there?

MR. COLLINS:

Thousands annually. We don't have that number, but I think there was a figure constructed years ago, at least 10,000 visitors annually.

LEG. TROTТА:

I go to Cold Spring Harbor and walk those hills all the time. I never even heard of this place.

MR. COLLINS:

You should check it out. It's a beautiful place. People actually that hike in Cold Spring Harbor are always hiking from those trails to our facility.

LEG. TROTТА:

I can drink more water, I can go -- I just can't see, you know, spending \$128,000. Too much.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I've heard of you before, so don't feel badly. I just want to clarify. There are five houses. We're putting in one system or five systems?

MR. COLLINS:

It will be one system that will service the facilities that are on-site.

LEG. KENNEDY:

How many are privately owned out of those five houses?

MR. COLLINS:

Well, we're a private entity so they're all privately owned.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. How many belong to you?

MR. COLLINS:

All of them.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. That's all I need to ask.

MR. COLLINS:

Another, you know, large component of the project is also based on monitoring. We want to really look at this closely and see, you know, how much nitrogen can we get out of the system, you know, with the goal of getting as close to zero as efficiently possible. We're going to be installing a series of groundwater monitoring wells to see how much nitrogen might be making it through the system into our groundwater, and we'll also be doing a lot of soil testing around those preexisting tanks. So there's going to be a lot of baseline monitoring as well as monitoring afterwards as well.

LEG. KENNEDY:

What is the manufacturer of your system?

MR. COLLINS:

I'm sorry. I don't quite --

LEG. KENNEDY:

The manufacturer of the system that you are using.

MR. COLLINS:

The one that we're proposing?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Correct.

MR. COLLINS:

It's -- yeah, it's just -- it's called a created wetland system. So it basically flows through a series of -- I'm sorry. I can't quite answer that question accurately. I'm not the engineer and our project lead, Chris Clapp, couldn't be here today. He's out on paternity leave. So I can't really accurately answer the engineering questions that you might need.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Sarah, how much for the system, how much for the promotion, the education, the advertising?

MS. LANSDALE:

Sure. I can get that for you. There are two resolutions associated with this project. The first one is 2006, IR 2006, and that's for 92,000. And then the other one is resolution 2007, and that's for 128,000. The 477 Funds will be used for the outreach and engagement and planning and design. The Sewer Infrastructure Funding will be used for the construction.

MR. CASTELLI:

Hi. In terms of the budget for this project, the TNC has broken it down that the planning -- the overall project, it's approximately 119,500 for planning, 193,000 for construction, and a total of -- and this is counting the TNC, this is not all money being requested from the County. This is counting their own money because they're fully matching this. And it came out to about 189,600 for the monitoring of the health -- effectively the system is working, all the groundwater monitoring, also the educational portion of the project. There's a lot of testing and monitoring that's going to be done.

LEG. KENNEDY:

But I thought the monitoring was going to be done by you; no? Who's doing the monitoring?

MR. CASTELLI:

Well, they will be. TNC will be paying for the monitoring. They're having a contractor that would be doing the monitoring.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay, but we don't know who that contractor is at that point.

MR. COLLINS:

We've identified some engineers and contractors that might be able to do the work so, you know, we're not going to jump into that yet until, you know, the time is there when we could actually do it. But we do have folks that can do the monitoring for us.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Thanks. So we have two projects or two resolutions before us, 2006 which is not technically before us at the moment but sits on the agenda under another committee, and 2007, which is before us at the moment. Why are they in two different places, first of all.

MS. LANSDALE:

There are two different committees and funding sources. The first one -- the 2006 has -- is coming from the 477 Water Quality Fund. The 2007 resolution, which is before you now, goes before the Sewer Infrastructure Committee and is using the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund.

LEG. CILMI:

Sarah, we've done 19 test systems throughout Suffolk County at this point?

MS. LANSDALE:

That's right.

LEG. CILMI:

Any of those systems in this general vicinity where this is?

MS. LANSDALE:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

By general vicinity I mean within the zip code.

MS. LANSDALE:

Not within the zip code, no.

LEG. CILMI:

Not within the zip code.

MS. LANSDALE:

And remember, our -- the systems were selected at random based on applications and based on legislative districts.

LEG. CILMI:

Right, but we didn't pay for those systems.

MS. LANSDALE:

No, we did not pay for them. They were donated. And this would be expanding the different types of technologies. None of those systems are considered constructed wetlands. This would be a pilot for a larger commercial flow using this type of technology.

LEG. CILMI:

Did we consider asking the company that manufactures this system to enter into the same sort of agreement that the other companies were or did the Nature Conservancy just come to us and say we need "X" amount of money to do this and would you guys be interested.

MS. LANSDALE:

I'll defer to the Nature Conservancy. It was their budget that was submitted.

MR. COLLINS:

Yeah, so we identified certain engineers, but we did not contact the folks that are installing the Nitrex systems on the County sites because we wanted to basically pioneer something different and show some new technology that might be available other than those systems.

LEG. CILMI:

Right. Well, I'm not suggesting that -- I mean, they've already -- the companies that supply those systems have already sort of made a commitment and made an investment. I'm suggesting that perhaps you might have taken that model, which I believe was a great model really, and employed it at the Nature Conservancy, where you might have had a company that would be interested in installing this type of system with the knowledge that, you know, at some point down the road after five years, let's say, which is what we negotiated with the 19 other systems. After five years the maintenance would become the responsibility of the Nature Conservancy, but the cost of the system itself would have been donated.

MR. COLLINS:

Yeah. I don't know if the rest of the team that I'm working with has been in contact with these folks or, you know, has reached out to them in the terms that you're referencing, but I can check in with them.

LEG. CILMI:

Right, well, except that the resolution is before us today, so.

MR. COLLINS:

Right and --

LEG. CILMI:

I'm not sure when you would want to do that.

MR. COLLINS:

Unfortunately, as I mentioned, our project lead, Chris Clapp, who I think most of you know, he is out on paternity leave and he had an emergency to attend to today so I'm the last minute fill in.

LEG. CILMI:

I understand. I appreciate you being here to answer questions. Is this something that's urgent?

MR. COLLINS:

Yes, it is quite urgent. We have a timeline that we, you know, we're hoping to adhere to.

LEG. CILMI:

Whose timeline is it, yours?

MR. COLLINS:

Ours and, you know, we had some preliminary meetings with the Health Department, you know, hoping that, you know, we can start getting contracts together and whatnot, at the first of the calendar year.

LEG. CILMI:

But the installation, I mean, this is something that you want to do, but it's not something that's, you know, where the system that's currently there is in imminent danger of failing or.

MR. COLLINS:

The system that's currently in place is not in imminent danger of failing, correct.

LEG. CILMI:

So all totalled from the County's perspective you're asking us for about \$200,000 between this resolution and --

MR. COLLINS:

Correct, about \$220,000.

MS. LANSDALE:

And then the Nature Conservancy would be matching it dollar for dollar with their own funds that have been raised.

LEG. CILMI:

Right, but that doesn't help us at all as a County, other than the value of the, you know, looking at the system and seeing if it's working. But the fact is, is that we have 19 of these systems, and I recognize that they're different systems, but nevertheless we have 19 systems currently installed throughout the County that didn't cost us a dime, that are benefiting the, you know, the property owners where they are, and that they're benefitting us because the information that we glean from those systems will help us make some decisions as to what types of systems we may promote or approve going forward, right? Those 19 systems, are they all different in some way, shape or form?

MS. LANSDALE:

There are -- of the 19, there are four companies and six different types of technologies being used.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. And this would be a seventh different type of technology and a fifth company.

MS. LANSDALE:

That's right.

LEG. CILMI:

That we would be funding rather than getting a donation from. And I suppose the real argument for this resolution, or both of these resolutions, is that the Nature Conservancy does great work and we should support it. Is that basically it?

LEG. SPENCER:

No, that's not. I'm going to speak to that.

LEG. CILMI:

I mean, it sounds to me like we're taking a piece of property that's privately owned and we're, the County, you're asking the County to invest in your privately owned piece of property because you can't afford to put in a system yourself? I mean, I hate to put it as bluntly as that, but it sounds to me like that's what we're talking about here.

LEG. SPENCER:

No, we're not.

LEG. CILMI:

And I respect, I really respect the fact that you're here filling in. I mean, I would suggest that maybe we table both of these resolutions today, reintroduce them next year when the folks at your office, you know, who were integrally involved here could come back before us and have a more

detailed conversation about discussions that they've had with the vendor or vendors and what our options as a County are. I mean, I'd like to see -- if the County is going to make this sort of investment with you and, you know, I believe the Nature Conservancy does great work and I'm happy to make an investment, but it's got to be an investment that returns some dividends at some point to us as a County, and it's got to be an investment that, you know, if you're benefitting from, if your organization is benefitting from, that we should benefit from as well in some way. Maybe after a certain amount of time you begin to pay us back the money that, you know, we're investing or something. I'm not exactly sure, but I think it warrants further discussion at this point. Thanks.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Spencer.

LEG. SPENCER:

I think that there's parts of this discussion that's being lost, that we don't have a complete story, and I think that hopefully that will fill in some of the gaps. We solicited them. This was in 2014 when we had declared nitrogen public enemy number one. The Administration prepared and we went out and said, you know, Suffolk County Water Quality Protection and Restoration Program and Land Stewardships Initiative Application Form. So in addition to putting out these 19 experimental technologies, we went out and we said to responsible people that had cesspools, we said look, we're going to give you an opportunity as a County. This is a priority for us and we want you to apply and bring novel technologies of reducing nitrogen. And The Nature Conservancy stepped up. We solicited them to come to the table. They filled out an extensive application. They went through a process, and we called them and said congratulations, you won. And so I just wanted to kind of, you know, they have not -- their cesspools are fine.

The problem is that where they are in the Uplands region, they are in the one to two year region from where that wastewater enters the aquifer. They've got cesspools there, and so I'm going to pass out a sheet to everyone shortly, but this project, the Nature Conservancy said we understand the detrimental effects of nitrogen. They studied it. They said wow, this is a great opportunity for us. Let's supply to Suffolk County. They're soliciting us. We're going to put in this system and a wetland system that's in a delicate area that's on the New York State list of nitrogen, I guess, areas that are most detrimental to our waterways. This area is on that list. And we're saying there's economic benefits of this. We know that we've got to sewer Suffolk County, if not sewer, we've got to get in wastewater initiatives.

So now they stepped up, they filled out the application. They're ponying up half the cash, and they're in a situation where with this technology they're going to reduce the nitrogen level less than five milligrams per liter and potentially a lot lower, and looking at upwards to a 50% more of nitrogen going directly into the aquifer into the surface waters. So this wasn't something that they decided they're going to come to the County for a money grant. They responded to an initiative that this Administration and this Legislature said partner with us, help us to reduce nitrogen. They came forward as good stewards. They went -- they jumped through all the hoops, they filled out this 40 page application, and we said this is the type of people that we want to work with.

I think that's the part that's being lost. It's just not a group of people that just decided that they wanted the County to pay for their sewer upgrade. And, you know, can I -- I would like -- Sarah, is that -- did I describe that accurately?

MR. CASTELLI:

Yeah, I'd like to speak to that. What Legislator Spencer said is exactly true. The call for applications went out from the Water Quality Protection and Restoration Program. That's really the other resolution, the Quarter Percent 477 money, but it's the same project. The application went out. The

Nature Conservancy submitted an application and the committee, during our October meeting, the Water Quality Committee decided that this would be a prudent use of funding. The private residences are not eligible for Quarter Percent Funding under the WQPRP, but not-for-profits are as long as they match dollar-for-dollar. So since they are not-for-profit they are agreeing to the match. The Water Quality Committee voted to approve just a portion of the funding. The Nature Conservancy originally came to the Water Quality Committee asking for \$250,000. Right off the bat the committee decided that 30,000 of that was not eligible because it was administrative overhead. So we subtracted out the 30,000 so you're down to 220,000.

It was subsequently decided by the Water Quality Committee that the TNC should apply to the Sewer Stabilization Fund for \$128,000 in construction costs, that that portion of the project would be eligible for the sewer infrastructure funding. So we subtracted out the 128,000 and the Water Quality Committee decided to recommend 92,000 in the Quarter Percent Funding.

Now, that funding is for -- it's not just for them to build this system as an educational center, but also as a pollution prevention project. This is in a one to two year, you know, recharge area, and the committee thought that it was wise to recommend this funding because of the very large amount of nitrogen reduction that they would be getting by installing the new system. And I can't speak for the Sewer Stabilization Committee, but I sit on the Water Quality Committee and we all there at the time thought that this was a worthwhile project.

LEG. SPENCER:

So my concern here is that we are looking at very difficult problems and lack of funding, and we know that water quality can pretty much have a major impact on our economic and on our tourist future and our public quality of life. And when we as a body decide that we're going to put forth an initiative, have the Administration put an application process and someone does exactly what we asked them to do, they bring funds to the table, they go through the process, then there's got to be some good faith effort. These were the guys that they won. They did what we asked them to do and, you know, I think that this is what we're looking for, these public/private partnerships. This isn't government doing everything. We're taking cesspools out of the ground in the zero to two year point, which is the most detrimental area of our recharge basin to reduce nitrogen. So it's like so much of a home run and I just don't want that point to be lost where it appears that it's just a group of guys that's coming for private funding for their sewer project. That's what I wanted to clarify.

LEG. CILMI:

So that actually does provide some good context, Doc. Knowing that the County actually requested proposals is something that I hadn't yet heard. I'm not sure that it changes my mind. I'm not sure that the County should have requested proposals.

LEG. SPENCER:

Sure.

LEG. CILMI:

Certainly protecting our groundwater and our surface waters is a valuable goal and I think the County has invested quite a bit of money over at least the time that I've been here, and I know for many years prior on water quality initiatives. And in some cases the County has been able to initiate some very creative initiatives that don't cost us anything, like the one that we talked about earlier with respect to the 19 -- the lottery that we had with the 19 systems that were installed for nothing.

All I'm saying is that if you say to a bunch of not-for-profit organizations we have a pot of money that we'd like to give you, surely you're going to have somebody that steps up to the plate. Is the goal valuable? Of course. The fact that Nature Conservancy wasn't coming to us initially to say, you

know, we need to do this, especially given that it's the Nature Conservancy, is a little worrisome to me. If they certainly didn't see the need prior to us saying, you know, we'd like to spend some money here, what kind of ideas do you have.

You know, I think there's certainly ample opportunity for us to spend money and we have spent money generously in the field of water quality, and I'm just not so sure that absent a good faith effort, and I recognize that the Nature Conservancy had no reason to explore a good faith effort in terms of getting a donation because we said to them we have some money, you want to help us spend it?

I really appreciate the fact that the Nature Conservancy is willing to put their money where their mouth is and match dollar for dollar our investment. I get that. I understand that and that's certainly valuable here. But you know the challenges, you know, just as much as any of us do. You know the fiscal challenges that we're facing. We have 19 different systems that are installed throughout the County that haven't cost us anything. My point is, given those fiscal challenges that we have, why don't we see how those 19 different systems are working before we spend any more money. That's my point.

LEG. SPENCER:

I think you have a great point and I think that what we're recognizing here is that we have said this is public enemy number one and we're saying okay, we're asking you to come and we've got the 19 free systems. We're saying we're reaching out to our best and brightest. We're reaching out to our industry and saying -- and we got the 19 systems and we're saying that's not good enough. We're also saying that we're looking for partners. Partner with us, go through -- see if you can meet these goals. The Nature Conservancy, they're there, they're minding their own business. They have no reason. But this isn't just a money grab, this is someone that's saying we're going to take money out of our own pocket and we're going to partner with Suffolk County and we're going to take on an issue that is -- that has been declared our number one threat that's facing us. I mean, I know we have the economic threat, but the economics of the impact of nitrogen and having our aquifer and our surface waters being contaminated is also a major threat. And to take a small amount of investment and partner with willing partners that are like-minded and saying step up to the table, if we're going to put the message out there that -- and I agree.

Maybe this was a discussion that we could have had and said we're only going to go for free. We're in a tight advantage. But then we can't approve it as a Legislature, and we ask that this come back before us and reach out there and then have people jump through hoops for months filling out our application, and then once we get them to the alter, we jilt them, and that's what this is. If we tell these guys hey, come help us, we're in trouble, we're having difficult times, we're looking for partners. They step up, they take money out, they've got skin in the game. This isn't a big pot of money. They're saying we're taking our money, we're going to invest, we're going to join with you, government, to help us out, you're looking for partners, and then we get them to the alter and we're like you know what? I think I changed my mind. So that's what my concern is.

LEG. CILMI:

I didn't change my mind.

LEG. SPENCER:

(*Laughter*).

MR. CASTELLI:

Can I just say one more thing here? It also should be noted that there were 16 applications

General Meeting - 12/15/15

received by the Water Quality Committee. This was only -- this was one of only six projects that was recommended. It's not as if the committee recommended every project that submitted an application. And also that the -- there are two systems that were just approved today, one in Sylvester Manor on Shelter Island and the other one in Southold, and we are looking for somewhat of a special resolution, to have a system put in Western Long Island and also to test somewhat different types of systems. I just wanted to make that clear. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. So I would just like to speak in support of this resolution. I have been familiar in the last few years with the vegetated wetland systems. They are different from the six different proprietary systems that the County has gotten donations up from the four different vendors in that the vegetative wetland system is a non-proprietary system. You could go to a store and buy the parts that you needed and put it in your own backyard yourself, okay. It does not work in the nitrification process that these other proprietary systems do. It's more of a biological process because you have an aerobic and an anaerobic conditions both located in the system. The water is circulated through it. The plants do the work of taking up not only the nitrogen, but all the nutrients. There's also the biological activity in the soil that many of us think are going to break down. Not only -- you think about what goes down the drain, your personal care products, all the pharmaceuticals, hormones, steroids, everything that goes through someone's body and out into in this case the groundwater, all these things there's a great chance that these things will be broken down in that biological process in the soil.

The only way we're going to know and the only way we're going to have our Health Department be assured that these systems are functional and safe and can treat the water is to put a few in. And so really in this case you're really paying to get an education because you are -- well, no, but you are sponsoring these. Look, you're not going to sewer the whole County, and these are a good solution for different areas in the County where you have the room to put these in, especially in seasonal areas where you can have the potential to have no discharge from your septic systems.

LEG. CILMI:

We also owe the Deputy Sheriffs \$4 million.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I don't think we could take that money out of this fund and pay a lot of different areas, so this is a specific fund that this could be used for. This isn't just General Fund money.

LEG. SPENCER:

I apologize. Not to be out of order, just briefly one sentence. If you compare the price of this to retro-sewering this area, it is not even a fraction of the cost. And that's something that -- that's the other thing that we are looking at in this County.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

Just doing the math that's \$500,000 for this system. I mean, don't we have a County facility that's more heavily used than this that we can invest this? I mean, that's a lot of money for four cesspools.

LEG. SPENCER:

Where did you get that?

LEG. TROTTA:

If you add up all the --

LEG. SPENCER:

Where did you get that?

LEG. TROTTA:

Well, if you add up 187, and I wrote it down, it comes to \$501,000. It is. Sarah, go over the numbers please, again, for the Doctor.

LEG. SPENCER:

(*Laughter*).

MS. LANSDALE:

Resolution -- Introductory Resolution 2007 of 2015 is suggesting an appropriation of 128,000, and then Resolution No. 2006 is suggesting an appropriation of 92,000.

LEG. CILMI:

That's 220.

LEG. TROTTA:

And they're --

MS. LANSDALE:

Doing a dollar-for-dollar amount.

LEG. CILMI:

Oh, so the whole system 440.

LEG. TROTTA:

When I did the math it came to 501. Maybe I did something wrong. Whatever. It's a lot of money --

LEG. SPENCER:

Thanks for doing math for the Doctor.

LEG. TROTTA:

I mean, it's a lot of money to pay for a cesspool for five bathrooms. It just seems to me that, you know, we should -- I think that what Legislator Cilmi said is correct. We should wait to see how these other ones work out. They cost 20 grand and why not spend \$40,000 as opposed to \$400,000. It only makes sense to me. These things are not -- these things are tested in other parts of the country, so I'm assuming the ones that we're testing are all going to be fine. So for ten cents on the dollar you can put this system in. You know, it's just, you know, I'd love to put five of those systems in, but the reality is we don't have any money. And how much is the educational component of this?

MR. CASTELLI:

The original budget that was submitted with the application is indicating that the video production, interpretative signage and outreach is estimated to be \$43,528.

LEG. TROTTA:

General Meeting - 12/15/15

Which would cover the entire cost of putting one of these up -- two of those other residential systems in. And I'm sure, I'm no mathematician, but five bathrooms -- two of those systems will cover five bathrooms. This is just a waste of taxpayer money and a waste of the Nature Conservancy's money. You can buy more open space and more land. You're going to get the same water at the end. You're going to get the clean water that you'll get with one of these new systems, and you saved \$360,000 and you can buy some land and not expand.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. So we have a motion and a second.

MR. RICHBERG:

Yes, we do.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Roll call.

*(*Roll called by Jason Richberg - Clerk of the Legislature*)*

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Pass.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

No.

LEG. TROTТА:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

No.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

No.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Thirteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Let's get back to page six. Bill Lindsay has been waiting very patiently. I apologize. He has a request to take **IR 1978** out of order. It's ***Approving and authorizing a contract to promote Convention Business and Tourism in Suffolk County (Co. Exec.)***. Motion by Legislator Lindsay. I'll second to take out of order.

LEG. CILMI:

What was the number again?

P.O. GREGORY:

1978. It was a good year. I think I was in 4th grade. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

To take out of order. Okay. The motion is before us. Motion to approve by Legislator Lindsay. I'll second. On the motion? Legislator Kennedy. We do have Ms. Jarnagin if anyone has questions she is here. She's the new --

MS. ZARA:

Good afternoon. I'm Regina Zara. I'm with Economic Development and Planning.

P.O. GREGORY:

Right. The new President or Executive Director is here if anyone has any questions. She did come to committee before Legislator Lindsay's committee. Legislator Kennedy, you had a question?

LEG. KENNEDY:

This is a resolution basically to renew the contract that we already had; correct?

MS. ZARA:

Yes. This resolution essentially reflects the existing contract terms that we have with no significant changes other than the exception of the date which coincides with the Hotel/Motel Tax renewal.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Just hold. So, Robert, how much does Convention, Business and Tourism get from --

MR. LIPP:

So they get 24% up to a maximum of two million, and they're past the two million level, so they're getting two million a year from more or less here on out.

LEG. KENNEDY:

All right. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

I guess this question goes to the new President is it or Executive Director?

MS. JARNAGIN:

President and CEO, yes, sir.

LEG. CILMI:

President and CEO. Sorry we haven't had a chance to chat before. In my six years that I've been here I've wondered whether or not we get value for the money that we give to you guys to spend. You know, it's -- and over those years your organization throws out lots of statistics and lots of, you know, nice looking graphs and anecdotal, you know, evidence of how, you know, without you we'd be doomed from a tourism point of view here in Suffolk County, from a commercial point of view here in Suffolk County. I have a couple of questions, but I guess the first question is going to be convince me that under your leadership that our investment is going to be well spent.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Thank you. Nice to meet you. My name is Kristen Jarnagin. I am the new President and CEO of the Long Island Convention and Visitors Bureau. I have been here for six weeks so I am very new to Long Island. However, I'm not new to the tourism industry. Just to give you a little bit of background on my career, I started at the Arizona Office of Tourism. I represented the whole State of Arizona. I was in Arizona for over 20 years. After that, I opened up a luxury resort, 500 rooms, the only five star, five diamond restaurant in the state with golf courses and shopping and a destination spa. And most recently I was, and this is where I hopefully will answer your question, sir, I was the Senior Vice President of the Arizona Lodging and Tourism Association, which is the membership organization and our primary role is advocacy and education about the value of tourism, not only to the public and our members, but to elected officials.

Tourism is a very critical component of any economic development strategy for several reasons. And to answer your question, Arizona recently had tourism go away in 2010 when we had tourism boycotts. It's very true. It's the holiday season, we've all seen the movie It's a Wonderful Life, and when you see what it's like without tourism, it does impact every element of the business community.

LEG. CILMI:

May I interrupt you?

MS. JARNAGIN:

Yes, sir.

LEG. CILMI:

So you don't have to sell me on the importance of tourism.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Okay, great.

LEG. CILMI:

I get that.

MS. JARNAGIN:

You're talking about my vision.

LEG. CILMI:

I'm talking about how can LICVB under your leadership promote tourism here in Suffolk County in a way that is different than it has in the past, or maybe your vision is similar to what has gone on in the past. I don't know.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Okay. Thank you for the clarification. Yes, my vision is different. Coming from an outside perspective the first thing I've noticed about Long Island tourism is that it's very segmented and fragmented, and when you leave Long Island there's really no Long Island brand. You were asking me what is our brand, and we have not established one so far. We don't know who our demographic is. There has not been any conclusive research that has been done in the last decade that talks about who we should be promoting to, what the household income is, what the age is, who has the most propensity to travel to Long Island. There are a lot of strategic variables we should be looking at to ensure that our advertising is targeting and directed to the right audience, so creating a brand for Long Island that invites people from all over the world to come here as well as instills pride and residences.

I would like to connect Long Island tourism better with economic development and make sure that we are aligning ourselves with the County initiatives in what you're doing with transportation, with the airport. We'd like to work very much more closely with MacArthur. One of the things I'd like to do is start referencing it as Long Island Airport instead of Islip, which it says on every reader board in the country, and no one knows where that is.

So there's a lot of things that I'd like to do differently and I hope that you will give me the opportunity to show you what it's like to have a regional and strategic brand. I think what Long Island is -- the beauty of my background is I do come from a state background, and Long Island is not like a normal Convention and Visitors Bureau, a destination. It is so diverse and so different from end to end that it should be perceived and marketed as more of a state would be because there's so much more to see and do here than it is in just a single destination that you see typically across the country.

LEG. CILMI:

So thank you for that. So if we don't have a brand, as you said, it's difficult to market when you don't have a brand, when you don't have, you know, a sense of exactly what it is you are marketing.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Absolutely.

LEG. CILMI:

What have we spent our money on in the past few years with LICVB then?

MS. JARNAGIN:

I have been here for six weeks so I can't speak to what you spent your money on in the past. I do think that tourism promotion is critical. It's not a perfect science. There have been beautiful imagery. We have been doing a good job of directing people to the website. We distribute over a million visitors guides a year, tourism, the hotels are full. In fact, if you look at occupancy and revenue per available room we're at record breaking numbers right now for Long Island. My colleagues back in Arizona would salivate to have the numbers that you all have here in your hotels. So visitors are coming. Are they the right visitors? Are they the visitors that are going to have the least impact as far as traffic and congestion, that are going to stay longer and spend more? That's what we're going to look at with our research and make sure that we're bringing not just visitors, but the right visitors who are going to have the biggest impact on economic development and tax revenue generation.

LEG. CILMI:

How long is this contract with you if we approve this today?

MS. ZARA:

It's in alignment with the Hotel/Motel Tax, which goes from 2016 to 2017.

LEG. CILMI:

So it's a one year commitment.

MS. ZARA:

It's a two year contract.

LEG. CILMI:

Two year commitment.

MS. ZARA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Let me ask you one more question, Kristen, if I could.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

There are those who say, and based on some data that I've seen I tend to agree --

MS. JARNAGIN:

Okay.

LEG. CILMI:

-- that we don't spend enough money on tourism promotion. Now, I assume you would agree with

that given the business that you're in, but could you, you know, expand on that a little bit.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Absolutely.

LEG. CILMI:

There's a point at which, let me just finish my thought here. So, you know, there's a point at which if you're spending a certain amount of money you may be just really wasting your money, but if you increase it by whatever, now you can really make an impact. I'm curious to know from you with your experience where we're at in that spectrum.

MS. JARNAGIN:

You're exactly right. You do, depending on the size and scope of your destination, you do reach a threshold of spending compared to what you're going to get in return investment. I will just give you some comparisons. We spend total, in Suffolk and Nassau, we have a \$3 million budget for our Long Island Convention and Visitors Bureau. In Arizona where I came from in Phoenix the Phoenix budget is about 26 million. It's right next to Scottsdale that has 26 million. It's right next to Tempe and Mesa and Glendale that all have in the high teens. They have Tucson with 17. The only place in the State of Arizona that has a budget similar to Long Island is a town called Flagstaff. It's a ski resort. It's lovely. It's got a population of 120,000 people and it has one downtown, and they spend three million dollars a year promoting Flagstaff. So the competition is fierce.

We have beautiful beaches here on Long Island as does Florida. The State of Florida spends \$100 million a year promoting tourism, and that doesn't include Orlando and Miami and Disney and Universal and all the wonderful things that pump tons of money, and that's because people spend money promoting tourism because they do know that visitors -- it's one of the highest tax industries in the country. People come and they spend taxes on hotels, restaurants and retail and you don't have to service them on a daily basis. They leave. You don't have to educate them. Hopefully you're not putting them in the jails, you're not paying for sewage and those kinds of things. It's new, fresh money they drop into your economy and they leave and it keeps all of our taxes lower as residents and it funds the critical services that we utilize to fund all of these other programs that you've discussed today.

So to answer your question, right now I'll throw out one of the great statistics that you referenced. For every dollar spent on tourism promotion in Long Island, the most recent study says you get \$39 in return in economic investment. Let's say you don't believe that. Let's be conservative and let's say it's ten to one or five to one, or worst case scenario it's two to one. What bank account would you not invest any dollar into where you're going to get double your money back. It makes very smart economic sense to do so. We would love additional funding of any kind, so if you wanted to look at funding our organization more I can promise you that under my leadership it will be strategically and targeted and well spent.

LEG. CILMI:

I'm wondering, we collect this Hotel/Motel Tax and I think Budget Review said that 20 some odd percent is allocated towards the tourism agency of our choice?

MR. LIPP:

Yes 24% up to a maximum of two million, and they're at the maximum now. And you should understand that the reason why --

LEG. CILMI:

If we did a straight 24%, how much would it be?

MR. LIPP:

Let's see. That'd be another three, \$400,000.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

MR. LIPP:

But you should understand that what you're doing now is, the reason why they have this resolution, is because there was only one response to the RFP.

LEG. CILMI:

I understand, but I'm wondering if investing in your agency under your leadership could pay dividends to the County in terms of additional sales tax revenue, additional Hotel/Motel Tax revenue, if it wouldn't make sense to rearrange the percentages. And I'm not sure that we can -- I don't think we can do that, right? The State does that.

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. CILMI:

Right. So we can't even do that ourselves, but --

MS. JARNAGIN:

But you could lift the cap. You can't?

LEG. CILMI:

We can't.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No, we can't, not without the State.

MS. JARNAGIN:

I thought I had a shot in the dark.

LEG. CILMI:

Sorry. But, I mean, you see where I'm going with this. It might make sense. We might see more revenue come to the County that we could invest in our parks, and that we could invest in our historic structures, and those sorts of programs and the cultural, you know, events that we support. We might see more money available to invest in those things if we maybe sacrificed short-term or somehow found a little bit of extra money to spend with you guys. The next two years are going to be critical for you as a leader obviously because we're -- I mean, from my perspective, I can only speak for myself, I'm going to be watching very closely and I would love to work with you.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Thank you so much.

LEG. CILMI:

Sure.

MS. JARNAGIN:

I really appreciate it and I look forward to working with all of you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Schneiderman.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

First, I welcome Kristen. I think you're going to do a great job. I think you have an impressive background. I won't be here, I'll be watching and, you know, I think LICVB will do good work. Let me give, and this is partly to address some of what Legislator Cilmi was bringing up. So recently this body, the Legislature, approved a two year extension of the Hotel Tax. It's all done at the State, but we have to do the Home Rule piece of it. In that two year -- in the language of the State that the State allows us to impose this tax there are certain conditions. That cap is actually conditioned; 24% up to \$2 million.

There's another condition, which I also don't like, which requires us to contract out. So we can't actually do it ourselves. If we said *Oh, maybe we'll give the two million to economic development*, that is not an option. The way the State legislation is written we have to use an outside agency. There was only one agency that responded to the RFP, and so you're it. You're also the agency that represents Nassau County. Of our two million, roughly a million of it is paired with Nassau County. They provide a million -- they don't have a Suffolk -- a Nassau only fund. We have a Suffolk only fund. That's the additional million that we provide. So a million gets paired with Nassau and it's used to promote Long Island as a brand, and the other million is used to promote Suffolk only.

Now, there have been problems with LICVB in the past. It's not you, Kristen. There was a Comptroller's report I think less than two years ago that actually found LICVB in violation of the contract and recommended not continuing. There was an audit done probably 12 years, or about ten years before that, that was also scathing. We don't have the best record with LICVB, so we're hoping that you will kind of take it to the next level to correct whatever issues the Comptroller found, and I urge you to take a look at not only the audit, but the management report.

We are not in a position to go any other direction as I see it. We have to contract out. We have one bidder. And I do know internally they are making changes to address some of those concerns that Comptroller Sawicki had uncovered. So I am going to support this and I just wanted to provide that kind of context because I think it's important.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

I have two people, actually three. Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:

What hotel -- five star hotel did you work at?

MS. JARNAGIN:

I actually opened the Sheraton Wild Horse Pass Resort and Spa. It's located on the Gila River Indian Community, a Native America resort, and we hosted both Superbowl champions while we were there, the New York Giants being one of them when they played the Superbowl in Arizona.

LEG. TROTTA:

Who -- I'm naive to this. Did we hire you? Who hired you?

MS. JARNAGIN:

For this position? The Board of Directors for the LICVB. They did a nationwide search.

LEG. TROTTA:

That's an outside organization. I went to school at Flagstaff.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

We have one seat on the board.

LEG. TROTTA:

They spend more money than we do, little, tiny Flagstaff. What do you see in your six weeks? What do you -- paint me a picture.

MS. JARNAGIN:

I am so grateful to be in Long Island, first of all. I did move across the country. I have been in Arizona for 20 plus years. I did have and I think still do have a successful career there, so I gave up everything I know and love to come here because I think that there is incredible potential and opportunity here. We have a feeder market of New York City one train ride away, which again, we could only dream of having a market like that so close to us in Arizona. We're definitely more of a fly in market. It's the number one tourism destination in the world and we should be siphoning off every visitor, national and international, that comes to New York City should consider Long Island as if not a day trip, then at least an extended trip on their first or second visit.

There's a lot of opportunity here, as much as even the logo of Long Island, which right now is a lighthouse. I'd love to see it, again, from an outside perspective, be the outline, the drawing of Long Island, because we talk about it so much as North Fork, South Fork, North Shore, South Shore, that when you're not from here, if you're a visitor, it's very difficult to understand what you're discussing and what you're talking about as far as geography. We all know about Americans and geography, so whatever we can do to make it easier is beneficial for visitors.

So there's a lot of opportunity here. It's endless, the potential. I appreciate you putting your confidence in me and I promise you all I will work diligently with my Board of Directors and my staff to make you proud.

LEG. TROTTA:

So what are you going to use to get people to come here?

MS. JARNAGIN:

Well, first of all, we have to educate people about why they should come here.

LEG. TROTTA:

Why should they come?

MS. JARNAGIN:

We have to do research. It depends, it depends on who our visitor is. So the first thing is, and this is what's happened in the past, is my understanding, a lot of people just say I like this element or I like that element so we should promote it. I'm definitely more of a strategic and research based thinker. I want data that tells me where I should be spending money and why and who's going to give me the biggest return investment. So the first thing I'd like to do is really commission some solid research that does focus groups and studies people that have been here and that haven't been here, and why they haven't selected Long Island, and that's going to lead us to a brand strategy that resonates with that person.

LEG. TROTTA:

Do you familiar with the Great Wolf Lodge?

(*Laughter*)

MS. JARNAGIN:

Is that what you're trying to get me to say?

LEG. TROTTA:

No. Do you know what a Great Wolf Lodge is?

MS. JARNAGIN:

No.

LEG. TROTTA:

You don't know what a Great Wolf Lodge is? It's a 400 room hotel with an indoor water park, sits on 12 acres.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Okay.

LEG. TROTTA:

You don't know -- there's one in Pennsylvania. You hit the nail on the head. We have 11.5 million customers an hour train ride from Suffolk County. I have been an advocate of a Great Wolf Lodge in my legislative district, which is 1800 acres of parkland. I have always said, you know, that's our tax revenue.

MS. JARNAGIN:

The Great Wolf Lodge?

LEG. TROTTA:

Bringing those people, the 11.5 million people that live an hour train ride out to Suffolk County to spend money.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Well, then you and I are on the same page.

LEG. TROTTA:

As you can see, they don't take me seriously, and they didn't take me seriously about something else, and that guy's in Federal prison, so.

LEG. SPENCER:

That was uncalled for.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. On that note, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. I'll take him seriously, don't worry. I did get a chance to meet with the President and CEO. We talked about -- we did talk about Long Island MacArthur Airport and not Islip Airport, and the difference between the east and the west and the north and the south, and how important it is to, you know, to kind of celebrate those differences and not lump all of Long Island together when you are trying to attract people for different reasons.

I have a big problem with how the Hotel/Motel Tax is allocated, but that goes back to the law. It

does not go back to this organization. So, you know, a new broom sweeps clean. I wish you the best of luck and I think, as Legislator Cilmi said, we'll all be watching closely.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Thank you so much.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, just a quick question. I was curious, how are you going to measure your success?

MS. JARNAGIN:

Well, that's a great -- there's several different ways to do it from a tourism perspective. The traditional way that people use to measure success is by conversion studies of visitors guides. So there's several different ways to do it. If you're going to do a targeting branding campaign, let's say we partnered with MacArthur Airport and we picked the two cities that they're going to go into for additional airlift. What we could do if we had a lot of -- if we had research money, is you would go into the market prior and you would do an awareness study, and then you do your marketing campaign and then you go into the same market afterwards and you follow-up with an awareness study and you see if you moved the needle.

There's also ways to do conversion studies on visitors guides. Every single person that did receive a visitors guide you follow-up with them. Did you come? How long did you stay? Did the visitors guide that we provided influence your stay? How much money did you spend? There's ways to do that.

With the emerging technology that people are utilizing to promote tourism, measurement does become more difficult because you're using social media and you're using digital and it's very difficult sometimes to determine what you did and the impact it had on the visitor. But when you are doing targeted marketing you utilize specific URLs. If we were to do, for example, let's say we decided to wrap a subway or something in New York City to tap into this market that you're discussing and we make it look like you're on the beach on Long Island. Instead of placing an ad on the inside, let's say you wrap the whole subway and you give people an experience so that they feel like they're here and you start to move their emotions. You would utilize a specific URL to direct them to your website, to direct them to your information to call to action, and then you can track that specific URL to see how many people reached you.

There's various ways to track and measure various different components of marketing, and it will all be built into the research that we're doing and depending on which way we want to go with that. Research does cost money and that is sometimes difficult to pull money away from marketing for research, but then at the end of the day when you're trying to justify your existence to the taxpayer and to the Legislature, it really does make a difference, so I find it very important.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. So there are ways to measure the success rate of your efforts, but where is the tourism industry right now on Long Island?

MS. JARNAGIN:

The tourism industry on Long Island is great actually. When I come here -- right now we are about -- we are record breaking numbers in both occupancy and average daily rate. It's typically gauged -- a success in tourism is gauged on something called revPAR, which is revenue per available room. That's a nationwide statistic that people utilize to measure against destinations, and right now Long

General Meeting - 12/15/15

Island is one of the highest revPARs in the county. We're up there with Seattle and San Francisco and New York City and San Diego. We're about \$143 in revenue per available room, which is great. So people want to spend the money to come here.

I have listened to all of the different districts and Legislators and I understand that, you know, tourism varies very greatly from one end of the Island to the next. The western portion is definitely more meetings and convention focus, the eastern portion is more leisure focus. How many leisure visitors do we want. We've had issues with some of that in some of our more remote areas. So how do we send the right message and get the right visitors in the part of the Island where they need to go and create maybe a compression that helps some of the other areas that aren't seeing the kind of visitation that they need. So it's not a perfect science. It is sometimes, you know, based on who we are as a destination and what direction we think we want to go, but there are a lot of opportunities for us to grow and become more concise in our messaging.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Do you see, when you talk about tourism, people will, for example, they'll fly from all over the world to visit New York City and Manhattan, right, to see a Broadway show or whatever you're going to do. But do you see that type of marketing for Long Island where someone would choose as a vacation destination Suffolk County?

MS. JARNAGIN:

Absolutely. I think it's beautiful. Look at all the beaches that you have here. It's just an education process.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But do we have all of the infrastructure in place to really promote Long Island as that type of destination? I mean, you can go to Jones Beach, you can go to Robert Moses State Park, you can go to some of the town beaches, but the facilities do not support the type of tourism that you're talking about. The roadways don't, the accommodations do not. Nothing is located close to the shorelines, most of it is private property.

MS. JARNAGIN:

I agree with you to the level that I do think there's a huge opportunity for new product. I would like to see a luxury mega resort here just like we had -- we have several of them in Scottsdale, and they include meeting space, 100,000 square feet of meeting space, and people will be able to come and stay longer than one or two nights. Do we need a convention center? Absolutely.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, that was my next question. We don't have a convention center.

MS. JARNAGIN:

I would like one.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It's in your name. It's in the name of your organization.

MS. JARNAGIN:

We have meeting facilities. We have hotels that provide convention services and we do bring quite a few conventions and meetings here, our organization, and we have those tangible numbers for you, but I would love a convention center here. Especially as New York becomes more -- less cost effective for meetings and groups that would like to go to New York City but would still like to have

General Meeting - 12/15/15

access to everything New York City has to offer, I think we are right for an incredible convention center here where people can have access with their meetings and yet have something more affordable.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I don't know if I agree with that.

MS. JARNAGIN:

No?

LEG. D'AMARO:

It's optimistic and I appreciate that, but when major companies and organizations are looking to come to New York for a convention, I just can't see them landing at Islip and winding up in Islandia as opposed to Manhattan. I think it's a very optimistic point of view, and I think also that aren't we really saturated at this point? I mean, how are you going to accommodate increased tourism? We don't have the hotels, we don't have the convention center. I just don't see how do you do it.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Specific areas might be saturated and that --

LEG. D'AMARO:

I mean, if you go -- I'm sorry. If you go out to the East End during the summer, you can't even get there. It takes you three hours because we don't have the roadways to support the trip. Once you get there, you're lucky if you find a room, and if you do, it's five to \$600 a night. You know, when you are planning a vacation and you go online and you look at these internet sites and, you know, it's very easy to do it yourself now, there are destinations that are set up for this. I just don't see that we're set up for it.

MS. JARNAGIN:

I think that there are different areas that meet different needs. There is compression in the area that you're talking about. The same if you go to San Diego, where every single person in Arizona in the summer wants to go to San Diego. If you're talking about like New York wanting to come here. And guess what? They all drive through the 405 traffic in LA and it's a nightmare, and you do what you need to do to get to the beach because that's where you want to end up. San Diego is the exact same thing. You pay -- they have very few beach front resorts. Most of them are not on the water just because of the price of real estate there. So what happens is instead of going to San Diego -- and everyone says I'm going to San Diego, but where you really go is Oceanside or Carlsbad or one of the outlying areas that as a family, or depending on what has the rooms, and you drive to the beach for the day and you go back to your hotel at night. That's the kind of, you know, visitation that we can see here.

I understand what you're saying. It's not that different from what a lot of other beach destinations face. People may say that they're going to go into the Hamptons, but really they're going to hopefully stay further out, and it's those other hotels that actually still do need visitors, that are still trying to make ends meet and would love to have our visitors in their rooms. But could we have room for capital improvement? Absolutely, and I'd like to see growth.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I don't think you'll see it happen. We don't have the funding available. We don't have the space available. Nassau County certainly doesn't have the space available. I mean, you drive around Nassau County in the summertime, especially on a weekday, you're lucky if you can even get through with the traffic that's now -- we're so saturated here. I'm just wondering how -- I think it's great that you want to bring in more tourism, and I understand that you'll do your job and pick who

to market to and what the best demographic is and where is the best bang for our buck, and I understand all that, but I don't see how you accommodate more tourists here. We don't have bed and breakfasts on the ocean. We don't have any of this stuff.

MS. JARNAGIN:

We do have 18,000 hotel rooms on the Island, and is there room for growth? Absolutely. And is there a market for conventions? There absolutely is. Think about Stony Brook University and the great labs that you guys have on the East End. And they're building a brand new industrial in Sloan Kettering Cancer Park in Nassau. There are new industries that are coming here, and these are the kinds of healthcare and education industries that do like to hold meetings. So there is opportunity. I hope that I can bring it to you. I will do my best to make it strategic and valuable to you.

I hope that everyone agrees, because the whole purpose is not just for us to brag about Long Island and beautiful it is, the core purpose of this organization and this industry is to generate tax revenue, additional tax revenue, that benefits every resident of this region, and it is to create jobs and we have about 74,000 jobs that are directly related to tourism on Long Island, not including indirectly related. So there's a lot of people that rely on the health and prosperity of our industry for their livelihoods. So hopefully we can continue to protect that.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Is your target more the local population or is it nationwide or regional? How do you do that?

MS. JARNAGIN:

The primary goal of a Convention and Visitors Bureau is to always bring new dollars into the market. You want to bring in the visitor that's going to stay longest and spend the most money. However, the staycation market is critical and it's not something that we would ignore absolutely. There's a lot of different ways that we can effectively do public relations or social media campaigns for special events and other ways to drive on Island interaction as well, but the primary role is to bring that new dollar in that generates tax revenue and creates jobs.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Thank you.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes. Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

Thank you, Kristen. You know, you have an impressive resume, incredible knowledge and incredibly articulate about our tourism industry. Long Island gets about \$5.3 billion to our economy, and we're talking about, you know, \$2 million. You know, and I also wanted to say how optimistic you are. You know, I grew up in Florida. I remember going to Disney and it was a warehouse in the middle of swampland, it was a while ago, but I remember that. And who would have ever thought Orlando would be what it is today.

I just wanted to bring to your attention, you know, my concern as well as what was brought up with Legislator D'Amato, the infrastructure. And the first thing I think about when you bring more people to a particular location is the transportation issue. So, you know, again, I just want to throw that out there, put that on your radar. And, again, I appreciate your -- your ability to be optimistic with the challenges. But, you know, we have New York City, we have, you know, out East for vineyards, Hamptons. And, you know, I've had international people come and visit me and they want to come

General Meeting - 12/15/15

to Long Island. They're in the City, but they want to come out to Long Island. We just have to make it easier for them and I look forward to seeing what you have -- what you're going to be doing in the future. But thank you.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Thank you very much.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Calarco.

LEG. CALARCO:

Thank you. All that talk of convention center perked up my interest. I represent Patchogue. I don't know if you're familiar with our community down there.

MS. JARNAGIN:

I had dinner there.

LEG. CALARCO:

I'm sure you have. We have great restaurants down in Patchogue. We are looking to build a hotel in our downtown, and I have always said that the best reason to build that is to turn Patchogue into a little convention town, similar to what we have Upstate in Saratoga Springs. Certainly we're not going to be a large scale facility, but we can bring people in. We're ten minutes from MacArthur Airport. We have a ten minute ride to Watch Hill over at Fire Island and a great nightlife that everybody's coming to. I would encourage you to come down and meet the Mayor and we'll talk about promoting that business down in Patchogue.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Thank you. I look forward to meeting him. I hear he's a living legend.

LEG. CALARCO:

That's what a lot of people say.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you, Kristen. I just want to, you know, being someone, a member of the Economic Development Committee, I appreciate the time that you spent at the committee talking about your vision. It's nice to have someone, you know, with a vision as you do. We were incredibly impressed with your ideas. Being a communications professional myself previously, you know, I really appreciate all of your focus on social media where the tourism industry is going, Pinterest, Facebook, Twitter talking about that. Talking about the visiting friends and family market and how important that is here on Long Island. Talking about agritainment, talking about adventure tourism. I particularly am interested, I don't see him here, he was here earlier, but our Commissioner of Parks. We talked about delivering the brand promise, those are the words you used.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

I didn't get there myself. You provided those words. But, you know, just making sure that as we advertise Long Island as a brand, and as we attach to that brand images of stand up paddle boarding, kayaking, bicycle riding, swimming on beaches, whatever, you know, vineyards and farm

tours, that all of that is deliverable. And so, you know, we should work in concert on that, because the worst thing that could happen is someone comes expecting to be on a boat and there are no boats to rent.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Someone comes expecting to ride a bicycle, and they can't find a bicycle to rent, etcetera, etcetera. So, you know, I think that our Parks can work with you, our Legislature can work with you on that.

I'm also particularly interested about the emerging markets, international markets. I don't think you mentioned -- although maybe I wasn't listening quite as attentively, I don't think you mentioned that here today. Partnering with the I Love New York and the New York and Company Campaign, but targeting Canada. And I know that we're already trying in the UK and Germany and we really, you know, will expect to see return on that. And I appreciate all of your knowledge in that area of the oversea markets. And, you know, you're just incredibly impressive, your knowledge and what you've been talking about and we're excited.

So you're going to deliver your brand promise, we're going to try to deliver our brand promise, and hopefully we get to a place where we can invest more in it. It just turns into more for us and more to invest. So we thank you so much. I look forward to hopefully we can sit down, I can show you my district and what we have to offer, and I'm sure you'll have similar invitations from around this horseshoe. So thank you.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Thank you so much.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes, Kristen, I said it at committee, you certainly have an impressive background. I certainly believe in your vision, and I look forward to your success, and however we can help you accomplish that certainly call upon us. We welcome you here and Legislator Lindsay is going to close us out before we take the vote.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Go ahead.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Cilmi, I'm sorry.

LEG. CILMI:

Question, but not for Kristen. So Legislator Schneiderman was talking a minute or several minutes ago about us having to spend this money with an agency separate from the County. So my question is for Counsel. Earlier today we voted to create an agency that's separate from the County, an LDC, and I'm wondering from a legal perspective could we theoretically do the same thing and then give our money, I'm not -- Kristen, don't get upset, I'm not suggesting we do this now, but could we do that here in Suffolk County legally?

MR. NOLAN:

We're supposed to contract with a tourism promotion agency. I don't know if the LDC we created today meets the definition.

LEG. CILMI:

General Meeting - 12/15/15

No, no. I'm not suggesting that the LDC that we created today meets that definition, but theoretically could we create an LDC that has that mission.

MR. NOLAN:

I would have to research that one for you. I can't give you a definitive answer.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. I'll look forward to your answers. Thanks.

P.O. GREGORY:

Now, Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Kristen, thanks for coming in today. Thanks for your presentation before the committee on Wednesday. It was very informative. I think everybody is excited about you taking over this position. One of the things you said was you're finding the industry to be segmented and fragmented. Well, welcome to Long Island, welcome to Suffolk County. As you start to learn your way around here, you'll see there's a lot of different segments and a lot of different fragments so, you know, your position, you're going to have the challenge of trying to bring all those pieces together to work together, which is not an easy task, so good luck to you with that.

I just wanted to go officially on record just to give my endorsement to passing this legislation. Meeting with you and hearing your vision, your plan with the limited resources that you're allocated, I think you're going to find a lot of success and I look forward to working with you. Thank you.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. So we have a motion and a second.

MR. RICHBERG:

Yes, we do.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. Thank you.

MS. JARNAGIN:

Thank you so much. Happy holidays.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. ***IR 1956 - Amending Resolution No. 481-2015 Cultural Tourism Funding (Co. Exec.)***.

LEG. CALARCO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Calarco. I'll --

LEG. TROTТА:

What number is this?

MR. NOLAN:

1956, page six.

P.O. GREGORY:

1956 on page six.

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

LEG. TROTТА:

What's the number again? I'm sorry.

P.O. GREGORY:

It's 19 -- I.R. 1956, Page 6.

LEG. TROTТА:

What page are you on?

P.O. GREGORY:

Page 6. Okay. So we have a motion and a second?

MR. RICHBERG:

Yes, we do.

P.O. GREGORY:

Is everyone where they need to be? Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***I.R. 2016 - Accepting \$10,000 from the Town of Southampton for costs associated with Suffolk County's Military Base Retention Grant from New York State Empire State Development (NYSESD) for Gabreski Airport (Co. Exec.)***. Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, second by Legislator Krupski, or no?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Add zeroes to that now.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's the last time I'm giving you guys money.

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

EDUCATION AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 1927 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and appropriating funds in connection with capital improvements to new and existing facilities (CP 2153)(Co. Exec.). I'll make a motion to approve, second by Legislator Calarco or Legislator -- whoever wants --

LEG. MURATORE:
(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Muratore. On the motion? All in favor?

LEG. TROTTA:
On the motion. What is this again?

P.O. GREGORY:
On the motion.

LEG. TROTTA:
Oh, this is the college thing?

MR. NOLAN:
Yeah.

LEG. TROTTA:
All right. Never mind.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. CILMI:
Opposed.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Opposed.

LEG. TROTTA:
Opposed.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Opposed.

P.O. GREGORY:
Raise your hands up, please.

MR. RICHBERG:
Fourteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

General Meeting - 12/15/15

Okay. **I.R. 1927A**, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

No.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fourteen.

ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING & AGRICULTURE

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Page 7. ***I.R. 1934 - Making a SEORA Determination in connection with the proposed Riverside Walking Trail, Hamlet of Riverside, Town of Southampton (Pres. Off.)***. Motion by Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Second.

LEG. HAHN:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by -- the one with the highest hand raised up. Legislator -- okay. He's pointing at you, you're pointing at him. I'll do it, on the second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***I.R. 1943 - Authorizing the acquisition of Farmland Development Rights under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (effective December 1, 2007) for the Villas at Roanoke, LLC property - Town of Riverhead(SCTM No. 0600-017.00-01.00-006.000 p/o)(Co. Exec.)***. Motion by Legislator Krupski.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Schneiderman. On the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1994 - Authorizing the balance for a Consent Judgement Settlement with the United States Environmental Protection Agency and amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program in connection with the Suffolk County Supplemental Environmental Project for land acquisition (CP 8735)(Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Hahn, second by Legislator Krupski. On the motion, anyone?

LEG. TROTTA:

We're required to pay this right?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

They sued us, or something like that?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes. Okay. All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1994A, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

He's a yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Okay.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***I.R. 2002 - Accepting and approving the Suffolk County Agricultural and Farmland Protection Plan 2015 (Co. Exec.).*** Motion by Legislator Hahn? No? By Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

(Nodded yes).

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Hahn. Okay. On the motion, anyone? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 2006 - 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 Nature Conservancy Nitrogen Reduction Wastewater Wetland Project (CP 8710.151)(Co. Exec.).

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Spencer.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Krupski. I see a lot of West End/East End cooperation here. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

(*Opposed: Legislators Cilmi, Trotta and McCaffrey*)

P.O. GREGORY:

Whoa, there goes the cooperation. The center.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, PERSONNEL, HOUSING & CONSUMER PROTECTION

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. ***I.R. 1942 - Authorizing the sale of County-owned real property pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law to the Town of Riverhead for Affordable Housing purpose (SCTM No. 0600-102.00-03.00-030.000)(Co. Exec.).***

LEG. KRUPSKI:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Krupski.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'll second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1946 - Approving the reappointment of Thomas G. Gallagher as a member of the Suffolk County Commercial, Industrial, Residential Septic Tank/Sewer Drain Treatment, Bacteria Additives and Maintenance Board(Co. Exec.). Yeah, that was very thrilling. Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, I'll second. All in -- I'm sorry, was that --

LEG. CALARCO:

Jason, I'm back here.

P.O. GREGORY:

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Hahn)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1947 - Approving the reappointment of Robert N. Falk as a member of the Suffolk County Commercial, Industrial, Residential Septic Tank/Sewer Drain Treatment, Bacteria Additives and Maintenance Board (Co. Exec.). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Hahn)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1948 - Approving the reappointment of William Garthe as a member of the Suffolk County Home Improvement Contracting Board (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Trotta, I'll second. On the motion, anyone? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Hahn).

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 2021 - Amending the hourly rate for temporary positions in the Suffolk County Classification and Salary Plan (Co. Exec.).

LEG. LINDSAY:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Lindsay, was it? I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Hahn).

HEALTH

I.R. 1939 - Appropriating funds in connection with the Environmental Quality Geographic Information and Database Management System (CP 4081)(Co. Exec.).

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, I'll second. On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Is this for the Health Department?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Will this help with permitting at the Health Department and recordkeeping?

P.O. GREGORY:

Walter?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

General Meeting - 12/15/15

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer, Legislator Krupski. Walter Dawydiak, Director of Environmental Quality. This will help very significantly with modernizing and updating each and every element of our operation and bringing them into the 21st Century, as well as permitting. I'm happy to give you a few words about the background or just to answer questions, whatever you prefer.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Whatever you prefer.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Basically, we're here asking for a \$900 appropriation. This has been in the mill under development --

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Nine hundred thousand dollars.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

I'm sorry?

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Nine hundred thousand, not \$900.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Nine hundred thousand. I apologize, I missed a -- I missed a thousand. That was a pretty good deal. Well, we have data systems that are over 20 years old, they're disparate, they're difficult to use. We do a very high quality technical job, but we're actually bogged down in inefficiency. And the main way to streamline the permit process was through various performance process efficiencies. This is going to help tremendously.

We have 11 different data systems. They don't talk to each other very well. They're very manual, they take many steps to accomplish simple transactions in. We need to approve the efficiencies. We have inspectors writing on paper forms that are brought back to the office, punched into a data system, then they're punched in again with letters to constituents, then they're punched in again for State data systems. Many times you have four or five steps of data entry for one simple set of transactions.

We collect approximately 100,000 paper records a year, and multiple millions of data samples a year. Every year that goes, we get a little more inefficient and it gets a little more cumbersome to do work. So this is going to tremendously help us get more efficient. It's going to geospatially enable us to better map data and link into records, so offices talk to each other better internally. It's going to tremendously improve permitting, short-term with certain online services, and long-term with the full online access portal, access to electronic records. It's going to help support reduced cycle time by taking the pressure off some of the clerical functions that are currently sometimes the rate-determining step. But ultimately, from my perspective, it's going to greatly enhance environmental quality because the information is going to be at the fingertips of both us and government, as well as constituents that need this information, where now, again, it's a very cumbersome and time-consuming process.

We issued a Request for Information, got several responses. We were asked last time around to do our due diligence and we did. We found that several other counties about our size have implemented similarly situated systems. They've realized significant increases in efficiencies, as well as cost savings and operational improvements. We got ballpark cost estimates which determined that we're on the right order of magnitude here. Our proposal would be to issue Requests for Proposals, come back to the Legislature with a member who was on the selection committee, come

back to Health Committee with an actual proposal to discuss in more detail the specifics of the cost requirements, bid specs and efficiencies, and elements of performance that we expect to do moving forward before we sign a contract.

So there's been a great deal of groundwork laid. We hope that this is supported. It's going to help us tremendously moving forward. It's also a key element to the Reclaim Our Waters initiative. The State DEC is giving us a significant amount of money to digitize records by virtue of a grant that was secured by Economic Development and Planning. So in two or three years, those wastewater records that are so hard to access are not only going to be electronic, they're going to be linked with this data platform, so the staff, as well as customers and users, can access them much more efficiently.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. What's -- so what's your timeline on this? I mean, this is long overdue, and thank you. What's the timeline?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Timeline is to go to bid as soon as possible in January, get a consultant on board, and to be fully functional in early 2017, is a realistic estimate. About a year is the best case scenario to get up and running.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Anyone else?

LEG. TROTТА:

Here.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

So what is this? I'm confused. Do you have a company picked to do this already?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

No, we don't. What we did is we didn't have an appropriation, so we couldn't do any actual Request For Proposals. We did a streamlined process called a Request For Information, laying out generally what our needs and requirements are, and asking vendors to come in with basically a preliminary pre-proposal or pre-bid about solutions. And initially, when we proposed this project five or six years ago, we talked about building our own software system to accommodate our needs, and the industry has come a long way since then. We're going to go with what's called the commercial off-the-shelf software, which is significantly less expensive to construct, operate and maintain.

LEG. TROTТА:

What does this do, in two sentences?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

This provides one uniform platform. First and foremost, it takes our 11 giant bags of data that don't all talk to each other and they put them in one large database. That has an overlying database management system, which instead of being screen-driven, where you have to put in command characters --

LEG. TROTТА:

Back up, back up. What does this do? Does it take a shopping center and says, "This shopping center has these cesspools," and this is -- like is it a computer system?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Yes. Moving forward, every record is going to be digitally coded to one record. Right now, every shopping center might have three or four records. It might have a pollution control record on tanks, a food permit record, a health permit record on wastewater. These records and systems don't talk very well to each other. All these databases are going to be put in one place, so we could look up that shopping center and find out what permits have been issued, what needs to be done moving forward. That's just the permitting piece. There's a huge number of investigation databases, from drinking water to groundwater to marine, that we deal with for environmental health and sanitation purposes. All those records are going to be entered in here, so it's going to be one uniform system where all of our technical people are trained in a Windows-driven format. So somebody in Wastewater can go into the Pollution Control record, drag down and find out, oh, this guy's got up-to-snuff tanks, or, no, he's going to need those tanks, rather than sending a form over to Pollution Control and having somebody check their paper file.

LEG. TROTТА:

And this is what, is it going to cost more than \$900,000?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

No. The best estimates that we got were about \$500,000, which was significantly less, which was good news. We just know from experience that a lot of our older data in particular is going to need some scrubbing, and it's going to be a bit of labor intensiveness. So our best estimate is that when the actual bids come in, when the vendors actually look through the elements of all of our databases, it's going to be a little bit higher than 500. But 900 looks like a good number to cover us.

LEG. TROTТА:

So you can't issue a Request For Proposal specifically without the money being appropriated?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Correct.

LEG. TROTТА:

Is that like a law or something?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

I would have to defer to Administration on that.

LEG. TROTТА:

Why don't -- why can't we -- to Counsel, why can't we issue a Request For Proposal if we don't have the money appropriated?

MR. NOLAN:

I think that's -- I think that's the practice.

LEG. TROTТА:

So we don't need to.

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah.

LEG. CILMI:

We've done it the other way before. I've advocated doing it the other way before.

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah. I mean, you know, I don't think there's any prohibition against doing it either way, but I guess it makes more sense to have an appropriation in place before you go through the process of issuing an RFP.

LEG. TROTTA:

Now people know that there's a \$900,000 appropriation for this. So anybody looking at this is saying, "Oh, look, they appropriated \$900,000."

LEG. CALARCO:

May I?

P.O. GREGORY:

(Nodded yes).

LEG. CALARCO:

The problem is, is that we have the money in the 2015 budget, and if we don't appropriate the funds this year, then we will not have the money in the budget next year when the RFP would go out and come back and have an answer on it. So we could not do this, but then we would be stuck in a position of not having a place to get the money from without an offset next year.

LEG. TROTTA:

Well, if we didn't spend it this year, theoretically, we should have it next year. I mean, you could add it.

LEG. CALARCO:

That's not the way the Capital Budget works.

LEG. TROTTA:

Well, you can add it, you can add it to the Capital Budget.

LEG. CALARCO:

You would need an offset, otherwise you'd have to put it off to 2017.

LEG. TROTTA:

This just seems backwards to me. We should have done this, you know, last year and then appropriated it. I mean, I don't -- for people that -- you're going to put out a Request For Proposal, they're going to come back with it.

P.O. GREGORY:

But you've got to remember, the process is they already saw quotes, so they have an idea what the expense is going to be. So I would imagine a lot of those same firms that are going to present again should be in a similar position or quote. You're not going to bid based on the budget.

LEG. TROTTA:

I don't think it's good business to have a quote of 500,000 and then tell everyone you're going to appropriate 900,000.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yeah, but it's based on information that they received from the bidding process. And also, in RFPs, when you do that, you're in a restricted time window. So, generally, in the language, it's 60 to 90 days before you have to execute an agreement.

LEG. TROTТА:

You're the RFP -- you can write the RFP. You don't have to limit yourself to 60 or 90 days, you can demand that it's for a year.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yeah, but generally it's not done that way.

LEG. TROTТА:

Now I know why I voted no. Okay, thanks.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Kennedy, did you have a question, too?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I have a question. Didn't we just vote to hire a pile of B.I. people in I.T. to write our programs? Why are we going out for programs, computer programs?

P.O. GREGORY:

No. I think you're talking about the --

MR. NOLAN:

We created some titles. I don't know we hired anybody.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And they're hiring?

MR. NOLAN:

They're not -- well, I don't know that. We created titles.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Hi, Walter.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Good afternoon.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It sounds great in theory. There are other jurisdictions that have implemented what you're trying to do; is that correct?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And, I mean, this is long overdue. It's certainly moving us in the right direction. It's

customer-friendly, if you will, where I can go online onto a website, or someone working within the County can go into the websites or access the data from all these various departments where each department will be part of an application process, let's say. So if someone calls up and has one inquiry -- has an inquiry to one department, but the answer depends on what three other departments are doing, that person should ultimately be able to look at all the data in one place and give someone a real update as to what's happening and why, and where you're at and what the timing is.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Exactly, Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah. So this is -- this is a very ambitious project for the County. You're talking about a massive amount of data that would ultimately have to be put into this system. Will the -- will the solicitations and the software consider security as well? It's going to be a very high priority.

One of the arguments against doing things like this is that once you give one person access to everything, you know, how do you -- how do you look over that person's shoulder? So do you know anything about the software or how this is done?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

I could give you my general layman's answer, which will hopefully be good enough. If not, Scott Mastellon may be in the house from Information Technology. But basically, right now, for accessing information, certain information is sensitive. National infrastructure concern, that stuff is just not subject to anybody's FOIL, like location of tanks that could blow up if they're hit with missiles. That stuff is scrubbed out of the system so the public can't get at it.

In terms of operational information for permits, key staff who are professional level who need to have access to enter the system to put data in, as well as look at information, are given that under a closely authorized administrator system. Other staff like myself who might make errors, because I don't enter data on a day-to-day basis, would be given read-only for certain sort of information. Staff further away would probably have a web portal, which would be structured for public friendliness. And I don't want to oversell what's going to happen in year one. It's going to be very, very important, but for year one, probably permit renewals will be automated, either online or with paper bar codes. Our goal is to get the full permit process over roughly --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Give me an example, what permit would be renewable?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

A pollution control operating permit for tanks.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So you can -- instead of going through a paper application and calling up and seeing where am I at, you can literally apply online and process this whole thing online?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Those sorts of renewals, swimming pools, bathing beaches. There's a number of different classes of permits.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right, right. So does the 900,000 include the data inputting and the personnel that are needed?

It's going to be a lot of man-hours to do this.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Yeah. Actually, it's going to save us time in the long run. Basically --

LEG. D'AMARO:

No, no. But my question is, is the 900,000 that we're talking about here, is that the total cost of not only the software, the installation, the training, the data input? You know, is the whole thing -- the whole project up and running, or is there going to be more components and expenditure for this?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Correct. It's going to be the migration of all of the digital data sets that are currently in our databases, which include attributes associated with permits, physical sampling numbers. It will not include each and every record in every file, and I want to make that clear also. So somebody that applied to Wastewater in 1970 that may have had a cesspool permit, that stuff is not going to be retroactively entered in the first phase, but we do plan on doing that over the next few years using the supplemental straight grant.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. So that's smart. So you want to start with the current information and move forward, and then eventually you can get to the older stuff, but -- so that's included in the cost?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

The data migration, as you say?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Is it going to be difficult to migrate that data over to this one system?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

I would defer to the I.T. people on that, but with a price tag that high, it can't be that easy. I mean, a lot of the data, some of it goes very smoothly, other data has glitches in the format that needs to be looked at and scrubbed out, they call it. And there are factors that are used for different qualities of data sets.

LEG. D'AMARO:

How would this speed up the permit process?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

This is going to speed up the permit process by shaving time off of critical steps, like a clerical having to go to a file, giving a piece of paper to another office, going to another file, looking something up. I mean, this takes minutes per step and days of cycle process time that it adds, where, instead, one analyst can look in and find out all the information they need to associate with a given application.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah. Like if you call the Suffolk County Treasurer and you give them a parcel's street address or a tax lot identification number, they will tell you right on the phone, you know, they'll look it right up

what the tax arrears are, what you owe, what the person owes, you know, if it's delinquent taxes. So this would be similar, where when you call in now and you're a commercial builder and you have some -- three permits pending in three different apartments -- departments, or one or two, usually what will happen is they'll take the information and say, you know, "We'll get back to you," because you don't have it in front of you, you just don't know. But now that will change over time where that information will all be readily accessible to be given much quicker to whoever might be applying, so then they can react and that would speed the process?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, okay. So the 900,000 gets this whole thing up and running?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Yes. We have 900,000 in this year's Capital Budget, and for 2017, there's one final authorization of \$200,000. One hundred thousand is for equipment, necessary hardware like laptops or hand-helds for all the sanitarians to be able to digitally enter information out in the field. They could be remotely uploaded to populate not only the database, but applications like letter notices, permit notices, data entry to the State, which, again, is going to be faster and more efficient than any incidental hardware needs --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right, but you don't get to that until you have the whole system up and running.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It makes sense. Okay. Good luck.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Thank you, sir.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

LEG. BARRAGA:

Opposed.

LEG. KENNEDY:

(Raised hand).

LEG. TROTTA:

Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen. Fifteen.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

You have me, right?

MR. RICHBERG:

I have you.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Okay. *I.R. 1939A*, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

(Not Present)

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. Fourteen, sorry. (Not Present: Legislator Cilmi)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. *I.R. 1990 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds for a new Wyandanch Health Center (CP 4088) (Co. Exec.).*

LEG. D'AMARO:

Mr. Presiding Officer, please note my recusal for the record.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes, I will.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. I make a motion to approve.

LEG. SPENCER:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Spencer.

LEG. TROTTA:

Motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion -- who was that? Motion to table by Legislator Trotta.

LEG. KENNEDY:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. CILMI:

For 1990.

P.O. GREGORY:

1990. It was a good year, I was a junior in college.

MR. NOLAN:

You get the whole life story.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. SPENCER:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Who was that? Legislator Spencer, okay.

LEG. SPENCER:

We had extensive testimony regarding this in the Health Committee, and the benefit of this, one of the things that the Federal Government is looking to do is, as well as the Federally Qualified Health Centers, is put a lot of money directing to the states to invest in something called DSRIP, Delivery System Reform Incentive Plan. And what they're looking to do is to basically provide financing and systems that have kind of a comprehensive plan of management, so when someone is discharged, that they have support services at home.

And when we look at our health centers that we have transitioned over to Hudson River, there's substantial dollars that are competitive in these projects. And we applied for, with our health centers, the one at Wyandanch and the one that's following up -- what's the second one? The new Patchogue Health Center. And out of the 39, I think, potential sites, we were ranked second and third. I may be wrong on the total number, but it was very competitive. And this gives us a chance to get substantial dollars that will come in to help us do the revisions to have a modern health center.

And one of the things I think that's important, too, is that as we modernize our health care clinics where there are places that are -- that have the technology, you're going to deliver better health care. And in the long run, it's going to lead to less errors, it's going to lead to more productivity, and it's going to save us substantial dollars. So these are supported funds that we're investing, and that's why, as it was vetted in the Health Committee, it came out of the committee that we were supporting it. And I think that -- you know, that was the majority of the members. So this is a great opportunity for us and that's why I made the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. And Legislator Krupski has -- wants to chime in.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I've got a question. What currently exists there? I mean, we're operating -- Hudson River operates a health center in Wyandanch?

P.O. GREGORY:

I could answer that. Yeah, this -- this health center is in my district. It's the oldest health center in the system. I used to go there as a kid, and so it's at least 46, 47 years old. It's a renovated old supermarket. And what they're looking to do is to move it to a new facility about a block, two blocks away. And, you know, this program, DSRIP program is something that the Governor has been promoting. There are various agencies that are eligible for DSRIP funding. This is going to improve the quality of service there. There's going to be a new building. The community is very much in

support of it.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

The question is why would the County be involved? I thought we transitioned away from health centers. Why is the County involved?

P.O. GREGORY:

The Counsel isn't here, but, you know, under our agreements, we have obligation to provide a location for the next 15 years, if I remember. It's a number of years. We have Counsel coming up.

MS. SEIDMAN:

Hi. Good afternoon. Phyllis Seidman for the County Attorney's Office.

P.O. GREGORY:

The question was from Legislator Krupski, why are we --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Why --

P.O. GREGORY:

Go ahead, you can ask it.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. So why would we make this investment as a County if Hudson River has taken over the health care, our facility and operation?

MS. SEIDMAN:

Right. So as we explained in the committee, and we've explained from time to time in the past when issues came up, the partnership with HRH require that we provide them space to operate an FQHC facility. So they would take over the direct provision of health care and we would provide them with County space, whether it was leased from a third party or in the health centers that the County owns. I apologize, I'm losing my voice.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Well, that's fine. Sorry about that. I'll try to keep my questions brief, then. So if we're supposed to provide them with 15 years, which at this point would be more like 14 years --

MS. SEIDMAN:

Well, it's not necessarily a number of years. The years that we've -- that we've determined were based on various factors. For example, in a couple of the health centers, there was other State money applied from prior grants, such as our HEAL Grant, for example, in the Riverhead Health Center, I believe, and that required us to provide health care at that site for at least 12 years. So, you know, our leases were based on other factors or for how long our proprietary lease was.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So in this case, this case in Wyandanch, how many years are we obligated? How many more years are we obligated to provide them with space?

MS. SEIDMAN:

Well, currently, since that lease was expiring and hasn't been renewed at this point, since we're exploring our options for the facility itself, whether to renovate or to move it, because it is part of Wyandanch Rising, what we've determined to do is at the point of contracting with them for the

subsidy they receive for five years under our Community Benefit Grant contract, we've essentially contractually obligated the County to provide them with space for those five years.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So --

MS. SEIDMAN:

With the -- if I can just --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Sorry, I thought you were done. Go ahead.

MS. SEIDMAN:

No, that's okay. I just wanted --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No, go ahead.

MS. SEIDMAN:

The intent was we would -- we would do that for the life of the Community Benefit Grant, but the intent was to provide them with space to continue providing health services in that area.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So -- but you said for five years.

MS. SEIDMAN:

Currently, that's our contractual obligation.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Okay. So then why would we build a new facility and with a 30-year bond?

MS. SEIDMAN:

Well, I think that the message from the Legislature has been that they do want to continue to provide health centers in their districts. So with that in mind, and with money available, we were moving forward in that direction.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So you're saying that the message you received here was that we would always provide space for someone to operate a health care center in the County, and we would be obligated to provide the space and maintain it?

MS. SEIDMAN:

Well, I think that's how we've progressed for at least five of the eight. You know, in one, it's a different circumstance, and these two, the lease was expiring. So, you know, the thought was we didn't think that, or at least it's really not the plan at this point that we would discontinue providing a health center in Wyandanch and in Patchogue, so we are planning for the future of those centers.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So suppose the -- just suppose, because I don't -- really, I'm not quite following, I'm sorry -- that the County's finances were really bad, and that we couldn't afford to build these new health centers and pay for their possibly upkeep, and which I'm going to ask next if we're responsible for the buildings, the utilities and the maintenance and cleaning and everything, what would Hudson -- and we fulfilled our obligation here, in this case, Wyandanch, for five years. What would happen to the

operation there if after five years of fulfilling our obligation the County said, "No, we can't afford maintain this building anymore and we're effectively not going to house you"?

DR. TOMARKEN:

I can't answer that at this time. I think once the five years is up, then it would be renegotiated. But there's a perspective, I think, that's being missed here. This is a unique opportunity. This is a matching grant that DSRIP has offered, the State has offered us to build together with their money and our money two new health centers or lease and renovate. So this is a little different than the previous health center. So this is a matching grant, and what's being asked for today is to match on a one-to-one basis what the State, if they award it, would provide us for these two health centers, which we have a commitment to provide some physical plant. So this is an extra opportunity to build very nice health centers with expanded services that DSRIP wants to see built, which includes things like urgent care center, dental care, behavioral health, which the other centers may or may not have, depending on their circumstances. So this is a unique situation that the State presented to us. We came up with a plan, and we've -- and the capital project is to build -- to obtain two new centers, because both centers have had their leases expire.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And what about the vendor, do they put anything into this?

DR. TOMARKEN:

The vendor being HRH?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Hudson River.

DR. TOMARKEN:

No. This is State money and County.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And what about the -- what about the -- what about the -- currently, we pay the rent and the maintenance and upkeep on the current facility?

MS. SEIDMAN:

Well, no. Hudson River, under the terms of the sublease with the County, provides their own custodial and maintenance upkeep, utilities.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Would they -- would that be the same arrangement? Should we pass this and they build it, you know, by the first of the year and they move in, would that be the same arrangement where they would pay for the custodial, and maintenance, and upkeep and utilities?

MS. SEIDMAN:

I don't see why it wouldn't be. That's the way we've operated for all the centers.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

Get ready. So we got out of the health clinic. We were told by the Administration that we were getting out of this to save money, and not three months later you're coming back for millions of dollars.

MS. SEIDMAN:

We got out of providing direct health care, yes, with a savings of approximately \$7 million.

LEG. TROTТА:

We're not under any -- under any requirement to have these things, are we?

MS. SEIDMAN:

We are under no requirement.

LEG. TROTТА:

Okay. And nowhere else that this health care, or whatever it's called, they don't -- they pay the rent everywhere else. Only in this County do they pay -- do we pay for their stuff.

MS. SEIDMAN:

I don't know that to be --

LEG. TROTТА:

It's true, because I had her up there and she said that that was -- so why are we -- we were just going to save money, now we're spending this money. This is absurd. This is absolutely absurd that we're going to build them new things for -- and pay for them for 30 years when we're flat busted broke. This is absolute insanity that we're even considering this. And then you can use the matching funds, it's still taxpayer money.

MS. SEIDMAN:

All right. So it's really not for them, it's really for the residents in the district.

LEG. TROTТА:

No, it's for them. That woman who owns that place makes \$600,000. I looked at all their salaries. They're making plenty of money. They can do -- they could pay for this themselves. To ask the taxpayers to do it when these not-for-profits are making tons and tons of money off taxpayers' back, that's wrong, and no one should support. If that woman was making 200,000 or \$150,000 a year, that's one thing, but for her to be lining her pockets with taxpayers' money is wrong. I would never support this. I don't think anybody should support this.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Anyone else?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yeah, right here.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, I'm sorry. Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Let me ask you a question. This bond issue is for \$6,800,000. Is that what you anticipate the cost of construction would be?

MS. SEIDMAN:

I can't speak to that issue, I don't know.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Is there anybody who can speak to that issue?

MS. SEIDMAN:

And I just want to clarify, I think at this point they just want to appropriate the funding; is that correct?

MR. NOLAN:

There's no bond.

LEG. BARRAGA:

There's no bond.

MS. SEIDMAN:

No bond.

LEG. BARRAGA:

But I'm just trying to get a handle in terms of what the overall cost is. Is it 6,800,000, is that what you anticipate once this construction is started and completed, is that the idea?

MS. SEIDMAN:

I can't speak to that.

MS. CAPOBIANCO:

What we're asking for today is an appropriation of a Capital Budget amount. We're not asking for authorization to issue bonds. This is strictly to verify that we have the matching funds in place, and if DSRIP awards the grants to us, then we would come back to the Legislature and ask to issue bonds. The Fiscal Impact Statement shows that the bonds would be over a 15-year period, not 30 years, as I think someone had said.

LEG. BARRAGA:

So, at this juncture, we don't have any idea what the State or the Federal Government is willing to pay in terms of matching monies.

MS. CAPOBIANCO:

It's a one-to-one match.

LEG. BARRAGA:

We don't know what that -- you know, for example, I think we had a bill about 20 minutes ago for Suffolk County Community College with reference to equipment. If we spent \$500,000 by the end of the year, the State was going to come in with 500,000.

MS. CAPOBIANCO:

Well, this is a special grant under the Capital Restructuring Financing Program, and the application that was submitted to DSRIP for the Wyandanch facility was \$8 million in total, and for Patchogue was 8,775,000. So these grants were ranked very highly out of all the applications that were made in Suffolk County, and we have reason to believe that it's a very good chance that we would get the grant.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Why not wait until you find out if you've gotten the grant before you proceed with this?

MS. CAPOBIANCO:

Because as part of the application that was filed earlier this year, we had to verify the availability of the funds. The funds have been identified in the 2015 Capital Budget, and if they're not appropriated by the end of the year, they would be lost.

LEG. BARRAGA:

All right. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. Anyone else? All right. We have -- oh, we have -- oh, yeah, we have a motion to table, that goes first. Okay. Roll call.

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

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

No.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Recuse.

LEG. STERN:

Table, yeah. No.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes to table.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes to table.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

No.

LEG. LINDSAY:

No.

LEG. CALARCO:

No.

LEG. ANKER:

No.

LEG. HAHN:

Pass.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

No to table. Sorry.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes to table.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes to table.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No to table.

P.O. GREGORY:

No to table.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eight.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Motion to approve. Roll call.

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

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

(Recuse)

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

No.

LEG. TROTTA:

Absolutely not.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

No.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

No.

LEG. BROWNING:

No.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No.

MR. RICHBERG:

Nine.

P.O. GREGORY:

Jay.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

You didn't call me.

MR. RICHBERG:

I'm sorry.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Ten.

P.O. GREGORY:

Just one more day.

MR. RICHBERG:

I wanted to make sure you were awake.

(*Laughter*)

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

That made a difference in the vote, didn't it?

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. *I.R. 1991 - Requesting Legislative approval of a contract award for Peconic Estuary Eelgrass Assessment Services for the Department of Health Services, Division of Environmental Quality(Co. Exec.)*. Motion by Legislator Hahn, I will second. Anyone on the motion?

LEG. TROTТА:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTТА:

Did that pass?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTТА:

I think you only had nine.

LEG. TROTТА:

No, nine. It was nine.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I thought you had ten.

LEG. TROTТА:

Nine. He recused himself.

MR. RICHBERG:

No, nine. Nine.

MR. NOLAN:

So 1990 fails.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. 1990 fails. All right.

MR. NOLAN:

Can you double-check that?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yeah, double-check that.

MR. NOLAN:

Just make sure it's right.

MR. RICHBERG:

Nine.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. *I.R. 1991*, motion, right, Legislator Hahn?

LEG. HAHN:

Yeah.

MR. RICHBERG:

We have a motion and a second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. D'AMARO:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Who's that? Oh, I'm sorry.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah. Is there anyone here from the County Executive's Office that can answer questions on this bill? We're on 1991; is that correct?

LEG. CILMI:

(Nodded yes).

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Legislator D'Amaro, Walter Dawydiak, Environmental Quality.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Hi, Walter. Okay. So how many times have we awarded this same contract?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

This same contract?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, you know, the service that we're -- the notes here or the bill says a contract award for Peconic Estuary Eelgrass Assessment Services. All right. So someone's been assessing the Peconic Estuary Eelgrass.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Who's been doing that up to this point?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

This has been done primarily by Cornell Cooperative Extension historically, but other entities have also been involved. This particular contract is a new and different type of effort. It's for bio-optical modeling to look at sources in relation to impacts to help come up with nitrogen reduction loading.

This would be go to Stony Brook. Stony Brook was the only entity that bid on this. It needs to go to the Legislature because of the procedural formality that when you only got one bidder, you need Legislative approval.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So Cornell has been assessing our eelgrass up to this point?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Cornell has done a lot of the long-term monitoring work. There may have been others involved historically.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. What's been the result of Cornell's efforts?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

In terms of eelgrass restoration and monitoring?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

They have certainly documented that a lot of eelgrass has disappeared. There's been some limited success in --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, but we knew that 15 years ago.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

What we know now is that certain conditions favor eelgrass. There's a temperature dependence, as well as a light extinction function, and that light extinction relates to nutrients and Chlorophyll A.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Is the eelgrass today worse off or better off than it has been over the last five years?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Worse.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It's getting worse?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Generally, eelgrass has been on the decline.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So how -- and how long have we been monitoring our eelgrass, like 20 years?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

I don't have a specific answer, but it would be -- it's been going on for that 10 to 20-year range.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Does -- I think we've had this discussion before. In addition to monitoring, which we have collected all this data over the years and we know it's getting worse, has there been any type of solution

that's been implemented, or are we just watching it disappear and paying to watch it disappear?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

It's been a multi-pronged effort. There have been some restoration efforts which have not been entirely successful, largely because the conditions that need to be present to sustain eelgrass are not there.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Why is the eelgrass disappearing?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

There are several factors that have been involved historically, and I'm the Marine Biologist.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Do we still need to explore the "why" question, do you think? Don't we know why?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

The thing that we need to do is to reduce the nitrogen loading, because this is something that we can --

LEG. D'AMARO:

But we -- I agree with you. We talk about that all the time, you know, septic systems and sewers. And I passed a bill to limit the application of fertilizer in winter months, you know, so you don't have it in runoff. You know, we're doing all of that, but why are we still monitoring the eelgrass?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

The real question is how much nitrogen we need to reduce and where.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But it doesn't -- we haven't even made a dent in reducing nitrogen yet. That's a question that answers itself. We have to reduce it, but why are we monitoring the eelgrass?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

There is a commitment on the part of the County to set up a Wastewater District and implement the Comprehensive Water Resources Management Plan. There are going to be new septic systems on the market in the next year, and some major programs to upgrade preexisting septic systems in the coming years. The challenge is how to spend all that money most wisely where and to what performance standard. This is an \$82,000 contract, which the Federal Government has earmarked the money for for the Peconic Estuary Program, is a 100% pass-through. It's a Management Committee appropriation. This is County money, and it wasn't a County decision to spend the money. It was EPA, DEC, the County and a number of other stakeholders that determined that this was a critical piece of information to guide eelgrass restoration, as well as nutrient reduction.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I think that we've been doing this for many, many years. I think we know the problem with the eelgrass. I think we know why it's disappearing. I think we know what the solutions are, which are very costly, and long-term solutions, and very difficult to implement. I don't see the need to continue a contract to monitor the eelgrass.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Just to clarify, this is different than strict monitoring. This has to do with bio-optical model development. There's a lot of new information about eelgrass, both in terms of Chlorophyll A --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Bio-optical, you mean put sunlight on it?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

The degree of which light needs to penetrate to the bottom to make the eelgrass --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, we know that already.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

We do, but we don't know how the Chlorophyll A relates to the suspended solids until they're dissolved in colloidal particles and --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Someone's got to know that by now.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

You'd be surprised at how much scientists don't know, Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No, no, somebody knows that. Somebody knows that. Somebody knows that out there. Listen, I am all for science, and research, and monitoring, and protecting our environment, but I have been here for 10 years and for 10 years we've been having the same contract, the same discussion. We know the problems, we know what causes the problem, we know what the solutions are. You know, we're just like -- we keep throwing money at the same thing over and over and over again. I'd rather take the 97,000 and put it towards a solution.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Again, I respect your sentiment entirely, and we share your commitment to moving forward with implementation.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I know you do.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

I would emphasize that this is 100% Federal grant funding.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I know, but it's still taxpayer money, I mean, you know.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

It is, but it's free money to Suffolk County.

LEG. D'AMARO:

The reason why we have a vote on pass-through money is because we can also make a decision on whether or not it's well spent taxpayer money, whether it's from the Federal Government, the State or our own, right? So you're not convincing me that we need to continue to monitor the eelgrass. We already know everything about eelgrass that anyone could ever possibly want to know.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

I respectfully disagree on the science, Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But you said that five years ago when we had this discussion.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

I think the state of the knowledge has moved us to a place where the County has committed to this pre-existing legacy problem. Out of these 350,000 septics, we know that 210,000 are in sensitive areas. I can't stand here before you today and tell you we need to upgrade 30,000 or 100,000, or something in between. This is an important piece of that puzzle that's going to help us to get to that answer. The State's committed \$5 million for the Nitrogen Action Plan. The County has all these demos going, the code changes are in the works, and this is the sort of information that's going to help --

LEG. D'AMARO:

I bet you you could use last year's monitoring and get the same -- moving forward, you can use last year's study to get the same results and the same -- continue with the -- with trying to find resolutions.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

I could tell you that a model does not currently exist.

LEG. D'AMARO:

What model?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

The bio-optical model to partition nitrogen and the Chlorophyll A versus the eelgrass to help give us an indication of how much load we need to reduce.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It's a big waste of money, in my opinion. It doesn't even matter if it's \$1 at this point. We really -- and I'm not really kidding, we know everything there is -- we know what the problem is. We need to find answers, we need solutions. So I'm not supporting this. Thank you.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

I completely disagree with Legislator D'Amaro, although, you know, we've over and over again disagreed on this, because I understand monitoring, the importance of monitoring over time, and to know if you're going up, going down. Research, new research is important to find out the very fine and specific details that you described that I never would be able to repeat the way you did because of your level of expertise in this area. This particular grant, we are both continuing monitoring that's been going on for a number of years, as well as finding new information, is that what you said?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

It's going to be primarily to integrate a lot of historic data and put it through the lens of a new modeling effort. There would be some very limited data collection that happens to supplement it and to refine it this coming summer, but it will be primarily based on pre-existing data and development of a new assessment tool.

LEG. HAHN:

But just to be clear, by no means are we stopping the collection of data on nitrogen and eelgrass, and all the -- all the monitoring instruments that we've put out there on these items and other -- and many others for water quality purposes. It's important that every year, every month, every --

whatever it is, weekly, bi-weekly, bi-monthly, whatever it is, that we have that data to fill in the models.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Correct. The baseline work is going on. This was a special supplemental add-on. Again, it's 100% EPA funding. Nitrogen and septic load reductions are the top priority of the Peconic Estuary Program, as they are for Suffolk County, and the Peconic thought that this was an important way that they could contribute Federal money to helping guide our load reduction allocations.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

One of my questions was answered, but I just want to ask this question. Al, Peconic Estuaries is in your District?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And you feel that using the estuary grant for this purpose is worthwhile?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes, I do.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Good enough for me.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's all I have. I'm going to say one thing too. I don't have any other Legislators.

You know, in the conversation about eelgrass, and, yes, we are monitoring the decline of eelgrass, so is the entire region. It is moving, migrating northward, because our species of eelgrass is a cold water species, and we're seeing our water warm up. That's not the only thing. Nitrogen certainly impacts if the bottom plants don't receive sunlight, or there's less oxygen as algae decomposed. But also the movement of water is really important to eelgrass, and we haven't dredged. Some areas have shoed in. We're not seeing as much water movement in some of these areas that the eelgrass was really dependent upon that constant pull and push of the water.

So I'm sure you know all these things, you're the Biologist. But even if we, you know, bring the nitrogen down, which is going to take many, many years to see, you know, a meaningful impact, we still have other conditions that are going to make it very hard to see eelgrass return. Though there might be some other solutions to bring in colder, you know, more oxygenated water into some of these areas, that could impact those areas.

So monitoring is important, but we want to take the information and then use it to try to come up with some solutions that will make a difference, because without eelgrass, we don't have scallops, and we don't have other marine life that depend upon eelgrass for habitat. So I'm just throwing it out there.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Well said, Legislator Schneiderman. Just for the record, I'm an Engineer, not a Biologist. I avoid biology where possible.

P.O. GREGORY:

Anyone else who wants to weigh in on this? All right. Let's call the vote. Mr. Clerk, do we have a motion and a second?

MR. RICHBERG:

We have a motion and a second to approve.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. All in favor? Opposed?

*(*Opposed: Legislators Cilmi, Barraga and D'Amaro*)*

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Sorry, 15.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Fifteen.

MR. RICHBERG:

I said 15.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Sorry.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***1993 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds for a New Patchogue Health Center (CP 4087)(Co. Exec.).***

LEG. CALARCO:

Motion.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion by --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Oh, please note my recusal for the record.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. TROTTA:

Motion to table.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to table by -- was that Legislator Trotta? Second by Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. SPENCER:

On the motion.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

On the motion, Dr. Spencer.

LEG. SPENCER:

I was wondering if someone from the Administration, Jen, could you come back? I had a question as far as the last health center we were talking about, we didn't pass because of the concern that why should we give them space after they've taken over. Is this arrangement spelled out in the contract, that we provide the space for Hudson River over this period of time?

MS. CULP:

With all of the health center transitions to date, or the majority of them, the County has remained committed to providing the space. So whether it's within a County-owned building or we're subleasing through, you know, a tenant or a leased space to HRH. With these two particular sites, MLK and Patchogue, both of those leases were near end. Both of those buildings are in need of either renovation or relocation and expansion to meet services. With the DSRIP opportunity, we saw it as a great opportunity to have matching funds come down. What has -- was put forth in the Community Benefit Grant was that the County would be committed to securing space for Hudson River for the period of five years, as that's the period of time for the Community Benefit Grant. In the other cases, it was dependent upon the time of the lease, as Phyllis had mentioned earlier.

LEG. SPENCER:

So with the understanding of just having a divided Legislature, where the perception is that, you know, why should we spend this, if we shoot this down, we still are under that contract. So is this -- is it fair to say, is this a matter of paying nothing or is it a matter of paying half price or full price?

MS. CULP:

I think it's fair to say that we are committed to having -- being responsible for two locations, and that today was about securing funds to be able to pay half price, to have matching funds for -- to bring into the community to both meet the needs of the communities, but also meet the needs of DSRIP, which is a statewide initiative, with the goal of reducing unnecessary hospital admissions by 25% over five years.

LEG. SPENCER:

So, if we defer this today, it's potentially -- what we're saying, it doesn't go away. It doesn't -- we're not off the hook. We're just saying we're not going to do; that at some point we're going to have to pay to be able to keep our contractual obligation, and if we don't, there could be consequences of it. And the Administration were put in the position whereby being maybe a -- penny foolish at this point, that we're going to pay full price later on. That's, you know, my concern.

DR. TOMARKEN:

In a nutshell, that's correct. And I would just point out that since the first health center was

transitioned, which was Coram, there's a long-term lease there that we continue to honor in the neighborhood of 20 years. So this has been a standard approach to all the health center transitions, except one in the Hamptons, which was a very unique situation where there was -- the hospital had property. So this is not something new. This is -- what's new is the opportunity to have money from the State match our money.

LEG. SPENCER:

And each one of these contracts came before this Legislature. We looked at them, we had a chance to review them, we understood the terms, we understood every aspect that was provided to us. And so where we voted down that last resolution, it's not like, well, oh, we just saved \$6 million. It's that we are going to have to spend -- we saved 3 million, we're going to have to spend 6 million next year or the year after that. We just said we're not taking the money.

MS. CULP:

Right. We're still going to have to figure out how we're going to support the space of these health centers. What was important -- what's important about today is the applications ranked very highly because of the matching funds. So that's why it's important to appropriate today so those funds are still here, so when the grant awards do come down from the State, that we don't jeopardize that high ranking.

LEG. SPENCER:

And so next year, let's say we don't do this and we apply again, my understanding of the way that the application process, the fact that we couldn't come up -- we applied and we said we're rejecting this money, it's not like we can just turn around and have the same favorable position next year. It could potentially jeopardize our application for future funds when we're looking at these issues.

MS. CULP:

Correct.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you very much.

MS. CAPOBIANCO:

I'm sorry. I just wanted to add one more thing. The grant application, the award is contingent upon verifiable proof of the proposed match. So if the funds are not appropriated, it's more than just paying half, half the amount or the whole amount. The award could be in jeopardy if we don't have verifiable proof of the match, and that's why it's so important today to appropriate the funds.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Could we continue to rent?

MS. CULP:

At this point, I think MLK is month to month.

MS. SEIDMAN:

Both of the Patchogue and Wyandanch leases have expired. So if you look at it as we could continue to rent or find new space, it's very difficult to -- and both health centers are in dire need of either renovation or replacement. So to move a health center is a task that isn't accomplished quickly or cheaply, unfortunately. So, you know, it would have to be a build-out. So even if we did lease space, any money we could apply to the build-out, my understanding is it would save us money in

the long run not to have to pay that premium to a landlord for a build-out. It's a very particular footprint that you need to build.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Legislator Calarco.

LEG. CALARCO:

Thank you. Yeah, this particular project, for those of you who aren't familiar with the Patchogue facility, it's an old Hills Department Store that's over 30 years old. It sits on Main -- East Main Street in East Patchogue. And, quite honestly, while it does a tremendous service for the patients that go there, the facility is in very poor shape. It's in a very bad location from the perspective of economic development. The County actually invested dollars to help with the condemnation of the Plaza Theater, which was adjacent to this property, and this can't be property developed without this property being a portion of that project. And, quite honestly, the lease has expired. The community called four or five years ago for us to relocate this facility, and that's what we have been working on trying to do. We have a site that is adjacent to Brookhaven Memorial Hospital where we would like to go, which takes it right out of the Main Street area, but puts it still along major transportation, and actually accomplishes the goal of the DSRIP grant, which is to keep people from going to the emergency room, and give them proper care in the appropriate setting.

This is something that we knew was coming down the pike, and as we spoke to Hudson River about their taking over the Patchogue facility, we -- I know I asked repetitively on the record about us being prepared and understanding that we were going to have to relocate the facility. Quite honestly, over the course of the summer, we had to shut the building down for a couple of days, because we had issues with the waste line coming out of this building. So one way or the other, we're going to have to make a substantial investment. And if we have to pay a substantial amount out to build out the facility while we're paying well over \$400,000 a year in rent on the facility, it just seems penny wise and pound foolish, when we can get a substantial amount of money from the Federal -- from the State government to help offset those costs and us to own the facility, which, ultimately, after the end of the 15 years with Hudson River, we could potentially lease back to them and actually make some revenue there. And that's, you know, what we're looking to do.

This is not a big surprise that they were going to be coming over with these proposals and these resolutions. It was in the Capital Budget that was presented to us in the spring, that they were going to be looking to do the amendments this year to facilitate both the Patchogue Health Center and the Wyandanch Health Center to be relocated to more appropriate settings, and that's what we are trying to accomplish here. We can say we don't, you know, want to provide them with -- you know, spend the money to provide them with an appropriate space to operate, but that's doing a disservice to my community, quite honestly, we're doing a disservice to the Wyandanch community, and, at the end of the day, it's going to just cost us more money when we could be getting a seven-and-a-half million dollar matching grant.

And, honestly, this isn't even appropriating the bond, this isn't even authorizing the bond. We're just saying let's make sure that that match is there should the State funding come in place. And if it doesn't, then we will have to -- you know, reevaluate what is the best way moving forward and most cost effective way moving forward. But this is going to set us up to be able to obtain a matching grant from the State to facilitate something that we knew we were going to have to do.

P.O. GREGORY:

I got one more. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. I've got a question for the Health Department. For the Patchogue location, how much --

I've got a paper here, it says we pay over \$525,000 in rent a year, with an escalator.

MS. CAPOBIANCO:

The rent in 2015 for Patchogue was \$466,000 a year.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

When is that lease up? When does that lease expire?

MS. CAPOBIANCO:

The Patchogue lease expired in June of '15.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So what is the -- what do we pay next year? 525,000, is that it?

DR. TOMARKEN:

We're getting the number for you.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So if we're going to -- why would we -- why would we seek a lease on the existing building if the proposal is to build a new one?

DR. TOMARKEN:

Well, whatever facility we would get, either an older facility that needed renovation or building from scratch, it could take up to a year, year-and-a-half for that to be finished, so we still need to stay where we are during that time.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Would we be able to get out of a lease? Suppose it was built in a year-and-a-half. Would we be able to get out of the other lease?

MS. CAPOBIANCO:

Okay. I have some clarification. The lease at Patchogue expired June 30th, 2015. There's a proposal to extend that lease for a three-year period. You're correct, the first year of the lease extension would be 525,000 per year.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And what would be the -- all right. What's our -- what's our obligation to Hudson River? How many years are we obligated to house them in Patchogue?

MS. SEIDMAN:

Currently, we have an obligation to house them for the five years of the Community Benefit Grant, which I believe was signed in 2014.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And how many -- so we would bond this money for how many years to build a new facility?

MS. CAPOBIANCO:

Yeah. The Fiscal Impact Statement showed a 15-year bond for the building improvements.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And after our obligation was over in 2019, what would we do with the building?

MS. SEIDMAN:

I couldn't speak to that at this point. I don't think anybody here could speak to that. I mean, we'd have to determine where we were at that point in time and a decision would need to be made by this Legislature what to do with the building.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I mean, it seems like Wyandanch is a longer-term obligation. Here there's only a four-year obligation.

MS. SEIDMAN:

Well, that's only because we didn't make a commitment for housing the facility longer, because we didn't really have anything to show them at the time. With the other facilities, we were -- we were in a long-term lease or we owned the facility. So we were able to extend out our agreement to house them over a longer periods of time. But because the leases for Wyandanch and Patchogue were expiring, we just guaranteed them what was available under the -- for the five-year term of the Community Benefit Grant. And they needed that for their certification for their FQHC status and also for their Certificate of Necessity from New York State. They needed to show that somebody was going to provide a place for this health center for the five years for which we were funding them. So that's why in those cases they were for five years. We couldn't give them a sublease for longer than the term of our proprietary leases at Patchogue and Wyandanch for obvious reasons, so we became month-to-month tenants, and we couldn't give them more than that. But the plan was to provide -- I mean, we didn't transition the health center not to provide them with someplace to house the facility going forward into the future.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MS. SEIDMAN:

I'm sorry. And so I think the point needed to made that any further decisions about bonding and space, leasing or buying would come before this Legislature in the future.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Kennedy?

LEG. KENNEDY:

We have intention to keep the Patchogue clinic longer than the five years we contracted for, correct? Anybody want to answer? Rob, you said 15 years?

LEG. CALARCO:

I thought we were 15. Apparently, I was --

DR. TOMARKEN:

Yes, the clinics we want to keep going as long as possible. It's the facilities that is the sticking point.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Correct, correct. Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

I want to get this straight. Whoever was up here said we have five years left on this Patchogue lease, four years left? Hello, someone from the County Executive's Office, somebody?

MS. SEIDMAN:

No. We have -- we have no time left. That lease expired in June.

LEG. TROTТА:

Okay. But you have four years that you have that you negotiated, we're going to pay their rent.

MS. SEIDMAN:

Correct.

LEG. TROTТА:

Okay. So you want to borrow millions of dollars and bring it out over 15 years?

MS. SEIDMAN:

I believe that's the plan of the Department.

LEG. TROTТА:

We're under no obligation after four years. I sat here and I asked questions, and I pulled the transcripts up back -- and I was told five years, that's the end of our obligation. I don't know if it was for this one or from another one. Now this County is flat busted broke, we don't have any money. We're cutting people's jobs, we're cutting -- we're laying people off, and you want to subsidize a company that's paying their executives, a not-for-profit, hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars on the back of the taxpayers?

P.O. GREGORY:

Question, question.

LEG. TROTТА:

My question is how -- to the Administration, not to you. How do they justify this? How do you justify taking taxpayer money and expanding it past the looks of the contract when people are making hundreds of thousands of dollars off other taxpayers? How -- to the County Executive's people, how does that happen? How is that good government?

P.O. GREGORY:

You don't have to answer that, he's debating with you.

MR. SEIDMAN:

I wasn't planning to.

LEG. TROTТА:

I do want an answer. It's my obligation for them to answer it.

LEG. CALARCO:

I'll answer the question to you, Legislator Trotta, because the reality is, is that we are --

LEG. TROTТА:

I'm not asking you the question, I'm asking them the question.

LEG. CALARCO:

We are saving by having these contracts --

LEG. TROTTA:

I'm asking them the question, not you.

LEG. CALARCO:

We are saving a substantial amount of money every single year by having Hudson River operate our health centers. Now, yes, we could have made the option to not provide the services anymore and shut our health centers down, because, no, you're correct, we are not obligated by the State to pay for these things.

LEG. TROTTA:

I wasn't asking you.

LEG. CALARCO:

And, in fact, it's because the State --

LEG. TROTTA:

I wasn't asking you.

LEG. CALARCO:

Well, I'm answering the question anyways.

LEG. TROTTA:

You could answer the question when I'm done.

LEG. CALARCO:

While the State --

LEG. TROTTA:

I'll ask the questions.

LEG. CALARCO:

While the State has decided that --

LEG. TROTTA:

I'll ask the questions, I have the floor.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right.

LEG. CALARCO:

This gives us the ability to get it in and provide these services at a lower cost.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Can I jump in?

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

LEG. TROTTA:

I'd like the County Executive's representative to come up here and answer what the thought process is that we're getting ourselves deeper and deeper in debt when we're not required to, when the people that are not-for-profit are making hundreds of thousands of dollars off the taxpayers' back and we are paying for it. I have constituents who are paying for this and when there's no need. Explain to me why.

MS. SANTERAMO:

I believe it is a policy decision. You know, on behalf of the Administration, we believe it's a policy decision. Yes, we're not obligated to provide health care to people who cannot afford it, but I believe as a policy, this body and the County Executive historically have decided to provide health care to people who need it, so that is what we're trying to do.

LEG. TROTTA:

They're still going to get their health care, just someone else, these companies will pay for it. Our contract ends in four years. Why are we just giving it to them down the road? Makes no sense.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Anybody else? No? We have a motion to table and a motion to approve.

MR. RICHBERG:

And a second on both, yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Right. Okay. Motion to table goes first. Roll call.

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

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

No.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Recuse.

LEG. STERN:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
No.

LEG. LINDSAY:
No.

LEG. CALARCO:
No.

LEG. ANKER:
No.

LEG. HAHN:
No.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes to table.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
No.

P.O. GREGORY:
No.

MR. RICHBERG:
Eight.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. A motion to approve.

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

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Recuse.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

No.

LEG. TROTTA:

Absolutely not.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

No.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

No.

LEG. BROWNING:

No.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Nine.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Change my vote to a yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Ten.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Mr. Presiding Officer.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Can I make a motion to reconsider Resolution 1990?

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

We do the bond first.

MR. NOLAN:

No bond.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yeah, no bond. Okay. Thank you. Second by Legislator Martinez. Motion to reconsider. I'm sorry. Motion to reconsider.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'll second.

P.O. GREGORY:

The motion is before us. We have a second, a motion and a second.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Recusal, please, please note.

P.O. GREGORY:

1990, Page 7. Okay. I guess roll call.

MR. NOLAN:

No, this is to reconsider.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, reconsider. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. TROTТА:

Opposed.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Raised hand.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Recuse.

P.O. GREGORY:

This is the motion to reconsider.

MR. NOLAN:

1990.

P.O. GREGORY:

1990.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Could I ask a question? A point of order on this. Yeah, on the motion to consider, whether or not we can do a -- it was a split vote, right? It was 9 to 9, no prevailing side? Was there a --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Nine-eight.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

It was 9-8? Okay.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I was on the prevailing side.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. So 1990 is before us. Well, actually, I make a motion to approve.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Jason, you get my recusal?

MR. RICHBERG:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Martinez. And --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Please, Mr. Presiding Officer, excuse me, just note my recusal once again.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes, okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

And roll call.

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

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Recuse.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

No.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

No.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

No.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eleven.

HUMAN SERVICES

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Thank you. Okay. Human Services, Page 8. All right. We have a lot of bonds ahead of us.

All right. ***I.R. 1944 - Authorizing a services contract and lease for Shelter for Homeless Families with H.E.L.P. - Suffolk, Inc.(Co. Exec.)***. Motion to approve by Legislator Martinez. Do I have a second? I'll second. Anyone on the motion?

LEG. CILMI:

What bill is this?

LEG. BROWNING:

Just on the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1944.

LEG. BROWNING:

I do appreciate that the Administration reached out to the community groups. Again, we look -- and I hate to talk about what happened when the facility opened up in Commack and the outrage that happened. And I want to credit the Bellport community for being so supportive. However, this was an issue that came to me when I first came into office, that it was supposed to become an affordable housing program and to date has not. And they have stood by the people who are at HELP-Suffolk. They have built a better relationship over the past ten years. And I just want to say I want to give the North Bellport community a lot of credit for the support, and I want to say thank you to them.

And, however, I did say I think the Administration, because of some of the issues that are occurring in that community, I am asking that the Administration meet with them to discuss an issue like license plate readers, which they have asked for for probably about four years and have yet to see. So the fact that they are willing to support HELP-Suffolk and continue to support them, unlike the other homeless shelters that opened up and the outrage, I think we should be doing more than our fair share and doing a lot to support that community when it comes to public safety issues. So, again, thank you for that.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

So they want -- what was it specifically that they were requesting? License plate readers for who? Okay.

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

LEG. BROWNING:

The license plate readers. They're placed in certain parts of the community. There was discussion about using Asset Forfeiture monies, there were things that were discussed. The Knappe-Swezey Foundation has been a phenomenal support in that community. But I think it's up to the Administration now and us to step forward that this is a place that was supposed to have closed ten years ago and it's still opened. And there was some issues with the Help Suffolk over the years, but that has been resolved. And the fact that this community is willing to accept them into their school district, into their community, there are a lot of public safety issues and this community has continually asked for license plate readers, one item, and I think that we should be accommodating

them and helping them out.

LEG. HAHN:

It sounds like a reasonable request. Is there someone from the County Executive's office who could speak to, you know, that kind of request from the community?

MS. SANTERAMO:

I am not familiar with that exact request, but we can commit to meeting with the community, meeting with Help Suffolk, meeting with the local Legislator in trying to address this. Because we agree with the local Legislator, we do appreciate the community's welcoming this shelter into their area, that is good.

LEG. BROWNING:

This was something that was promised to them by -- through the Police Department, and it has still not transpired. So they do have ShotSpotter, and obviously Knappe-Swezey has been very helpful, but the license plate readers is something that they have continually asked for.

MS. SANTERAMO:

We will work with you, set up a meeting and work with them to see what we can do there.

LEG. BROWNING:

Thank you.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Calarco.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yeah, I just want to echo Legislator Browning's comments. I think the community has been crying out for more investment in terms of public safety issues and their willingness to continue to house this facility I think speaks to their willingness to be good neighbors. But, you know, Asset Forfeiture money is a great place to go to get the resources necessary to do license plate readers or cameras or whatever else is needed to make the investment for public safety here, and that's something that our County to the west, who we don't always want to point to, but in this instance I think utilize those funds in the best fashion and we might be able to follow suit here.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Anyone else? All right. Do we have a -- Jason, do we have a motion and a second?

MR. RICHBERG:

Yes, we have a motion and a second to approve.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen.

P.O. GREGORY:

1944 --

MR. NOLAN:

We did that one.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. IR 1933-15 - Reappoint Gretchen --

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen. Sorry.

Parks & Recreation

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1933-15 - Reappoint Gretchen Oldrin-Mones as a member of the Suffolk County Vanderbilt Museum Commission (Trustee No. 2)(Hahn).

LEG. HAHN:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. SPENCER:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1935-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with the Historic Restoration and Preservation Fund (CP 7510)(County Executive).

LEG. HAHN:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Calarco. On the motion, anyone?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

On the motion?

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I have a question for Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Good evening, Legislators.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So this is \$500,000 --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's correct.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

-- for two projects, the roof on the West Sayville golf course and the Cedar Point Lighthouse?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Cedar Point Lighthouse, that's correct. We --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Why --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Sorry?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I've never been to Cedar Point, but is it that big that -- I mean, that's a lot of money for two roofs.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, it's not only the roofing -- it's not only roof shingles at Cedar Point Lighthouse, it's the entire infrastructure. The entire roof is shot. We have been patching it up for a number of years. The contractor won't even go up there anymore, so it's not only the roof, it's the rafter, it's the whole infrastructure of the roofing itself, and it's also located out on the point. It's very difficult to access, you have to get out there by water, actually.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So is there public access there?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

There is public access. There's public access when -- you actually have to walk from the park through the site. We do allow some vehicular access out there when we're not in the plover season, but for a good part of the summer it's closed off.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And what is the plan for the lighthouse once it's rehabilitated?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

The plan, we have a friends group in there called the US Lighthouse Historical Society that has plans to convert that into a bed and breakfast of sorts. They're charged with raising funds to redo the interior of the building and get it up and running, but we generally take care of the major structural issues and this is one. They can't go in there safely without a roof on the building, and the interior of the building is starting to deteriorate because water is getting into the granite block and everything else. So it needs a roof desperately.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

When did we take ownership? Ballpark.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

1970s.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Just to add to that, not only the B and B, but they're also looking to do a museum on the ground level and to run tours --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's correct.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

-- from the Long Wharf in Sag Harbor to that facility, and it's an important historic landmark. The roof, you know, you could drive a car through the roof if you could ever get up there; there's a giant hole in the roof.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

As with all of our facilities, all our historic sites, we try to get them open to the public and that's what they're tasked with doing.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

So they can't do anything. And they're trying to raise a million dollars for the interior, but they can't do anything with, you know, an open roof.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Right. And they are a good group. They just pulled a lantern off about a year ago and took that down and took it into the village, had it sandblasted, ready to go. So it's ready to go back up on the roof, but we really need to get the roof fortified before we can do that.

Any questions?

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

It was in the Capital Program.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator D'Amaro, you had a question?

LEG. D'AMARO:

I forgot what my question was.

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

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

LEG. D'AMARO:

Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Opposed: Legislator D'Amaro).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***IR 1935A, Bond Resolution (of the County of Suffolk, New York authorizing the issuance of \$500,000 Bonds to finance improvements for the stabilization, preservation and restoration of historic structures at County parks (CP 7510.343);*** same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yay.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

(Not Present).

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen (Opposed: Legislators D'Amaro & Trotta).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***IR 1936-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with improvements to campgrounds (CP 7009) (County Executive).*** Same motion, same second. On the motion, anyone? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Opposed: Legislator D'Amaro).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***IR 1936A, Bond Resolution (of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$450,000 bonds to finance the cost of improvements to campgrounds (CP 7009.320);*** same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen (Opposed: Legislators D'Amaro & Trotta).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, ***IR 1937-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with restoration of West Neck Farm (a/k/a Coindre Hall), Huntington (CP 7096) (County Executive).***

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Spencer. I'll second --

LEG. STERN:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Stern. On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Commissioner Dawson? Thank you. So what I have here is 200,000 for planning and 100,000 for construction, and this says, "*Recently a planning report was drafted, but the construction agency felt this report did not cover all the issues.*" Where was that -- do we have a copy of that planning report, or who drafted it? What happened with that \$200,000 that was spent on it?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

It didn't include the -- first of all, it didn't include the foundation, there were some issues with the chimney. And then since -- right after Superstorm Sandy, the project, the scope of the project increased to include the granite bulk-heading on the outside of the facility which was severely deteriorating, and they didn't realize that before Sandy. So that needs to be done as well, and the pier included, so.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So 200,000 was spent already on this draft?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, there was a draft report done a couple of years ago. We realized that the building is having structural issues, the chimney at the time was pulling away from the building. What's happening is the seawall, which is in front of the building, is, for lack of a better term, **{sivs}**, so water is getting in there on a daily basis and that action is actually drawing out sediments and is impacting the building, so you're getting some settlement and some structural issues. So a couple of years we hired these structural, historic structural contractors, guys that we used out in Riverhead to do the courts. They did an analysis to allow us to essentially stabilize the building, to structurally stabilize it to keep it from further deterioration.

But unfortunately, as the Commissioner said, we didn't consider the bulkhead; that action of the tidal action is impacting it and we need to further -- the funding is basically to further develop plans that we can go out and structurally support the bulkhead, structurally make it whole again, keep water from getting in and out to remove that tidal action and then do the -- you know, construct the final structural improvements to the building itself.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So back in 2008 and 2009, a million was appropriated for construction. So all we spent was 300,000 for that. What have we spent so far on this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, there was -- at the time when we had that money appropriated, we didn't realize the extent of the damage until we started looking into it. And we had issues with the consultant at the time, so we cut ties with them and we brought in this other firm that has, you know, proven experience in doing this type of work, and they basically stabilized the building at the time, or gave us the ability to structurally stabilize the building. And now what we're looking to do is to move forward with construction. There is money, I think it's a million five, but I couldn't tell you -- oh, okay.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, I believe there's a million five in the account right now. We're looking to start working on the structure to get it shored up. Right now dispensing around it, there's plywood on all the exterior windows and doors. Kids are getting into it routinely so we'd really like to get the facility kind of opened back up to the public. We've got a number of groups that used it prior to its structural problems, like the Sagamore Rowing Club, the Huntington Rowing Club and St. Anthony's Rowing Club. So once we get the building stable, once we get the building refurbished, for lack of a better word, we can get some of those groups in there, charge some rent and provide a recreational source and get some use of the facility. Right now it's just a place for kids to hang out. We feel the more positive use we get in there the less negative use we're going to, so we would really like to get the building kind of moved into the construction phase.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

You said you had a million and a half right now ready to spend, authorized, all ready to spend on this?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's correct.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So how much more do you need to complete the project?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

If we include the retaining wall and the pier, it's probably close to three, but we have money in outlying years, in subsequent years to do that, budgeted.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And then how would this -- this would be used by a rowing club?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Multiple rowing clubs. It's right on Huntington Harbor. I mean, if you're familiar with the facility, it's a 30-acre facility. It's one of the old Gold Coast Estates. We have the main facility up at the top of the hill, it's our catering facility, it brings in a tremendous amount of revenue for us. The Lessings are in there, Cornell is in there, Splashes of Hope, and we have a rental unit.

There's another building on the property. It has -- it's a gymnasium that we have a contract with the Town of Huntington for. They run their recreational programs out of there all winter and all summer. They give a percentage of their gross revenues as well. More importantly, they actually maintain the site, as does the Lessings do for the main building. So this is just the third portion of that site to get it kind of up and functional.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

You said they maintain the building? So what happened that it closed to the public?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Which one, the main --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yeah.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

The boathouse itself?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I think it was structurally -- I think it was found to be structurally unsound. It just wasn't safe for them to be in there anymore. You know, the foundation wasn't good, the chimney wasn't good, so we asked them to leave with the anticipation of doing -- you know, refurbishing it, but there were problems with the engineer. The construction money ended up sitting. So here we are, we now have, you know, a viable engineering firm to go in there. They're very well known, they did engineering work on the Statue of Liberty, on the Washington monument. They've also worked for the County in the past. So we're looking to bring them in to give us a good report so we can move

our construction forward.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

This main building that you're talking about, that's open to the public now?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

The main building's open to the public. We have a concession agreement in there with The Lessings, it brings in about \$75,000 a year in revenue. They're responsible for the maintenance of the exterior; the lawn, the gardens and whatnot. Again, the Town of Huntington is responsible for the maintenance of the building over by the recreation center, they take care of the grass, so Parks really doesn't have a whole lot of maintenance obligations over there with the exception that we take care of what we call the systems. Like if the boiler system were to go down or the roof was to go bad, we do that type of work. But for the most part, they handle all the -- we'll call that all the interior maintenance, the cleaning, the garbage collection, the grass cutting and all of that.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I mean, I'm kind of torn here. I do appreciate the history of the area and I've never been there, but I saw the aerial pictures. But then if we're going to commit \$3 million there, we've got buildings throughout the County that people work in that need a lot of repair that we can't seem to get repaired and fixed. So it's kind of -- it's kind of a quandary there with three million here for a boathouse that's probably going to see very limited use.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, I mean, it is a site that, you know, that we do need to get -- we do need to get it back up and running. We do need to stabilize it. So, I mean, it's a responsibility --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Well, yeah, but you can say that about a lot of buildings that we have, that we need to get them up and running and stabilize them so we can get the public in, and this is three million just for one building.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's correct -- well, it's spread out over a number of years, so. I mean, we do put money aside for historic properties. They're given to us by this body to manage and maintain and upgrade and we do put that into the Capital Budget, you know, on an ongoing cycle.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

If we vote to authorize this money, what would be the timeframe? What's your plan?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Gil?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You'd be looking at -- again, this is not the entire, that \$3 million that we're looking to spend a few years out. This is really to, again, structurally stabilize the retaining wall, and then in turn structurally stabilize the house, and then the finer detailed construction would follow further on. So my estimate would be we would complete the design plans end of next year, beginning the year after, and then go to construction after that in '17. But again, it wouldn't be, you know, all the bells and whistles. It would be to basically have a sound building that you could then complete the detail work.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And what would that cost?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's all included.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, it's all included; it's included in that estimate in the Capital Program.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I mean, it's just hard to support something like this. I've got -- I can't get gravel to fill holes in a parking lot in a beach in Southold for years and to spend \$3 million -- where the public uses all the time, and to get -- to spend \$3 million here in a building that's closed to the public is kind of -- it's a stretch.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I understand your point. The concern here, though, is that this building, if the wall is unattended and the building remains unattended, it will collapse. You know, maybe not this year, but at some point it's going to undermine because -- again, because of the tidal nature. We actually have water, whether -- and you're getting both tidal action and you're getting groundwater sitting in the basement.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I understand how that works.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Fair enough.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

But nothing was done for years. I mean, this money was authorized -- why wasn't something done when it was authorized in 2008?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

As I mentioned earlier, we had a -- we hired a consultant, we found him completely unsatisfactory and we had to go back out and bring somebody in, the company that we were familiar with that the Commissioner mentioned, and these guys -- you know, they're world-renowned, they're doing a great job. We know that they can develop the plans that we need to have this building stabilized and we can move forward. Unfortunately, you know, there was that snafu in the beginning, in 2008, 2009.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Spencer, then Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. SPENCER:

I guess, Gil, with regards to the property. How many acres is it?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I believe it's 32 acres.

LEG. SPENCER:

And so there's two buildings on the campus.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

There's actually three buildings.

LEG. SPENCER:

Three buildings.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

There's the main facility at the top of the hill; then we have the gymnasium which is off just to the east, I think; and then at the bottom of the hill we have the boathouse which actually sits on the water.

LEG. SPENCER:

Is it all historic over there?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

The two buildings definitely are. I defer to Richard; is the gymnasium?

MR. MARTIN:

Definitely not the gym.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

The gymnasium's not historic.

LEG. SPENCER:

But the rest is historic.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That's correct.

LEG. SPENCER:

Does the public use the grounds?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Very heavily.

LEG. SPENCER:

What do we have -- what's in there now; are there any tenants that are in the main building?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, we have -- the main building has, as I said, the catering facility.

LEG. SPENCER:

So there's catering going on?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

There is catering, Lessings has that license agreement with us. Again, it brings in about 70 -- between 70 and \$75,000 a year in revenue. We get a percentage of that gross.

LEG. SPENCER:

Who else is in there?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Cornell Cooperative is in there, Splashes of Hope is in there, and we also have a tenant in there. There's an apartment up on the second floor that we rent out. And we bring in roughly 35 -- I'm sorry, \$32,000 a year between Cornell and the tenant. Splashes of Hope, we have an agreement with them. They run recreational programs out of the facility; in turn for that, they offer, again, recreational programs.

LEG. SPENCER:

So we're generating revenue on the property. Is there any public safety there also?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, they -- I'm sorry. Issues with?

LEG. SPENCER:

No, is there any -- I understand that is there security there or the police are there also? Do they have a satellite there?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

No, we don't have a substation there. You know, when you speak about security, we do have issues with the boathouse, that is a problem of vandalism for us. We have it gated off, but the kids tend to get in there.

LEG. SPENCER:

So I was listening to the line of questioning, that it's not being used by the public because it's unsafe. If this is done -- was it being used by the public before?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

The boathouse was; it was used by three rowing clubs. And again, they pulled out -- well, I think we --

LEG. SPENCER:

Three different rowing clubs?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

It was Sagamore, Huntington, I believe, and St. Anthony's. We have very few places on the water where we can --

LEG. SPENCER:

Would they return? Are they looking to return?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I believe they are. They have been approaching the Town of Huntington to try to get space at Gold Star Beach, but there's no place for them to store their sculls. When I say rowing, they have the sculls, they're very --

LEG. SPENCER:

Is the Town of Huntington, have they had interest in this boathouse before? Were they looking to partner with us?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

They did. We actually had money that they had actually committed \$700,000 for this project, but because it stalled they had pulled their grant. So, you know, we'd certainly like to approach them when we have some more concrete plans to see if they're willing to partner up with us again, but I

can't commit. You know, I can't commit for them to --

LEG. SPENCER:

Oh, it stalled because of the Superstorm, that we had plans to go one direction and after the damage to the seawall, it expanded the scope of the project and --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, that was part of it, yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Okay. All right, thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Thank you. And Commissioner, I know we spoke about this in committee, just to refresh my memory, though. So we spent \$150,000 on planning, but we weren't happy with the plans, right?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

No, I think we have \$150,000 in planning. I don't know -- you know, Legislator Krupski said it was 200,000; I don't have the exact number of what we spent.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

No, the original one where we said we weren't -- it was unsatisfactory, I think.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

An incomplete, it didn't include the problems. When they started to do construction, they realized there were problems with the foundation, they realized that there were problems with the chimney and the walls, the chimneys were pulling the walls out. And then after that we had Superstorm Sandy, we went down and started to look at the granite retaining wall and that is in dire need of repair. If we -- right now it's a matter of just refilling the joints. If we let that deteriorate any further, in the next year or two what's going to happen is all of the mooring joints are going to come out, the granite's going to drop and we're going to be in for a much, much larger cost to repair it.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Yeah, but just going back to the engineering. I thought I heard in committee and I thought I heard again tonight, that we had appropriated approximately \$150,000 to planning originally, because we had this money. We've got the million something dollars sitting -- we spent one point -- \$150,000 on planning. What happened to those plans? We didn't use them because we didn't like them, it was unsatisfactory; what ended up happening with that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

My recollection is, and I'll have to verify it, was that the plans were never fully completed because of the issues we found once we started looking at this and determined that the consultant who we had was not capable of dealing with the line of work and the speciality involved. So we then regrouped and we brought this other historic specialist that knows how to deal with these type of issues.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

And what happened to the 150, they just kept it although we didn't get the finished plans?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, I don't think so. I don't think we paid them. And I'll go back and find that out for you. I don't know off the top of my head.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Yeah, because I think we raised that at committee, to say what happened to that money. Because I was -- I couldn't figure out why there was so much money in planning and that's where it went backwards and we found out that we had already done the planning or paid for the planning and appropriated the money for the construction.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

And so when I -- also at committee, I thought we said that there was no money for the main building. Has that changed, or I misunderstood?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, this money, there's a million five for the entire facility, it doesn't differentiate one building from the next. This appropriation is for \$200,000. We put another \$100,000 in to do some work on the main building proper, not the boathouse. We had to do some work in the parking area, on the portico on the east side of the building, some windows and some minor things. I think asbestos remediation needs to be done there as well. So that's in the main house, that's what that \$100,000 is for.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

And that's the building we lease out to Lessings for their catering?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's correct.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Okay, I thought we weren't doing any -- I might have misunderstood, but I thought we weren't touching that building, so. But we don't know what happened to the original planning money, although we know we didn't use the plans.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, Commissioner Anderson will get that information for you and what happened with that plan. You know, they might have taken it and they might be the new -- the new engineering firm might be piggy-backing off that original report, but I can't say for sure.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

So the real sense of urgency here is the -- from what I understand is the seawall, the retaining wall, right?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

The retaining wall, and then right after that the building itself. Again, any time you have a place that's pretty much abandoned, we have liabilities with kids getting in there.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

I understand, but we could board it up. I'm just saying that we're going to spend all this money for

what I see so we can get the rowing clubs to come back in, which probably are paying us next to nothing in rent, if anything, and then approve the catering facility for someone who's paying us \$75,000, and it's just a lot of money at a time we don't have a lot of money, you know? I mean, the roads are crumbling and there's things going on that we need to fix and someone said it before, we still owe the Deputy Sheriffs \$4 million, but we're repairing historic buildings which, in my mind, can wait. I mean, what would it be to fix the retaining wall? I mean, we're just talking about fixing a retainer wall so we don't lose anymore? I think we have to take a look at that. But we're looking -- throwing that whole renovation into this project for the rowing club.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, I don't know specifically what the retaining wall is going to cost. But I will say, you know, to your comments about the facility, it's the catering facility itself that generates far more revenue than we ever paid out. I think it's \$107,000 between The Lessings and the two tenants that we have in there and we generate another 15 to \$18,000 a year from Huntington, so. And our expense there is -- we do pay the fuel bill which comes to about \$20,000 a year, but The Lessings pays the entire electric bill for the facility, regardless; I mean, they pay it for everybody, including Splashes of Hope and Cornell and whatnot. We do generate revenue from those guys.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Okay, thank you.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you. Commissioner, I had a couple of questions. The boathouse right now is not open to the public; is that correct?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

No, it's completely fenced off and boarded up.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. Now, you said it's 32 acres for the entire site.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

The entire park, correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Is this designated parkland, as we say?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yes, it is.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It is.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Anything we use we consider parkland. Was it dedicated via resolution? I can't --

LEG. D'AMARO:

You know, the type of parkland where to alienate the parkland you'd need two consecutive votes of the State Legislature?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yes, regardless of whether it was dedicated or not dedicated; if the park is being utilized as parkland, the State feels the same way.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But it's not a parkland, it's a catering facility.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, no, there's a whole lot of people that use that facility to enjoy the vistas and whatnot.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, who decides if it's dedicated parkland?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Okay, I'll let Richard jump in on that.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay, sure.

MR. MARTIN:

Yes, it is a dedicated parkland. It's also dedicated to the Suffolk County Historic Trust and both of those actions are done by the Suffolk County Legislature.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right, so it is part of the County's parkland holdings.

MR. MARTIN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But it's parkland, but the main hall is used for catering; is that correct?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, there's a recreation facility, Huntington runs recreation programs over there, Splashes of Hope runs --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Oh, Splashes of Hope is not parkland use.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

No, it's not.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No. There is no parkland use there.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, I beg to differ. If you go there on any given Saturday or Sunday, you'll probably see 30, 40 people meandering around the park.

LEG. D'AMARO:

On the grounds, the grounds.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Absolutely, right, correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

And in an historic site --

LEG. D'AMARO:

So if it's dedicated parkland, how do we -- aren't there restrictions on how you can use property if it's dedicated parkland?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

How so?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, we have Splashes of Hope, we have rental, catering. I thought that once you accept a designation as parkland, that there are limitations, it has to be used as a "park", but this is being used as a park, I guess, in the sense of the open grounds outside, but the rest of it, the buildings themselves are not part of the parkland.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's correct. I mean, I'm going to defer to what it can and can't be used for to the County Attorney's Office. But I do know that part of our agreements that we enter into with people like The Lessings is we enter into a licensed agreement as opposed to lease agreement, because that does --

LEG. D'AMARO:

It seems to me if the catering hall is making 75 to 100,000 a year and the boathouse is closed to the public right now, but there is a parkland use where there's people on the grounds, why do we need the buildings?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Why do we need the boathouse?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, why do we need either? Why do we need the building -- I mean, I understand that people like their parkland and there's nothing wrong with that, but they can't use the facilities. I mean, they can't use the buildings right now, the public.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, the public is in there. The public had catered events in there, again they go in for Splashes of Hope, Cornell Cooperative uses the facility --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Oh, Cornell, you know, they're in every building.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

There's a historic property and part of our understanding and agreement with Splashes of Hope, because there is an agreement in place --

LEG. D'AMARO:

You're missing my point. My point is that parkland means it's for the public use. We're renting it to

a catering facility, a not-for-profit organization and the boathouse is closed. So that is not being utilized as part of the parkland. So why do we need these buildings?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, we need the boathouse so that we could do just that. We could offer rowing and recreational opportunities through groups like Sagamore Rowing and Huntington Rowing and St. Anthony's, to do exactly your point. And it is an historic property. It was given to us by the Legislature and we do have to keep it open to the public, so.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, I don't -- I know that that's the position that you need to take for parks, I understand that. But just on a more policy level, it would seem to me that, you know, when I go into a County facility, that the entire facility is available and open to the public as part of the parkland. But this is kind of a hybrid or a bifurcated --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's correct. And if you went there on any -- if you went there tomorrow afternoon, you could certainly walk through the --

LEG. D'AMARO:

But, you see, what I'm saying is it seems to me that we're maintaining the boathouse for some rowing clubs, not the general public or maintaining the hall itself for a catering facility to make, you know, \$100,000 a year. I don't understand the sense of doing that. It's not -- in my mind, it's not really a park, and if you want to utilize it as a park where people can use the grounds, you don't need the buildings. So we're dumping a lot of money into these buildings over the years and this won't be the last time that we have to do something like this. And I just don't understand. I mean, it's a great location for a park, but the buildings that we're maintaining are not parks. They're not part of the park.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, they're part of the holdings that were given to us when we accepted the property and we had the responsibility to manage and maintain them. And then unfortunately, given our -- I mean, you're right, if I had a tremendous budget, could I put our own historic people in there? Absolutely. But we enter into these public/private partnerships to do just that, to keep the buildings open to the public --

LEG. D'AMARO:

I understand.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

-- and to keep them from falling down.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Sure.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

So that's kind of where we're at.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. What's the value of that 32 acres?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

You'd have to ask --

LEG. D'AMARO:

A lot.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

-- Real Estate and Planning.

LEG. D'AMARO:

A lot.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

On the water front? Yeah.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah. So -- but we don't have the authority to sell that property, it would have to go through the State Legislature; is that correct?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah. I think -- I want to provide facilities for rowing clubs, but I can't afford to do that anymore.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I think we need to -- you're right, if you just want to -- we're not going to knock the building down. It's on a historic register, we have a responsibility to keep it open, we're not allowed to do that. So if it's going to be there, I guess our position is we might as well --

LEG. D'AMARO:

What happens -- we're on an historic register with the boathouse.

So what happens if we don't maintain it? Is there any type of penalty or repercussion?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I'm going to defer that to Richard Martin.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You'd probably lose your historic designation.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I'm going to defer to Richard.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Sure.

MR. MARTIN:

The properties there, as I said before, are dedicated to the Suffolk County Historic Trust which are supervised by the Council of Environmental Quality. And it's part of the requirements, when we have the historic properties, is to occupy them to try to -- that helps to maintain them, so that's why we occupy the main building with so many different groups. And if we were to take them down we'd have to -- again, since these buildings are dedicated to the Historic Trust, you'd have to also go to the State to have approval to take them down. It's just the buildings have the same designation as parkland since they're dedicated as historic buildings.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But there's nothing that compels the County, excuse me, to maintain the building.

MR. MARTIN:

I'll say, just as part of the County Charter with the Council on Environmental Quality, it is our responsibility to maintain them; whether we choose to do so or not is the Legislature's decisions.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right, okay. I'm just trying to understand what that designation means. So if we fail to maintain that boathouse, what would happen?

MR. MARTIN:

We'd lose the rowing club and the use of the building, and it would be a negative effect on our whole historic program, especially in Huntington.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Legislator, if I may. The cost of the demolition, even if it -- there would be a cost to demolition even after it fell down. You know, there's a significant amount of permitting that would be involved to take the material out of there. There'd also be, you know, the cost of actually disposing the material, taking it down completely, restoring the area so it's not just -- you know, it's not just going to go away.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right, I understand that. But it's not -- you know, we're maintaining structures that are on the water, they're getting older. You know, it's a very, very expensive proposition.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I'm not sure that maintaining that boathouse goes to core functions of County government, it probably goes to a secondary function. I mean, core functions are parks, too, but we have plenty of parks and we have people utilizing those grounds. Right now no one's even using the boathouse.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

They were.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, that's because they can't. It's structurally --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, but even when they can, it's three rowing clubs that are utilizing it. So, you know, it's not really for the general public, so to speak.

MR. MARTIN:

Just, you know, there's a great need for these rowing facilities on the north shore. And when it was occupied, that place was full with the sculls from floor to ceiling, and it was a very active program and they are very interested to come back.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Totally agree with you, but can we afford to do it is my question. Because, you know, we -- I don't want to go into all the debates that we have here about, you know, deferring police salaries and budget problems that we have. And, you know, it's just that we always talk about bold initiatives,

hard decisions, thinking out of the box, but yet here we are talking about millions of dollars for a boathouse that's not utilized by the general public for a couple of rowing clubs.

MR. MARTIN:

Well, the general public is welcome to join any of these -- the Sagamore Rowing is open to the general public, and then of course Huntington High School program is for those students and the other program is for St. Anthony's High School.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah.

MR. MARTIN:

But Sagamore Rowing, anyone is welcome to join that organization.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I appreciate the advocacy for that type of activity. But unfortunately, I don't think, given all the other activities that we need to fund in the County, that there has to be at some point where we just simply can't afford to do it anymore. And so I think we're at a crossroads with this building where it's falling down, it's in a complete state of disrepair. The testimony that we've heard is it's ready to fall into the sea, and here we are, just going to dump a boat load of money into it. I just -- I find it difficult to justify that given the economic condition of the County. I mean, I love our parks, I do, and I want to maintain our parks, but I need to allocate those resources very carefully to make sure that at least what we do keep and what we do maintain is acceptable to the public, and I'm not sure this is the right way to go. All right, thank you.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Yeah, thank you. I guess I'm just trying to understand the -- something like the Vanderbilt which was given by the owners to the people of the County of Suffolk and we have the responsibility to not only maintain it, but to utilize it as a museum for those cultural purposes and there would be ramifications if we did not maintain it for that purpose. So I think the question from before was is there any similar legal impediment to doing something differently with any of the buildings that are on the grounds here of this park. So when it was given to the people of the County of Suffolk, was it done with the same, with the similar type of requirement that it be maintained for a particular function, or there might be some type of a reversion that would come afterwards.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Are you talking about the covenants and restrictions on the property when we acquired it? I don't know. Richard, you may have --

MR. MARTIN:

When the County purchased it, it was for a cultural arts center and that did not go forward at the time. And then it was, as I mentioned before, dedicated as Suffolk County parkland in the early 90s, and also dedicated again to the Historic Trust and put on the National Register. And when I had got those designations, then our office is required to go ahead and try to restore the buildings and to occupy them. And this was all approved, those designations, by the Suffolk County Legislature at the time, and it was an acquisition, a purchase in the early 70s.

LEG. STERN:

So it was not given to the County.

MR. MARTIN:

No.

LEG. STERN:

It was an acquisition by the County in the 70s.

MR. MARTIN:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

You had mentioned the gymnasium which is on the grounds; is the gym connected to the big house?

MR. MARTIN:

There's a walkway that's connected to the main house. And the gym is from the 1960s, so it's getting older. It could be added to the Historic designation, but it's not part of it right now, and that's actively used by the Town of Huntington Recreation Department, so there's programs in there year-round and they pay for all the utilities for that gym.

LEG. STERN:

Since it's not currently in the Historic Land Trust part, it doesn't have that designation, are we bound by anything else to keep it operational or to maintain that structure?

MR. MARTIN:

Just the need. The Town of Huntington, really, residents there actively use this park. It's very well attended. The recreation program in the gym is a year-round program and we don't -- Suffolk County Parks does not need to run that because the town has the need, so they have a contract with us to run it.

LEG. STERN:

Okay.

MR. MARTIN:

So they would just be lacking in that activity if we didn't have it there.

LEG. STERN:

So it might be our desire to maintain it, there might be a need to have it, but there's no requirement, there's no legal requirement that we maintain it or offer it for those services or any other.

MR. RICHBERG:

I think that's correct.

LEG. STERN:

Okay, thank you

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

It is revenue neutral.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I know that it's very well attended, I've been there numerous times. I just want to ask again, if the

seawall is not maintained and the seawall falls into the sea, there will be erosion during a storm, is there any concern that there will be damage to the other buildings?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, there's absolute concern. If we lose the retaining wall, we're going to lose the building. The retaining wall holds back the soil, if the soil goes, the foundation collapses and there goes the building, so.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Anyone else? All right, all Legislators to the horseshoe, please.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Jay, can I ask one more question?

"No" said in unison

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

You're sure, Lou, you want to ask one more question? Because we're about to call the vote here.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I'm sure.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right, Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Just I'm going to ask two -- guys, I'm sorry, I just had one more question. Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yes, sir.

LEG. D'AMARO:

This is only for the boathouse today?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

This is only for the boathouse today. Well, I mean, we do have \$100,000 in construction for the main building. But again, that can be -- that can be utilized in any -- it can be utilized at the boathouse, it can be used on the main pavilion. So we anticipate doing work on the portico and doing asbestos abatement.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But the focus today is on the boathouse --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- which is falling down.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, the bulk of the money is for planning for the boathouse, correct. And the seawall and the pier that --

LEG. D'AMARO:

The planning for it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Not the construction.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Not construction. We have construction, we have a million five in construction.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay, so it's just the planning. So you have the money for the construction, you just need to plan how you're going to shore up the boathouse.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And when it's open and functional, it's the intention to continue with rowing clubs, some of which are open to the public; is that true?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's correct, Sagamore Rowing Club is open to the public.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Thank you.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. So this is 1937. We have a motion, Jason, and a second?

MR. RICHBERG:

Yes, we do.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

To approve. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

*(*Various Legislators Raised their hands in opposition*)*

MR. RICHBERG:

Can you keep your hands up? I'm sorry. *Fourteen (Opposed: Legislators Krupski, Cilmi, Barraga & McCaffrey).*

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. And then we have the companion bond ***(1937A, Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York authorizing the issuance of \$300,000 Bonds to finance the restoration of West Neck Farm (a/k/a Coindre Hall), Town of Huntington (CP 7096.116, 316)***; Mr. Clerk, will you call the roll?

MR. NOLAN:

Same motion.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Same motion, same second.

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

LEG. SPENCER:

Yay.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

No.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

No.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fourteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, ***Public Safety***:

IR 1928-15 --

MR. RICHBERG:

Sorry, *thirteen*. (*Opposed: Legislators Krupski, Cilmi, Barraga, Trotta & McCaffrey*).

P.O. GREGORY:

-- ***Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law adopting a requirement for the registration of alarm systems (County Executive)***. Please, don't jump all at once.

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Browning makes a motion. Second by Legislator Hahn.
On the --

LEG. CILMI:

Motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to table by Legislator --

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

-- Cilmi. All right (*laughter*), second by Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BROWNING:

DuWayne?

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to table. On the motion, Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

I know we discharged this without recommendation. There are some items. I know we had 911 operators here. The amount of calls on 911 on these alarm systems does take away from our law

enforcement from being able to do what they really should be paying attention to.

I do have issues with the registration fee and reoccurring registration fee costs every year that you have a system. We have businesses who have to be registered in different types of trades; they have to register, but they're businesses. This is a little different. And I don't think that anyone -- and I do believe it is a resident -- for my own personal home, now do I have to register with the County if I have an alarm system, or is it just businesses? Who's got that answer?
I thought it did say residence.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Good evening. I'm Chief Stu Cameron, for those of you that don't know me

MS. MAHONEY:

Can you pull the microphone closer, please?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Is that better?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Sorry. Both residents and commercial establishments would have to register. The fee structure is different; residents would be \$50 a year and commercial establishments would be \$100 a year.

LEG. BROWNING:

But it's every single year.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Correct.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. You know, I am prepared to support it right now, but I do want to address it. And I've already talked to our Counsel about amending it moving forward for 2017, 2018. Because I don't think it's fair to a private homeowner who wants to do something to protect themselves, that they have to register and pay a fee because they have an alarm system. I think that the fine structure that's in place is more than sufficient.

Businesses, you know, if I'm a carpenter and I open up a business, I have to register with the County as a legitimate business. I could see a difference because I do believe that there is a lot of issues with businesses. So again, I'm okay with it as it stands right now, but I really do think that we need to revisit it next year. And I know it's in the budget, I know it's an anticipated revenue, however I don't want to hit local residents over the head because they try do something to protect themselves. If they're not maintaining their alarm system, like I had said, you know, I've had my alarm go off and false alarm, but if I don't fix my problem then I should pay a fine. But anyway, I will let it go. We will revisit it next year.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, Legislator Barraga.

LEG. CILMI:

Put me on the list.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. Even though Thanksgiving is over, every once in a while you see a real turkey come forward.

*(*Laughter*)*

And that's what this is. This is a terrible piece of legislation from the standpoint of my constituents, the ones I serve. Our residents purchase a security system because they want safety and security for themselves and their families. No one wants to spend hundreds, if not thousands of dollars on a home security system, but they do so because they want to protect their families from criminals. They pay not only the initial installation fee, but the quarterly monitoring maintenance charge which often can run \$75 to \$100 every three months. And now, because these tens of thousands of families have made and continue to make the financial sacrifice to bring safety to their families in their own home, this bill wants to financially penalize them. It's a disgrace.

This bill, this proposal is a blatant, arrogant, and I use the word very specifically, stupid money-grab designed to bring us revenue at the expense of the taxpayers, the residents and the families of the Suffolk County Police District. Personally, I always justified the Red Light Camera Program, and even the Speed Camera Program if implemented, because individuals receiving the fines were breaking the law. But the residents affected by this bill are the good citizens protecting their families, making a financial sacrifice to do so, and they are rewarded with an annual permit fee, late fee of \$50, late fees of \$25 and a host of false alarm fees; just absolutely absurd.

The people we each represent are struggling financially in this County. High property taxes, mortgage payments, car payments, exorbitant electric bills, huge heating bills, insurance, tuition, gasoline expenses, food costs, rip-off Cablevision bills and outlandish phone bills. They're having a very, very difficult time in this County. A recent poll showed that Nassau and Suffolk as a region ranked second in the nation as being the most expensive counties to live in. My Police Department taxes are \$1,385 for police protection, and for that kind of money, I want the cops to answer every single alarm requiring a police response. No excuses, get the job done.

Finally, this is a very bad bill put together by someone somewhere who doesn't have a real clue as to what the hell is going on in Suffolk County, and it will never run for election, but you will; you will. Remember, remember not too many years ago the MTA bill. It was passed early in a two-year session for the State Legislature and two Senators from out here voted for that bill. They knew they shouldn't have voted for it, but I know what happens in conference and they voted for it and they were history because the people never forgot. When the word gets out on this bill, they will hate this bill. They will understand it and they will hold each one of us accountable. I'm not going to be here in two years, and neither will Browning or D'Amaro or Stern, unless something extraordinary happens. And we'll all be sitting out there waiting for that one paragraph in Lipp's song that covers four of us.

*(*Laughter*)*

This is the kind of a bill that will increase that paragraph of four to six or seven. Don't underestimate this bill. The people of Suffolk County are good, decent people; they don't deserve to be screwed over with a bill like this.

Now, I don't know why you're sitting there. You're probably here to rationalize why this is a good bill. Maybe somebody in the County Executive's Office sent you down here; you don't belong here. You're new to your position. I don't know why you'd even have a position on this issue. But it isn't about the police, it's about the people we represent, it's about the people who send us here. I have people coming in my office, they're losing their homes, they can't pay their mortgages, and we're

going to screw them with this kind of a bill? This is absurd and it's a disgrace. So say what you've got to say but then do me a favor personally, get up and leave.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Spencer.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Brief pause) I don't know what to say after that.

*(*Laughter*)*

I am -- I think that -- I appreciate you being here, Chief. And I wanted to get a sense of with the fees that are incurred after two warnings, they're consistent with kind of national sort of plans of other municipalities; is that your understanding?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Yes, sir, that's correct. And if I could, I could explain the basis why the Police Department thinks this would be advantageous, if you're interested in hearing that.

P.O. GREGORY:

Sure, absolutely.

LEG. SPENCER:

I actually -- I would love to have you address that. Yes, please, go ahead.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Okay. This may come as a surprise to you, but false alarms are the number one category of calls, 911 calls, that the Police Department responds to; it's, in fact, one-sixth of our calls that we respond to. On average, every sixth call a police officer in Suffolk County handles is a false alarm call. Those are false alarm calls, those are not alarm calls. The calls that, when we arrive, result in some type of criminality, whether the property was criminal mischief, there was a burglary, there was a robbery, those are categorized as criminal mischief/burglary/robbery. These are purely alarm -- you know, alarm malfunctions or misoperations of alarm systems where we get there and there was really no basis for us to have to respond to that. It ties up a tremendous amount of patrol time for us. So we're looking to improve efficiency within the Police Department.

And historically, departments that have implemented similar programs like this and, in fact, for -- to resolve the false alarm issue, this is a Department of Justice recommendation, that a program like this be implemented to reduce the burden of false alarms on police response. Departments that have implemented, municipalities that implemented similar programs have seen a 50 to 70% reduction in false alarms. And what I see that doing for our department is improving our response time because there are less calls that we're responding to, so we can get to the true emergencies faster. We'll even get to the other alarms faster; alarms that are indicative of real criminal behavior, burglaries, robberies, we'll be able to get there faster because there's less calls coming in. It will reduce the backlog in our 911 center. If you're a parent and you're calling that your child has a medical emergency, you'd be less likely to get put in the queue and the call will be answered more promptly, because less of our 911 operators will be tied up answering calls from alarm companies for false alarms.

It will improve the department's overall efficiency. It will allow our officers, because it will free up time to engage in more self-initiated activities.

I'm sure many of you have close contacts with your precinct Commanding Officers and you pass along constituent concerns. By freeing up our officers' time, it will free more time for them to

address these concerns, whether they're traffic concerns in their communities, cars running stop signs, red lights, speeding through the neighborhoods. It will allow more time for officers to work on Homeland Security issues, and it will also reduce our officers' complacency. Over 90% of the alarm calls we get are false alarms, and when you respond to the bulk of something as false, you become complacent. So many times our officers will respond to an alarm thinking it's just another false alarm, they will arrive with that mindset when, in fact, there will be a burglary in progress, and they'll be safer as a result of this legislation.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you. I agree with you and I can't tell you how much I appreciate you speaking to me about this. And it has weighed extremely heavily because I think in your new position, you deserve as much support and confidence to give you the tools that you need.

I have several questions, and I know the hour is late so I'll be very efficient with them. But I guess one would be to the County Attorney, if I may ask. When we look at these -- we said that they're false alarm fees; and so someone that gets a false alarm, they get the two warnings, if they get a fee, we're not -- are we calling it a violation, is it a fine?

MR. BRAUN:

It's not a criminal violation, if that's what you're asking.

LEG. SPENCER:

Right, and so here's the quandary that I see. So we're not saying it's a violation. It's not a misdemeanor like you're running a stop light, you're getting a fine.

MR. BRAUN:

Right.

LEG. SPENCER:

Right.

MR. BRAUN:

It's administrative.

LEG. SPENCER:

So it's administrative. So let's say I say to you, typically with a fee it implies like some sort of service that you're getting, where if someone says, *I'm not paying that fee*, so if I'm applying for a permit or something like that, *Well, if you don't pay the fee you don't get the service*. So has there been some thought, if there is a fee that's issued and someone says, *I'm a taxpayer, I have a right to be here. This is something that I have, but I'm not going to pay your fee*, what do we anticipate or what would be -- you know, would they no longer be able to receive police services? Can we hold liens? Do we have the same ability to impose, I guess, penalties as we would with a fine?

MR. BRAUN:

Well, with respect to the fees, if you will, for false alarms --

LEG. SPENCER:

Sure.

MR. BRAUN:

-- there's a higher schedule for unregistered systems than there is for registered systems. Allowance of the first two for free, so to speak, is for registered systems.

LEG. SPENCER:

Right

MR. BRAUN:

That doesn't apply to people who didn't register their system. So they would receive a notice that they are -- there has been a finding that they had a false alarm and that they are being billed this \$50, let's say, for the first one in a residence. And certainly it would not effect their right or their ability to receive police services in the future, but if they didn't do anything to correct their system as time went on, the fees increase according to the schedule in the bill.

LEG. SPENCER:

Okay. So it's my home, it's my private property, I've now purchased the security system and, you know, if my alarm goes off, you know, maybe it's an audible, it serves as a deterrent or whatever, the police will come because I'm paying my taxes. But I'm saying -- you know, if someone says, *You don't have a right to impose this fee on my private property for this*, what is the point in the law? We can pass a law here in Suffolk County, but do we have the right to impose fees for services that were not asked for?

MR. BRAUN:

Well, it --

LEG. SPENCER:

If someone says, *I don't want to participate. And when I say I'm not registering, I don't want to participate. I'm not paying your fees*, what are our recourses for that person? Would we then pursue --

MR. BRAUN:

We haven't had that, you know, situation yet arise. I assume at some point a decision would be made to pursue the homeowner for civil penalties in court if we needed to. But again, it hasn't arrived at that, certainly since this has not yet been adopted.

LEG. SPENCER:

Okay. And I think I am asking the question more along the line of understanding the difference between a fine and a fee and how -- what's our right as government to impose penalties on a private homeowner that has something that they went out and they purchased and they paid for and, you know, they're a member of the community, like if I'm operating a vehicle out on a road. But once I'm on my property, that if I -- you know, I can't shoot a gun or shoot off fireworks, but if I decide that I want an alarm there, you know, that was one of my questions. And I think that there's no way of answering. It could be challenged.

My next question relates to with regards to understanding the need that the Chief has expressed and wanting to figure out a way to support that. My concern comes from just my district as a representative and where I have areas that have -- that are relatively affluent, have homes and make the decision to have alarms and can potentially pay the fees and be responsible. But I think a situation where there's a senior or someone that is a single parent and they have -- they're in a community and they're concerned about their safety and they may be in a situation where the fees could be potentially burdensome or make a decision whether or not that they decide to have a security system.

Is it your position that -- is it -- in general, is it your preference that homes have security alarms versus not having security alarms? Do they help, do they deter crime? Do you have any thoughts about that?

CHIEF CAMERON:

I think it's fair to say in general alarm systems do deter crime and we would encourage people to have them. And since this is a new program, we certainly will reevaluate it as we move forward, and if we find that the fee structure has a severe, adverse reaction on low income communities, that's certainly something that we could revisit. All we're looking to do from the Police Department's standpoint is reduce the number of false alarms. Right now there's a hundred thousand of them; we'd like to reduce that. You know, other municipalities that we've spoken to, 50 to 70% reduction, there's probably nothing, no single thing that we can do to free up our officers' patrol time that would work better than this, in my opinion.

LEG. SPENCER:

Do we have a map or a grid or a number, townships or communities where we would see -- you said a hundred thousand, very trackable, every time it's 911. There must be some data to let us know where these alarms are coming from when we're talking about a hundred thousand. Are most of them coming from Brookhaven, or they're coming from Huntington? Are they coming from the villages, are they coming from suburban areas? Are they coming from -- you know, there's no -- because I think that would be important. Like I don't want the legislation to be a deterrent and I hate to waste those resources and I will support you in whatever way I can, because that to me is a waste. It's difficult on our 911 operators, it's difficult on our police officers. And so if there's a way where I can be assured that if I buy my mother an alarm system who lives in a town and she's there by herself and she's on Social Security, that difference -- maybe it's not a very large number, but I think those numbers would be -- I'm curious to find out if most of the false alarms are coming from particular communities, I think that would be helpful. But I think in the time it's here, we may not be able to get any of that information. But with a hundred thousand, is there any sort of generalized trends that you see? Because you're basically -- we're saying we're introducing this plan because there's a problem, so I would love to study the problem and understand.

And here's my fear. My fear is that, you know, we've gotten a lot of backlash from the Red Light Camera Program, from the school -- you know, and I hear the frustration. I'm trying -- I don't want to -- it's a great -- it's a big problem and we need a solution, but I don't want a solution that has unintended consequences. So I would love any sort of number with a hundred thousand calls. Is that something that maybe it could come back to me in a little bit, that would be -- do you have anything?

CHIEF CAMERON:

I have them sort of broken down by precinct, if that's helpful to you.

LEG. SPENCER:

That is a bit helpful.

CHIEF CAMERON:

And it's fairly evenly distributed. I mean, I could go through the numbers with you, but I can tell you just from looking at it that it's very evenly distributed across all of our precincts.

LEG. SPENCER:

All right. So we wouldn't have a sense if it's more in, you know, a downtown area versus a suburban area, but I guess most of the precincts have both.

CHIEF CAMERON:

I think the vast majority of our businesses across the County probably have alarm systems. With respect to commercial alarm -- residential alarm systems, I think they're dispersed all across the County. And the false alarms seem to indicate that they're coming fairly equally from each one of our precincts in numbers.

LEG. SPENCER:

All right. So what -- and I did say I was not going to ask a lot of questions to hurt this one way or the other, but I'm struggling. I'm really struggling. I want to figure out a way to support you in your efforts and give you the resources that you need, and this is a major internal struggle between understanding one problem but also going -- some of my concerns as far as who the burden is going to be placed upon and I think those that are in the least position to be able to handle the fees may be the most adversely affected, and that's what I'm trying to reconcile.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Well, if we find that to be the case, we could certainly adjust the fine schedule. I have spoken to the County Executive and they're amenable to that. We do have to make the fine schedule a disincentive, but perhaps they don't need to be quite as high.

LEG. SPENCER:

That would mean so much to me. I would love to give people -- and I just know that that could quickly happen where they could get one or two. And even in the legislation where if I happen to be away, I mean -- and I would love to give you my cell phone, I would love the police to call me, I would love to work with them, I will call the electrician to come out and check my system. But I could see someone getting a group of fines and the way the legislation is right now, any decision to give leniency would be at your discretion. And I trust you to do that, but the law will exist far -- you know, I don't want to have bad policy in place because I have a good Chief in place. So that's the thing here. I don't know how -- I've said yes, I've said no, absolutely not, I came into this today absolutely not. The passion of my colleague weighs heavily on my heart and I'm just not a happy man right now. So we'll figure it out, but thank you. I'll yield for the time being, but I may come back. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Is that a threat?

LEG. SPENCER:

I'll be back.

P.O. GREGORY:

We may make you register. Thank you, Chief, for coming here today and those that are with you. I have some questions as well. I have to admit, I really don't like this bill. I mean, this is almost a result of -- I know we had looked for a solution during the budget process, but we just couldn't find the funds to fill the hole, that's why we're really here today. But I do appreciate your expertise and your position where you say that your members are responding to these false calls and it's obviously a nuisance, it's an inconvenience and it's a distraction from doing other things. So my questions are leaning towards that.

So when a false alarm comes in, the company contacts 911. Is that a priority in the queue? Where does that fit in the queue?

CHIEF CAMERON:

It's one of our lower priorities, I'm not sure exactly what priority it is. But because there's such a volume of them --

P.O. GREGORY:

Uh-huh.

CHIEF CAMERON:

-- sometimes our response time to them is not optimal like we would want it to be, just because there's so many of them.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

CHIEF CAMERON:

So had there actually been a crime in progress, we may not be getting there as soon as we would like because there's a hundred thousand of these and it overburdens our system, and they seem to be incrementally increasing as more and more people get alarm systems in their house.

P.O. GREGORY:

And so that was my next question. I must have missed it before, but you said there's a hundred thousand false alarms, or alarms, and 90% of those are false alarms, so 90,000 thereabouts.

CHIEF CAMERON:

No, there's a hundred thousand false alarms.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, okay. Oh, wow.

CHIEF CAMERON:

There are alarms that come in that turn out to be something when we arrive, they're recategorized as what they are. If your house is damaged it's a criminal mischief, if your house is burglarized it's a burglary, if it's a bank alarm, hold up alarm, there's a robbery, it's a robbery.

P.O. GREGORY:

Right.

CHIEF CAMERON:

These are purely false alarms and nothing but false alarms.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. And the concern, the real major concern that I have is these are people that are looking to protect their home and property, and it's almost like everyone gets penalized -- and excuse me for using that term, penalized in the sense of having to register and pay a fee. Some get penalized more because if they have a false alarm, they actually have to pay a fine. So my question is -- I know, I've spoken to Legislator Krupski and some others in the smaller towns and villages, they have a similar program that's been very successful. Are there any Counties or jurisdictions of our size that have done this, and what was their success?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Well, we don't have to look far, sir, we can just look towards Nassau County.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, okay.

CHIEF CAMERON:

They have a program and they're one of the ones that gave us great success statistics with reductions in their alarms. And we see for the people that have alarm systems, just the permit fee itself, paying the permit fee as being a value added for them. Because when they register, they can

General Meeting - 12/15/15

supply us with alternative means of contact, they can supply us with alternative contacts. So if we respond to their home and we find a problem such as an open door, and I recall myself, when I was a Police Officer, being in this very position. I would respond to a home, the door is open, I'm unable to contact anybody, I wish I could because I would love for them to come down, make sure their house was not burglarized, re-secure their home. And I would feel much better if I could do that, but I had absolutely no means to contact them. So this will allow us to collect that.

On the same plane with that is your alarm goes off, perhaps you've provided your cell phone number to your alarm company, you're here at a long Legislative meeting like you are today, you get that call your alarm went off at your home, now you have a lot of angst all day, should I go home, should I check on my house, is it a false alarm, did someone break into my home? What we want to do with this system is, because we've collected that contact information, after officers have checked your home, made sure it's secure, we want to electronically notify you as a follow up; the Suffolk County Police have been to your home, we found no apparent break, we think everything is secure, and then you can be relieved that you can go on about your business for the rest of the day and feel as though your house is secure.

So there is, in my mind, value added for the people that just simply sign up for the permits. And then they have the ability to have two unintentional alarms through the year that will reset at the beginning of the next year and they'll get two alarms again. I think that's pretty fair in my mind to have two of those alarms. If there's a malfunctioning with the system they can get it repaired, or if someone responds without the code and sets it off, that can be addressed as well.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. So how long has Nassau had their program in place; do you know?

CHIEF CAMERON:

It's been over 20 years.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

CHIEF CAMERON:

In some form for over 20 years.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. And --

CHIEF CAMERON:

And they cite great success with the reduction in the false alarms.

P.O. GREGORY:

And their program is similar where you have to register on a yearly basis, you have to pay whatever the fee is and then there's two times and you get a fine.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Yes, sir.

P.O. GREGORY:

Very similar?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Their system is very similar. The one thing that they have, you pay three years of permit fees at

once.

P.O. GREGORY:

Three years.

CHIEF CAMERON:

So if you're talking about an impact on a low income community, you would have to come up with a much larger --

P.O. GREGORY:

Right.

CHIEF CAMERON:

-- amount of money. Ours is spread out on an annual basis. So if you've paid ahead for three years and you move, you may not be able to get your money back. So ours is on a yearly basis, which we think is fairer.

P.O. GREGORY:

Right. Now I know in Suffolk, you know, we're much larger than Nassau County and we have pretty much the East End is all separate police jurisdictions, I live in Amityville, they're a separate police jurisdiction; in Huntington they have their own; some -- you know, Lloyd Neck and some others -- have their own police jurisdictions. I'm not sure, I'm not all that familiar with Nassau County. I know some of the villages have their own police jurisdictions. So obviously I guess they did the similar program because there were concerns about their response times to even in a smaller jurisdiction, a geographically smaller place was having to respond to these nuisance, or however you want to term them, calls; is that what the impetus was, do you know?

CHIEF CAMERON:

I'm not certain what the impetus was, but I would imagine it's similar to ours.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

CHIEF CAMERON:

I mean, really responding to false alarms, I don't want to say is a waste of our time.

P.O. GREGORY:

Right.

CHIEF CAMERON:

But our time could be much better utilized for higher priority calls or for traffic enforcement or for a lot of other things.

P.O. GREGORY:

Do we have -- and my last question. I know you have the number of the hundred thousand false calls, false alarms, but do you have any information as far as the break down? Is it out of the hundred thousand it's, you know, 30,000 people who are getting three false alarms, or is it a lot of -- is it a small segment of the community that are getting these majority of these false alarms four, five, six times, or is it a larger segment of the community.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Forty-eight thousand locations had three or more alarms. We had one location, one commercial

business, that had 158 alarms in one year.

P.O. GREGORY:

Wow.

CHIEF CAMERON:

And there's absolutely no disincentive for them to do that year-after-year. They could have 365 alarms a year and there's no disincentive right now for them to fix their alarm system or to do anything with their employees that set it off repeatedly.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. That's very important, I'm glad you said that. All right, thank you. Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you very much. This is a problem. Clearly, 97,000 false alarms a year -- BRO, check my math, I did some very simple math. I did 97,000 divided by 365 days in a year, that's 265 false alarms a day.

I then divided that by seven precincts?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Correct.

LEG. HAHN:

That's 38 false alarms a day per precinct.

MR. LIPP:

Pretty close.

LEG. HAHN:

Well, 30 -- it was 37.25 -- yeah, seven-five or something like that.

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. HAHN:

So I can do simple math, good (*laughter*). Yeah, I used a calculator, thank you (*laughter*).

I mean, this is not -- this is -- when you say 17% of calls, when you say, you know -- this is one out of every six calls is a false alarm. This is a drain on resources that is absolutely unbelievable. And, you know, I can tell a story from, you know, growing up. I am a daughter of a volunteer firefighter, and I remember when I was a little girl, because, you know, my bedroom was right next to the stairs in our house and it actually -- my bedroom sat over the back door, and every time my father answered the call in the middle of the night, he'd run down the stairs next to my bedroom and run out the back door that the door would slam under and it would wake me up. And there was a period of time where they had, over and over and over again, false alarms at the Stony Brook Boys School in a dormitory. And every night, three times a night they would answer. Now, I remember it as going on for four months; I was very young, it could have been a week for all I know now, looking back on it. But the idea that the resources -- and it turns out, if I remember correctly, it was something like a spider web, or whatever, got caught in the smoke detector, but it had an automatic alarm that went to 911 and the fire department got called every night and there was no incentive for them to figure out -- disincentive or incentive for them to figure out what was the mechanical wrong. There was nothing there.

It was -- you know, if there had been, okay, every time there was an alarm there would have been a fee paid, whether this was that school or whether this was another business. If there had just been some sort of something that incentivized them to just look, what is wrong here for them to just call their system operations, and say, *Why does this alarm keep going off? You know, I don't want to get the fee*, this will do that. This will make people have to look when something -- if something goes -- is a little too sensitive to the wind blowing. Right now, ah, the guys come, *Oh, sorry, it must have been the wind. Oh, it was a raccoon that went through*, whatever. You know, I think that this will make folks look carefully into their system and figure out and ask the companies to make sure that their system doesn't -- right now there's no reason. I know I every time -- I once, you know, burned something on the stove, or the oven. When I first moved into my house, my oven was --

LEG. BROWNING:

(Inaudible)

LEG. HAHN:

You know, we wound up the fire department got called and I felt horrendous, I couldn't believe it. I thought back to my Dad and how they had to come out as volunteers and come down to my house, I can't believe I'm calling them when it's -- you know, the stove's smoking and we had just moved in and it was a stove that was malfunctioning. It was like electric inside the stove itself that was burning. But my point here is whether it's volunteer firefighter resources in the case of smoke detectors that malfunction, whether it's police officer resources in the case of security alarms that may malfunction or human error, the drain on the resources is significant. And this will, as you said, will significantly reduce the number of calls that are not needed. There is no need for our police officers to be responding in those 97,000 instances, 265 a day, 38 a day per precinct. I mean, that is just incredibly -- and each time they spend about how much time? I mean, obviously depending on if it's a commercial building that's huge or a house or a home that's, you know, a traditional four-bedroom, there may be a big difference, but they spend not an insignificant amount of time checking out the premises, am I correct?

CHIEF CAMERON:

I would say at least 20 or 30 minutes for every alarm is a fair estimate to say.

LEG. HAHN:

At least 20 or 30 minutes.

CHIEF CAMERON:

A lot of time.

LEG. HAHN:

Right, and that's a lot of time. When you add that up and when you times it by the number of instances on average a day, that is a lot of time that our officers are spent when they absolutely don't need to be there. So there's patrol needs that are significant, and I think that this makes a lot of sense and we have to do something, and we can do something. It's been shown to work in other jurisdictions and I think it's important that we do this. Thank you.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Legislator Martinez.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

That's right, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Profound words.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Profound words. So of course I'm looking out for my district as well. I have a couple of questions, and one of them -- I don't know where Doc went -- but -- he's right here eating my worms. But I understand both sides. My question really is about the financial impacts the fees will have on communities such as the ones that I represent. For example, you know, many of my families have double jobs, you know, sometimes it depends on whether they're going to feed their family or not, you know. So that's really my concern, is the impact it will have on families. And let's say, for example, a family is not able to pay the fee; what will then happen to -- what will happen? What are the consequences if someone's not able to pay? Are you willing to -- well, I'm not going to ask you, but -- I mean, what would you do?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Pay the registration fee or pay the fine?

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Both.

CHIEF CAMERON:

We're not forcing people to get the permit fee. That eliminates the two free alarms; if they had an alarm and we were summoned to their house, they would get fined immediately at a higher rate if they didn't get the permit. Actually, what we would do, we -- the law does not include no response, a no response clause. When we had an alarm law years ago, frequent alarm abusers, like the location I said that had 158 false alarms, we would put them on a no response list, which I don't endorse, because some of the alarms could be legitimate criminal behavior and I think that's bad for the Police Department not to respond to things. We're basically trying to get people to address issues with their alarm system and that and that alone is what we're trying to do by this bill. What happens if they don't pay the fee would probably be a better question for the County Attorney.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Okay. So before the County Attorney does come up, let's say for example, all right, they don't sign up or they do sign up and let's say, for example, they can't pay the registration fee first; what happens then? I know you won't put them on a no response list, but what happens if the family can't pay that registration fee?

CHIEF CAMERON:

If they have no false alarms, absolutely nothing will happen.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

No, but in order for them to -- if I understand correctly, they have to -- well, they don't have to, but you're obviously suggesting that they get the permit, correct?

CHIEF CAMERON:

I would suggest that they get the permit. I think there's -- like I spoke to Mr. Gregory, Legislator Gregory, there's value added in getting the permit. If something happens at your house, we have an alternative means of contacting you; if you're away on vacation, we'll have people that you designate that we can contact you if there's a problem at your house. And if you have an alarm and you're notified by an alarm company and you've supplied us with means to contact you electronically, we'll let you know that your house is secure once we've left there. So I think for most people there's value added, especially people that are working multiple jobs that are unable to leave and come home and check on the house, I think that's something that people would like to have, to know their house is secure after the alarm has gone off.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

And I thank you. I just have a hard time because I know the families that I represent, you know, and sometimes a decision between eating and safety might be juggled; you know, it might be a decision of life or matter for them. And I guess really what I'm asking is I just want a commitment that if someone within any of our Legislative Districts are in need of financial help, that it's going to be given. You know, for example, some sort of payment plan or something, you know, because we can't just not have someone not get the permit because they can't pay.

CHIEF CAMERON:

We don't want this to result in people that need security systems cancelling their security systems, so we will continually reevaluate the system. And if we find that it has a severe, bad impact on somebody, like I said before, we may lower the fine structure if we feel that we'll still have enough disincentive for people not to have multiple false alarms. If people need a payment plan, that's certainly something that we could consider doing.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Okay, thank you. And I guess now the County Attorney in terms of what happens if a person does not pay their fees; are there any consequences? And I don't want to hear like increased fees because if you keep increasing fees they're still not going to be able to pay for the fees.

MR. BRAUN:

Right. There's a provision in the bill for an additional penalty if a fee is paid late, but there's no -- the first -- if you register, the first two false alarms are without any fee and the third one -- I'm talking about residential customers. The third one is \$100 and the fourth one is 150 and it goes up by \$50. There's no particular enforcement provision in the law, it's a civil penalty, it's not a fine, it's a fee. If somebody has, as the Chief has indicated, 138 false alarms in a short amount of time, the decision may be made to sue them for the fees that they should have been paying, but there's nothing in the bill that provides an automatic method for enforcement.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

So --

MR. BRAUN:

And excuse me, one more point. There is a provision that allows the Police Department to promulgate rules and regulations, some of which may require amendment to the law, if it's adopted, and others of which would be procedures to be followed, including a review, including perhaps a payment schedule, including things like that.

As far as registering in the first place, if someone chooses not to register, that's fine. But the first two false alarms that they would have gotten without any fees imposed, they've given that ability up, so if they never have a false alarm, they never pay a fee.

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

LEG. MARTINEZ:

So that raises a whole nother, you know, question, because if there is nothing in place of what would happen if someone does not pay the fee and it continues to increase, then the potential rules and regulations will be -- you know, be put into place, but I don't think P.D. is able to put those regulations of how a person is going to be charged if they don't pay?

MR. BRAUN:

There's -- again, the fees are something that the Legislature will or will not adopt. But how to

collect them, what to do about them, at what level the Department may seek the assistance of the County Attorney's Office to sue for them, all of those things can be done by regulation to be promulgated by the Department under this bill.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

So then if someone does get sued, now they have to not only pay their fines, but they have to find a lawyer, and now they have to pay the lawyer to go to court.

MR. BRAUN:

I'm assuming that we're not going to be chasing anybody for 50 or \$100, but, again, that's not -- the bill doesn't address that.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

So I guess that's where I'm stuck, you know, because what will happen? What will happen if the fees and the fines keep increasing? And there is nothing on the books right now that says that, and people won't be able to pay, and there are no answers for that.

LEG. CILMI:

Threatening letters.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yeah, and then collection agencies, and then bad credit, and it just keeps snowballing.

MR. BRAUN:

So the rules and regulations are to be developed if the bill is adopted, that's all I can -- you know, I don't know exactly what they'll say.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Okay. Thank you. So if you could just, you know, just bear in -- you know, just keep in mind the different types of communities that Suffolk obviously encompasses, and those that are working families that have a hard time just putting food on their table on a daily basis, and do have to have alarm systems in their homes.

CHIEF CAMERON:

I'm aware of that, and I'm also aware that I would prefer to have our police officers addressing the gun problem, the heroin problem, the traffic issue on the roadways. I'd rather have them spend their time doing that than going to false alarms. That's the only intent from the Police Department's perspective is to ensure our ability to reallocate our police resources to things that we feel are a higher priority.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Oh, and I understand that. Third Precinct is one of the busiest precincts and that's the one I represent. And, clearly, I would want P.D. to be responding to the most important calls, but, at the same time, I also need to safeguard -- you know, safeguard those that are not committing the crimes, such as heroin, or driving fast on the street, gang violence, shootings and so forth.

CHIEF CAMERON:

If your alarm systems are working properly and you're very careful in how you operate, and you don't have any false alarms, you're not going to have an issue, even if you don't get a permit. If your house gets burglarized, you're not going to pay a fine, because that's going to be a legitimate response from us. So that's --

LEG. MARTINEZ:

So I get that, that's completely clear to me, but the part that's not clear to me, you know, the whole fine and how someone's going to pay for it. That's the issue that I'm having with this.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Thank you, Legislator Martinez. Next up is Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. I think, Chief Cameron, you've really laid out the scenario very well. I live in Southold Town. We've had this law on the books since 1993. I was surprised that there was no law like this in the County. We reviewed the structure, the fee structure of the other East End towns, and the law was put in place for exactly the reasons that you stated, because it ties up valuable hours of your public safety. It ties up -- you know, we talk about our dispatchers being overworked, and, you know, you've said how many false alarms. That's a lot of false alarms. When the dispatcher gets a call, they don't know if it's a false alarm. They're going to react to it the same way and with the same professionalism and urgency as if it were a serious incident.

So I appreciate your attitude on this. I agree with the bill. I know I had a neighbor once who had an alarm and it was malfunctioning, so he got -- eventually, he got his third false alarm, he got a bill for \$100. And he contacted his vendor and he got it, the system, to operate properly and he never had another false alarm, and that solved the problem, because you're tying up all your resources.

So I find this very easy to support. I don't see it as a revenue generator, because who wants to pay the fine? You've got to take care of your equipment. If you want that system, you got to take care of your equipment. You're not going to generate false alarms and everyone's going to be better off for it, so thank you.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Thank you, sir.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Chomping at the bit.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes. Thank you. So I have a number of questions and comments. I want to impress Legislator Hahn with some of my math. I can do math, too. And I wanted to take her number of false alarms per year divided by the number of days in a year, divided by the number of precincts. She got 38, I think, per precinct. And I want to take that a little bit further, and I want to preface this by saying that I don't -- I appreciate that you're all here to talk about this. I don't blame you for this. There's one person's name on this bill. Legislator Barraga said that this was some idea conceived by some unelected, never-will-be-elected official. The County Executive's name is on this bill. So you take that 38, you divide it by the fact that we have three shifts in each -- in each precinct, right? Thirty-eight divided by three is roughly, let's say, 13 per shift. Each shift consists of eight hours. How many sectors, roughly, are there in each precinct?

CHIEF CAMERON:

It varies. It's probably around 20.

LEG. CILMI:

Twenty sectors.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Twenty, roughly.

LEG. CILMI:

All right. So let's say 20. So there are 20 sectors, 13 alarms per shift, and each shift is roughly an eight-hour shift, roughly.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Correct.

LEG. CILMI:

So is this really a problem? I mean, when you look at it in the aggregate, it sounds like a lot. A hundred thousand alarms, false alarms in a year sounds like an awful lot. But when you break it down, you have one -- less than one false alarm per sector per shift. I mean, hopefully, the sector cars are driving around anyway, so they stop for a few minutes, check out the thing and they move on. When you look at it that way, when you really break it down, it's not a lot of extra work.

LEG. HAHN:

And you think it's divided that evenly by every single one of them? So that it's every single day it's --

LEG. CILMI:

No, no, it's clearly not every single day. It's clearly not dispersed evenly across the year, clearly not dispersed, although the Chief said it's dispersed fairly evenly across precincts. But the bottom line is that the taxpayers of the Police District pay on average \$1100 a year in Police District taxes. They pay on average about \$90,000 a year in General Fund property taxes. On the surface, on the surface, this amounts to a 56% tax increase, property tax increase for the taxpayers in the Police District, at least those that choose to put alarms on their homes because they're concerned for their safety. Fifty-six percent property tax increase, that's what the headline should be. This is not a program, it's not a plan, it's not a fee, it's a tax increase, is what it is, only on the Police District of \$50, at least, just to register your alarm.

Now, if -- Chief, if you are -- if you are sincere in saying that this is really a method to try and, you know, reduce the number of false alarms, okay, so don't charge the registration fee. Give people two chances to fix their alarms, and when they don't fix their alarms, charge them whatever you want to charge them, but don't charge them to register their alarm system as well. They're already paying, like somebody said -- I mean, I pay about, I don't know, \$21 a month, or something like that, to my alarm company, so now my price just went up.

I want to talk about exactly what's happening with these false alarms, and why do we have all these 100,000 false alarms? What is it about the alarms that's creating a false alarm? Is it -- you mentioned something about people were leaving doors open. Is that -- is that predominantly the reason?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Historically, the alarms are probably attributed to a malfunctioning system. As electronics have become better and better, more and more of our alarms are operator error.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Someone, an employee opens the door, doesn't have the code and it sets the alarm system off.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So people are making mistakes. They'll continue to make mistakes. They're not going to all of a sudden stop making mistakes. You may get some of them to disconnect their alarm systems because they don't want to get charged extra money. That's not good for public safety. You may get some people that say, "You know what, I was going to put in an alarm system, but on top of the cost that the alarm company is going to charge me, now I got to pay the County, and if we have false alarms, I've got to pay the County more." They're already paying \$1100 a year in Police District property taxes. They're already paying \$90 a year in General Fund property taxes. As of a couple of months ago, they're going to start paying more money for their -- what was it that we increased? The registration -- the vehicle registration fees. They're going to be paying more money for tax map certifications. They're going to be paying more money to use our parks. And now we're saying to folks, "You want to provide yourself with some security, it's going to cost you more money. Regardless of whether or not you have any false alarms, it's going to cost you money, it's going to cost you 50 bucks." And you could say to folks, "Well, you know what, you don't have to pay the 50 bucks, because, you know, we'll never know until you have an alarm go off in your house." And if we respond, and it was, God forbid, a false alarm, if something happened, even the first time, they're going to get hit with a fee, 100 bucks. All of a sudden, that's 100% tax increase.

I really don't see this as a tool, or as a plan, or as a program at all. Honestly, I mean, I hear Legislator Krupski and I hear you, Chief. I have no reason to disbelieve that alarms in other places where they've instituted this have gone down, but it's almost like saying unemployment is down because there are more jobs. No, people have stopped collecting unemployment insurance.

So I don't -- I don't support this program at all. I think it disproportionately impacts those in our County who are least able to live here, to afford to live here, our seniors, those on fixed income, some of those in our lower income areas, middle income folks as well who are struggling to pay their electrical bills, and their taxes, and their mortgage payments. We cannot continue to dig into pockets that are empty, and that's what this is doing and I can't support that.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

You did my math for me. I was going to do the same thing with the calls. I mean, having said that, I've answered more than my share of alarms. I mean, I'm against this, too, except for the fact that if -- I don't think anybody should be paying the \$50 a year fee. However, if a guy has more than 10, or 15, or some number, there should be some consequence. I mean, I couldn't agree more. I mean, I was doing the math myself and that came up, you know, and a lot of those alarms are all at once, a thunder storm, or a power surge. A lot of those alarms are all blanket -- you know, you get 20 at one time. I can remember getting on --

LEG. CILMI:

No fault of the owner.

LEG. TROTТА:

No. Yeah, but there's a provision for that not to be charged, but that's not the point. That's

100,000 that's still in there. So, if 13 guys a day get a call out of 20 calls that's in the Fourth Precinct, there's 13 false alarms. You know, guess what, the taxpayers are paying a lot of money. However, I don't want the guys going to the same house ten times in a year or 15 times in a year. I agree, that will force them to fix it.

So I don't think there should be a yearly signup. I think that when someone does something wrong ten times, or a business ten times, or six times, or whatever we decide upon, then they would get charged. I agree, you know, the people are struggling. Even in my Legislative District, you know, I get complaints about, you know, every nickel and time, and just not -- you know, I don't think that it's unreasonable for the guy to go into a neighborhood and drive through a neighborhood and check an alarm, because guess what, he's now driving through a neighborhood.

LEG. CILMI:

Exactly.

LEG. TROTTA:

And a lot of times the cops get a bad reputation, so they love to see cars driving through the neighborhood, and sometimes that's the only time they get in there.

So I am against this bill as it stands, but I'd more than like to table it. Come up with a number, and, yes, in short, because that will reduce -- just out of curiosity, how many calls -- how many more than five do you get? Let's use six, more than six.

CHIEF CAMERON:

24,439 more than six.

LEG. TROTTA:

So it cuts it in half from 48, from three to six. That's still, you know, a substantial amount. So, you know, how about ten? One a month, that's too much. Something like six or seven, I think, something we could discuss. I mean, we should table it, talk about it and go from there. I just don't see -- I think Legislator Cilmi brings a great point. You know, having done it, you know, being in Stony Brook, I answered a ton of calls because of alarms, but, you know, guess what, that's what they pay us for. By the way, I used to go to Stony Brook School, and that alarm, that was my sector.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. You done?

LEG. HAHN:

It was the boys school then.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm next on the list here. So, Robert, I got to ask you for a little help on the math, too. So, Chief, you said 90,000, roughly, false alarms a year. And how many patrol officers do we have that would be responding to those alarms?

CHIEF CAMERON:

All of our officers that are assigned to precincts at some time or another would be, no doubt, dispatched to a false alarm.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Are we talking how many men minimum, like patrol officers?

CHIEF CAMERON:

I believe the Patrol Division is about 15, 15 or 1600 people right now.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So, 90, 90,000 divided by 1500. Robert, you got that? So that's --

MR. LIPP:

So they said 97,679 false alarms. We'll use that, divided by 1500, will give 65.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. So each officer is basically doing 65 false alarms a year. And, you know, Legislator Cilmi made it sound like it's just a simple thing, but with the drive time and then they have paperwork, don't they, right?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

So what is the typical amount of time associated with it.

CHIEF CAMERON:

As I said before, I would say it's very fair to say it's 20 to 30 minutes to handle an alarm call from start to finish. It could be more. It depends where you are. It depends, as Legislator Hahn said, how large the --

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

But don't they have to do a report, then, that they responded? There's paperwork associated with it, it was a false alarm.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Correct. Correct, yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

So is that in that 30 minutes, or that's on top of that 30 minutes of driving there and checking on it?

CHIEF CAMERON:

It may be on top of that. It may be an extra few minutes to fill out the -- we don't do a paper report, we do an online report for the alarms.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

So maybe an hour?

CHIEF CAMERON:

No, that's not --

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Total?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Not that long. In my mind, it's all waste of time, really.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm just trying to figure out, like on a -- how many hours is spent responding to false alarms,

because we --

MR. LIPP:

About 32 or 3 it would amount to.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right.

MR. LIPP:

If you used 30 minutes per call, then it would amount --

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

The average cost to put a cop on the street per hour, with salary and benefits.

MR. LIPP:

Well, it's an opportunity cost, it's not really going to be an actual savings.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

We're talking millions of dollars, millions. You know, probably conservatively 3, 3 million. Robert, you don't have the number there, but --

LEG. HAHN:

It's 2 million.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Several millions dollars of County taxpayer dollars being wasted on false alarms. I think that's significant. Robert --

MR. LIPP:

So a simple \$100,000 per cop, which is, you know, a lower bound number. But using it for illustrative purposes, it would be about 3.3 million.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay, so \$3.3 million. So there's a huge cost to the County taxpayer already with these false alarms. If we reduce the number of false alarms, we have savings there.

Robert, in terms of the budgetary impact, if this were not to pass, this was like about \$7 million in revenue?

MR. LIPP:

Right. So, as Legislator Gregory mentioned before, we did discuss this down in the Working Group, that we, you know, observed, obviously, if the recommended budget should include over 7.3 million for this one purpose in the Police District. And we struggled with it, because we couldn't find that large of an offset, given other issues in the budget.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can I ask, how do you -- how did you come up with that number, though, because there's -- okay. There's the registration fee, which is somewhat optional, they don't have to pay that, they can pay that. I don't know how many alarms there are out there. So then we'd have to figure out how many there are. Let's say there's 80,000 homes or 100,000 homes that have alarms, and then we'd have to go -- what percentage will pay the fee, how many false alarms they'll have. There'll be -- the idea is for false alarms to go down, so we're not going to -- you know, if it goes down by 50% --

and, Chief, you had given a number earlier in terms of other areas and how much false alarms had dropped. So I just -- Robert, did you factor these things in? Is this a real number?

MR. LIPP:

So that's an excellent question. The best I could say is we didn't come up with a calculation, but we were very concerned that we would be able to bring in that kind of money, because there was a program that -- although it was different years ago, and I don't believe there was much money generated from that. That being said, we considered the 7.3 million to be a risk factor in the budget. However, without passing this, then, it's 100% clear that there would be a hole of 7.3 million in the Police District budget, having nothing to do with whether or not it's a good idea or bad idea, service provision wise.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, even if we pass it, there may be a hole. It might not be --

MR. LIPP:

Right. So if we pass it, there may be a hole. We don't know for sure.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

If revenues come in less --

MR. LIPP:

If we don't, there's 100% --

MR. LIPP:

I suppose it could be -- revenues could come in above that figure, but without knowing the method for calculating it, it's hard to predict whether it's a good number or not.

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Particularly, you've been pretty on with your projections.

MR. LIPP:

Well, it's always especially difficult to predict something that's new without any experience, given the difference here.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I mean, Nassau County is similar size. What is Nassau County? Is this -- are the fee structures similar to Nassau County?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Yes, they're extremely similar to Nassau County.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

And what are they bringing in, do you know, to this program?

CHIEF CAMERON:

I believe they had 4 to 5 million in the budget, but that's -- don't hold me to that. It was approximately that amount of money.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. So that might be a more reasonable number that's brought in from this.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Don't forget, they've also had their program in place 20 years and they've already seen a reduction in false alarms.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Oh, okay.

CHIEF CAMERON:

A significant reduction in false alarms.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's a good point, too.

CHIEF CAMERON:

I anticipate that the revenue will go down, because we're going to reduce the number of false alarms, which is our purpose here.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. They also, though, might have more alarms than that, so I don't know, in Nassau County.

CHIEF CAMERON:

They may. They may have.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN,

More alarms systems, you know.

CHIEF CAMERON:

They may, yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I don't know. That's also an assumption, so all right. I mean, I think that's something we -- and it won't be me, because I won't be here, but something we're going to have to watch, if this goes through during the year, whether we're coming in anywhere near expectations, because, otherwise, we're going to end up with a larger hole in the budget.

But I'm going to support this. I believe Southampton Town, where I'm heading for as Supervisor, has a program like this. I don't think there's even a reset function. I think if you have a -- that second alarm comes within a -- it doesn't matter how many years later, you get hit with that penalty. But East Hampton, I believe, has the same program, and Southold we heard has a similar program. So it's up and running and it's -- the Police District doesn't extend out into the Town of Southampton, but I -- if you don't put it in place, then I think you have a real problem with next year's budget as well. But I think what you said today really underscores that this could free up resources. This could add to faster response times, because people will take -- you know, they're not going to be accustomed to those false alarms. So I think there's a -- there are several benefits that make this worth supporting. Okay. Next up is Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Good evening, gentlemen. Most of the questions I had have been asked and asked and asked. I am in the position of great difficulty. Like some, I was on the Operating Budget Committee, and we thought this out and we debated it. And it was difficult then with the situation that the County's in,

and the Police having so many excessive calls, it seemed like a good idea. And then the bill was put in front of me, and I read it and I said, "Oh, no."

My district covers two precincts. They're not the worst districts -- they're not the worst precincts. I have a lot of seniors and I have a lot of young families. I -- I guess I'm an anomaly, but I encourage my seniors to apply for food stamps, because their Social Security and their pensions are so small that they are having difficulty paying their taxes and eating, paying their taxes and paying for the electric bill. They're weighing their bills every month. The young families in my district, there are some that live in houses that I could never expect to live in, or on their third year holding off foreclosure. Now just because people make poor decisions in life or lose a job, that's not something that I can do anything about. Now I'm hearing if these seniors or these families that are struggling to put food on the table don't do it, don't register, they'll have to pay the first time, they'll have to pay the second time, and then civil fines?

Now, I will tell you, I would bet that 50% of my seniors, if their alarm goes out, they are barely paying for the company to maintain it. They can't afford an electrician. They're getting \$18, which is not, a lot a month in food stamps to keep them alive.

My thing here, my discrepancy is I would like to have better answers what the rules will be toward civil fines. And perhaps we can tweak, make it from two to a little bit more, as Legislator Trotta was saying. So I'm going to request a tabling. I do feel that your people -- even though it appears not to be that great an amount per shift, if it delays one person getting help in a severe situation, it's too much. So I'm going to request a tabling of the bill so we can rework it a little bit.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Kennedy makes a motion to table.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Barraga. I have Legislator --

MR. RICHBERG:

We already have a tabling motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, we did? Oh, I'm sorry.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

A while ago.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Spencer is next on the list.

LEG. SPENCER:

Certainly. I've had a chance to listen to some testimony, and one thing I do think that hasn't been mentioned is that we're saying 91,000 false alarms a year. And we all get the --

LEG. CILMI:

Ninety-seven.

LEG. SPENCER:

How many? Ninety-seven. And we all get the ShotSpotter report, and in ShotSpotter report, it says false and unsubstantiated, and that's also a concern, because, you know, someone could be running -- who's menacing, running up to someone's back door, jiggling the door, setting off the alarm and running away. So someone comes there -- and this is -- this is important. You're going to -- we're going to impose fines on people that at some point, what if it is a situation, the difference between a false alarm versus an unsubstantiated alarm, and there's not enough investigation there to necessarily determine that? And I personally witnessed that happen, where I had in my business a situation where a belligerent vagrant who decided that they were going to come up and shake my back door and set off the alarm, and the police came by several times, and there's no evidence, there's no window broken, there's no entering. So I don't know if there's a way to distinguish the number of unsubstantiated, is one of my concerns.

I mentioned seniors, I mentioned low and fixed income people. What about churches? What about not-for-profits? I do think that that is an issue. And then we're saying that every time there's an alarm that goes off, that the police respond. And I also know from personal experience that sometimes after an alarm goes off once or twice, that there isn't the response, that they might come by an hour later. They may know that it's a site where there's been kind of chronic things that have gone on.

My issue is that, yes, there's a problem. Yes, I would do anything possible to support my Chief Cameron, who is basically coming into this position and deserves our support and for a major issue. You know, I would love to see some sort of educational awareness program, some public service announcements where we say, "Do you know how much it costs every time there's a false alarm? Make sure your alarm is checked." I would love to see the fees go down; go up for commercial violators, go up for chronic violators after you reach a threshold of like six or seven, and not hit people for \$100 after two false alarms. There are other ways. We don't have to force policy.

I would love to know, out of these false alarms, how many of them are commercial? How many of them are residential? I think that's important. I think there needs to be more research where these are coming from. I think there needs to be some way to deal with an unsubstantiated issue. And if you fine me and I'm going to say how -- you can't tell me it was a false alarm where someone could have come up and rattled my back door and ran away, and now you've got the right to fine me.

So I just -- I understand the need to balance the budget, I understand the need to address issues, but I have a concern with rushed bad policy, that this can be tweaked. There are other ways to address this issue, and it doesn't mean that we are married to this. It doesn't mean that we don't care about false alarms and we don't care about police resources because we don't support this policy. So I -- as I've listened more and more, we need more research, we need more data, we need other strategies, and I can't support this.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. So while we're sitting here, I texted a friend of mine who works in a sector car. I'm not going to say what precinct, I'm not giving him away. However, I asked him, "How many alarm calls do you get in a week?" He said, "Well, actually it's probably two or three a day." And he said it depends, but some sectors do more than others. So I asked him, "Do you have other calls that come in at the same time when you're responding to an alarm?" And he said, "Yeah, you do." He says, "I could be going to an alarm call and get a call for a heroin overdose or a heart attack." So I said, "Well, how do you decide if that's a false alarm? Do I go to the false alarm, do I go to the heroin overdose and the heart attack?" And he said, "Well, you don't know it's a false alarm."

General Meeting - 12/15/15

However, I guess they usually take the heart attack or the heroin overdose as a priority. But he says, "To be honest with you, 97% of those alarms are false." And he said, "That's my experience."

And like I said at the beginning, is, you know, I -- I do think we just talked to George. I'm going to put something January, because come '17, I don't think -- I don't think this is working. I don't think that -- and I think that the renewal of a registration of a year, I think it's a bad idea. But, again, I've said I've had two -- my alarm system, when I had it put in, and I've had two false alarms on my system, and when I realized what was causing my alarm, it was those chicken cutlets that were getting overcooked, that I needed to move my alarm, I needed to move the sensor, and I did and I never had another call since.

So there is a certain amount of responsibility on the part of the alarm owner to realize that there's issues. And I do believe we do have exemptions if it's a weather condition, a power surge. So there should be some responsibility. And, you know, when I'm talking to my friend here in the precinct that he works, and he's saying that 97% of them are false alarms, I think we need to do something. Residents need to be more responsible. And I think that when they see they're going to get a fine, they're going to be more responsible.

And to respond to putting the food on the table, whatever, you know, we have an alarm. The reason we got it was my husband was being deployed, so that's why we got it. Then it get to the point where the price was going up, cancel it, we can't afford it right now. So if you can afford to pay that monthly fee, then I think you could probably afford to pay a registration, and, hopefully, you'll not get the alarms and you'll be a responsible resident and you'll never have to pay the fine. I think somebody said it's a volunteer program on another issue. But, anyway, so I think that I am going to support this now, but I am working with George to already have something for January to lay on the table to make some changes. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

So it's a little while later and Legislator Cilmi is not here.

LEG. MURATORE:

He is.

LEG. HAHN:

He's not here? Okay. Darn it. So the bottom line, you know.

LEG. BARRAGA:

He had a false alarm.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. HAHN:

He had a false alarm? So the bottom line, the Chief said that, you know, these were pretty much evenly distributed throughout the precincts by precinct. He didn't say they were evenly distributed by sector or by shift. Regardless of that, they all go through 911. We know the strain on our 911 system, and I'm really surprised, and this is to Mr. Cilmi -- Legislator Cilmi. You know, "Mr. Lean Government" would be willing to put up with this kind of inefficiency in the system. This is absolutely complete wasted time. It's inefficient.

Quite frankly, I think it's a racket that this -- how does an industry get away with saying that they're

providing security, they're providing security when all they do is they forward it to 911? I mean, didn't it used to be that they would send a car around, that they would check it out and then they'd call 911 if there was a problem? This is like a complete drain on our system, that this industry is getting away with saying that they provide security.

And there's a certain -- you know, one in six calls. There's a certain percentage of the population who's getting more services than the rest of us. Those who have systems and that automatically call because there's some sort of malfunction, sometimes human error, they're getting more services than everyone else. And really, in a way, that's just inefficient. And, as you know, it just really seems to me this is common sense. It's done every -- almost every -- you know, many other places, successfully decreased the number of false alarms. And, clearly, we have to do something, if, you know, 17% of calls that our Police Officers are responding to are false alarms. And this will go a long way to decreasing that, and, you know, I think -- once again, I think it's a good idea. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Muratore.

LEG. MURATORE:

Thank you. You know, I've been sitting here all night and I'm looking at both sides of the table here, and each side is trying to convince the other that their figures are the ones that count. You know, the Department is showing, "Look at our numbers," and we're trying to say, "No, no, our numbers are better." You know, and then a couple of my colleagues have said, "Well, you know what, if we do it this way, we'll never have a false alarm." Well, we all know you can never say never. You know, there are things that are going to happen out there and people are going to be impacted by it.

You know, we spent, the nine of us, and I was part of it, sat down below in the room downstairs and we crafted a budget with the best tools we had. We used estimates from both sides. We thought we were experts in estimating this and estimating that. We thought we were experts in making this decision and that decision. And I thought the deal was going to be, is, you know, if you're on the team and you make -- and the quarterback makes the call, and you come up, you know, to play, you're going to carry out the play, you know. And I don't think it's fair that some people sat down there, and I don't know if it's anybody, but if you're thinking that way, I think it's wrong. If you sat down there and you worked on the budget, then you should stick by what you -- the plan you put forward, no matter what it means to you, because you know what, if you're worrying about getting elected or not elected on a budget like this, I don't agree with that. I think that what you do in your district and the way you handle your people is what's going to make or break you.

So my plan is maybe -- you know, we can't -- we can't do away with this. It's going to put a hole in our budget. You know, I heard a rumor from a little birdie that they're talking about another emergency in January or February, you know what that's going to mean, so I don't think we can do that. What I think we should do, and we should think about this, is we pass it as it is right now, and then we do, like Kate says, and in February, we start making the changes. Maybe we want to change the fees. Maybe we want to educate the public, you know, and make provisions for the mistakes that we're going to learn about when this resolution becomes a law, because there's going to be some things we've never thought of here, and we'll have some time to do that, but we got to do this together.

You know, if we all stand, all 18 of us, and say, "Okay, you know what, this is what we're going to do, we're going to work together," we've got a responsibility to the constituents and the taxpayers of Suffolk County. We made decisions on alarms. They are -- they do cost us money, they cost us time, they're very expensive. Nine of us sat down there and picked a number and put that into the

budget. If we put it off now, if we table it, we're going to get hurt monetarily-wise, it's going to put a hole in the budget. At least if we do what I'm recommending, we move it forward and then we start to work on it the first meeting that we can in January. So that's my pitch on it. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Tom. Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

So I agree that we need to address the problem of those individuals. Both residential and commercial that are putting a burden on our Police Officers need to be addressed, they need to be fined, and they need to be identified. However, I don't agree that we should penalize those that have security systems. Why do we all need to register? We didn't do anything wrong. Most of the people don't -- you know, they don't mean to set off their alarms. But why, number one, do we need to register? That's \$50 and \$100 for nonresidential commercial. You know, those are my -- those are two concerns.

And like I said, you know, I agree, we need to address the problem, and we need to fine those individuals that are creating this problem to the extreme, and it is an extreme, 97,000 calls. But who's to say someone's in their house and the alarm goes off? They don't think it's a -- you know, it's an emergency, and the alarm company calls and they say, "Is this a false emergency," and they say, "Yeah I think it is," and it may not be. So, I mean, that -- hopefully, that would be a very rare situation, but it's still a concern.

And there's some holes in this legislation as far as, like Legislator Spencer said, we need to identify exactly what these calls were about, you know, which are false and which are not. You know, there needs to be identification and more information pertaining to this. So, again -- but going back to, you know, why are those folks that have security systems having to pay that extra fee? That's a concern to me. So thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Schneiderman.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yeah, thank you. I'll be very brief. I just wanted to look at the numbers one different way, which I think -- before I looked at it monetarily, but I want to look at it in terms of human beings.

When you said, Chief, that it was roughly 97,000 false alarms, and that this program, you believed, would cut the number of false alarms in half, and that it would be roughly -- each response to a false alarm is about a half an hour with paperwork. So I calculated that, in terms of hours, at around 24,250 hours, and based on the schedule for your police officers of around 2000 hours a year, it's basically equivalent to 12 additional police officers. That's significant. If we could put an additional 12 cops out on the street, we'd want to do that, and we know that they're needed. So this program is equivalent to putting 12 additional cops out there. That's significant, and just one more way to look at it, besides the \$3 million or so in savings we have in the revenue, 12 additional cops.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I just have a couple of quick questions and some new ground to cover here on the issue. If I could ask, did we look at reversing the process, and rather than charging the fee or the penalties to the homeowners, charging it to the alarm companies?

CHIEF CAMERON:

The alarm companies really don't control the false alarms. It's the homeowners that cause them, either primarily by misoperating a system, or having someone come into the house or their business that they have not provided the -- either the code word or the code to turn the alarm system off. So I think -- I personally think it would be unfair to fine the alarm companies, because all they basically do is install the system and then monitor it for the customer.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay. No, I could understand that, having spent several hours with the 911 operators last week and listening in to the calls that they take, and it was an overwhelming number of calls were for alarms. Whether they were false or not, I couldn't tell, but it was obvious that that was a huge majority of the calls that they get on an hourly basis. So I agree, there is definitely an issue here with it, and when you see that there's some -- there was a commercial business owner who had 145 false alarms to their business, I mean, that's excessive. And I -- I'm just trying to think -- figure, is there another way of trying to accomplish what everyone is trying to accomplish and just trying to eliminate some of these?

CHIEF CAMERON:

This is a Department of Justice recommendation, it's a national policy recommendation to address this issue. We didn't just pull this issue out of the air, and a lot of other municipalities have adopted similar programs with great success.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay. My next question would be to the Administration, if I could ask Katie or Lisa to come up to the mic.

MS. SANTERAMO:

Hi.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Hi, Lisa. If I could just ask you on the record if you -- you know, if this is passed tonight, I think we all agree that there needs to be some changes made to it. Would you on the record agree to amend the legislation to make some of those corrections?

MS. SANTERAMO:

Yes. We are hoping that this bill passes tonight, but we are committed to working with this body to help identify offsets for 2016 to accomplish any amendments that this body would wish to make.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay. Thank you. That's it.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

I think I said in my comments that if this were truly about discouraging false alarms, charge people who have numbers of false alarms, but don't -- as Legislator Anker said, there's no need to charge people the equivalent of a 56% tax increase to register their alarm systems. If you want to discourage people who are willfully ignorant of their failing -- of their alarm systems, who willfully leave their doors open, or somehow give people the wrong codes, or whatever it is, you want to charge those people who are, you know, blatant violators, charge those people, I don't care. But don't charge people who are -- who are just trying to protect their homes. There's no reason for that, there's absolutely no reason for it. Charge people if they're going to -- if they're going to

waste the Police Department's time.

Nobody wants to waste -- despite all of the calculations, and my calculations and Jay's calculations, we could all -- look, we could all massage numbers to look one way or the other. Yeah, it's costly, okay. Charge people when there's a blatant disregard for the time that it takes for a Police Department to respond, the time that it takes a 911 operator to take the phone call and dispatch a police officer, but don't charge your average everyday, you know, guy or gal who's just trying to protect their homes. Fifty bucks is a lot of money. They're only paying \$89 a year in their General Fund property taxes.

You know, there was one other thing that I wanted to mention that came up, and I -- it's slipping my mind at the moment, but, you know, that's the long and the short of it. You know, Legislator Muratore mentioned something about being down in the budget room and, you know, committing to work together, and putting forth a budget, and then voting for the budget, etcetera. I'm not sure. I'd like to ask Legislator Kennedy, maybe, since she seems to be looking at me, did anyone come to you to discuss the specifics of this bill before they put forth this bill, as somebody who was in the room and, you know, just -- and voted on the budget favorably?

LEG. KENNEDY:

We discussed it. We discussed the penalty. We discussed the registration. None of the rest of this stuff. No progressive --

LEG. CILMI:

Right.

LEG. KENNEDY:

-- billing.

LEG. CILMI:

So you discussed -- you discussed it on sort of a cursory level, but no specifics.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Very cursory. Very cursory.

LEG. CILMI:

And that was only in your budget. Nobody from the -- the County Executive sponsored this bill. This is a County Executive bill. Did the County Executive's Office reach out to you post those -- after those discussions and discuss the contents of this bill at all?

LEG. KENNEDY:

No. I opened my packet, just like anyone who gets them, and was appalled.

LEG. CILMI:

Legislator Muratore, did anyone call you and discuss the specifics of this bill after the budget, the, you know, basement budget negotiations that you were in?

LEG. MURATORE:

But it's our job to investigate it. If we see the --

LEG. CILMI:

After you -- but you only --

LEG. MURATORE:

Let's look at it.

LEG. CILMI:

Once you got the bill, which already contained some details, then you had to go back and investigate it afterwards.

LEG. MURATORE:

Correct.

LEG. CILMI:

Nobody reached out to you to say --

LEG. MURATORE:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

-- "You know what, here's how we're" -- "here's how we're looking at doing this. There's going to be a graduated" -- you know, "a graduated fee based on the number of false alarms," etcetera, etcetera. No one reached out to you to discuss that kind of detail?

LEG. MURATORE:

Well, you know, we can ask some of our other colleagues that were down there. Maybe ask the P.O., because he's got a sharper mind, but I know my -- Leslie and I --

*(*Laughter*)*

Leslie and I, you know, we heard it. We saw what was going -- where they were going with it. Maybe we didn't get all the final details, but it was enough to convince us downstairs that we supported it.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

LEG. MURATORE:

And we said yay.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

LEG. MURATORE:

I mean, that's what it was about, you know. And, like I said, I don't think it's -- I don't want to say you have to go, but I don't think it's the right thing to do to say no up here when we said yes downstairs.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So I mean, I want to make my position perfectly clear. If we have repeat violators who have shown a willful ignorance to the cost associated, not only the fiscal cost, but the potential cost to other -- dealing with other public safety emergencies associated with their -- with their repeated false alarms, then let's fine those people, but let's not tax innocent people who are just trying to protect their homes.

Let's table this bill today. There's a mechanism to address problems in bills, if we all agree that

there are problems in bills. And that's not to pass them and then figure it out later, it's to table them and then figure it out. That's why we have tabling.

LEG. MURATORE:

Can I ask Legislator Cilmi a question?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

If we do that, Tom, I'm being told that we're going to suffer catastrophic losses, it's going to be a big hole in the budget. I mean, I think that's -- you know, if we can do that, if we can table this -- but then don't we have to go through the process again? Because anything that dies tonight is over.

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah. So according to my calendar --

LEG. MURATORE:

If we move forward, we got to start the process over.

LEG. CILMI:

According to my calendar, it's December 15th. Our organizational meeting is on January 4th. I mean, I suppose we could put something -- I don't know if we can put something on the agenda for that meeting. Maybe we can, maybe we can't, but we could certainly do it at the next meeting.

LEG. MURATORE:

I mean, if we can move it along and -- you know, I mean, I'm for that, I mean, because you see the problems here. All the questions that weren't answered, the Department's coming up with some -- you know, some more answers, we're coming up with some more questions and more ways to fix this, and maybe we can make it a good bill where the people who violate the rules are penalized and the good people are not.

LEG. CILMI:

I'd be happy to have those discussions with people. There's a level, I'm sure, that we would all agree on, but let's not pass a bill that many of us feel is flawed at this point in time, and then try and go back and address it later, because once it's done it's done. And if we can't find consensus on an amendment, it's going to stay the way it is, and that's not acceptable to me.

P.O. GREGORY:

And if I may, I've been informed that this proposal was in the BRO report, Page 7. So I think it was --

LEG. CALARCO:

Among other pages.

P.O. GREGORY:

Among other pages, still was available for public consumption. I'm not sure why you haven't seen it or read it, but it was available. Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:

I'm good.

P.O. GREGORY:

You're good? Did I just see your hand, Legislator D'Amaro?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Just a very quick question, procedurally, to Counsel. George, can the County Executive bring a CN at the organizational meeting?

MR. NOLAN:

Only if it was on the -- it's a special meeting. If it was on the special meeting agenda, then, yes, I suppose he could.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So that's an option that's still available as of now?

MR. NOLAN:

That's an option.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay.

MR. NOLAN:

It would have to be on the special meeting agenda. You'd have to post the public -- you know, you'd have to post the public hearing. You know, it would come on as an emergency basis. So you can -- you can pass a Local Law in one day.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah. I'm only thinking out loud on this, because I am concerned about the budget ramifications of not going forward this evening. So perhaps that's an option that would get a revised bill passed very early in the year.

MR. NOLAN:

I would just add, we almost -- well, at least in my experience, we've never done business at the organizational meeting.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Or what would be the next regular meeting where a CN could be brought?

MR. NOLAN:

That would be, I think, at the end of January, beginning of February.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, so we'd miss a month.

LEG. CILMI:

And our history has shown us, if I may, Mr. Presiding Officer, that sometimes we literally tape 8 1/2 by 11 sheets of copy paper on the front door and call it a public notice for a public hearing. So if for some reason we couldn't get a public hearing notice out over the next couple of weeks, we could tape a piece of paper to the door and call it a day.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. That's all I have that wanted to speak. We do have a motion to approve and a motion to table. Motion to table goes first, and roll call.

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

LEG. CILMI:

Yes to table.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes to table.

LEG. SPENCER:

Pass.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No.

LEG. STERN:

No.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

No.

LEG. LINDSAY:

No.

LEG. CALARCO:

No.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

No.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes to table.

LEG. BROWNING:

No.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No to table.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No to table.

P.O. GREGORY:

No to table.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eight.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Approval motion, roll call.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Excuse me, on the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Very briefly. I just want to make it very clear for the record that I am going to support this bill here this evening with the understanding from the County Executive's Office and from, I think, most of my colleagues here that we will work in the new year to change this bill to incorporate many of the suggestions that we heard here today.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you.

LEG. SPENCER:

And I feel the same way. I'm so strongly against it as being bad policy, but with a firm commitment, not that possibly, but that when this is changed, to have better research and better reflect. Understanding that the Budget Group worked very hard, that we made a commitment to this, I'm going to support this with the understanding that this is going to change. I don't like this policy, I'm very unhappy about it, but we made a commitment.

LEG. BROWNING:

DuWayne.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes, Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

I've already talked to George. We have already got some stuff in line for our first meeting. And I want to say, Chief Cameron, welcome to the Legislature.

*(*Laughter*)*

CHIEF CAMERON:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Has anyone calculated the amount that we paid him to sit here for the past hour and twenty minutes?

*(*Laughter*)*

The whole dais, gees. So we have roll call. Oh, I'm sorry. Legislator Muratore.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yeah, just to chime in. You know, I don't want to let him have the last word. But I appreciate what Lou brought forward and what Doc Spencer brought forward. And you know what, that's the way we should really do things. We've got to get this moving. We'll get it moving, hopefully, and then we can change it in January and make it better for everybody, and we'll be happy, the constituents will be happy, the Department will be happy, and they'll be happy with their numbers, okay? So I thank my colleagues for that.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Anybody else? No? Okay. All right. Roll call.

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

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Pass.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

No.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes, with trust.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Absolutely not.

LEG. CILMI:

No.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

No.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Thirteen. (Vote Amended: 12-6/Opposed: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. I.R. 1928 passes.

I.R. 1950 is next - ***Accepting and appropriating federal funding in the amount of \$17,548 from the United States Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration, for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the DEA Long Island Task Force with 79.14% support.***
(Co. Exec.),

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

LEG. TROTTA:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to -- Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Muratore. On the motion, Legislator Trotta, was it?

LEG. TROTTA:

Chief, this is only for -- over here. This is only for 17,000 for the DEA. Could we expect more than that, more people in that Task Force coming up?

CHIEF CAMERON:

This is for DEA Task Force currently, and, yes, we are reviewing our Federal Task Force representation, and you can expect increased representation on them.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yeah, because that's for -- 17,548 is their overtime for one year, so, hopefully, we can get -- as a matter of fact, I was talking to them, and the next one, too, they want some more people. So thanks.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Thank you, Chief.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. I.R. 1951 - Accepting and appropriating Federal funding -- oh, I'm sorry. Yeah, **1951 - Accepting and appropriating federal funding in the amount of \$17,548 from the United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the FBI Joint Terrorism Task Force with 79.14% support (Co. Exec.)**. Legislator Trotta is a -- smiling. Do you want to make a motion?

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right.

LEG. BROWNING:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1952 - Accepting and appropriating federal funding in the amount of \$45,000 from the Department of Homeland Security, United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the Ice El Dorado Task Force with 79.14% support (Co. Exec.).

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1953 - Accepting and appropriating federal funding in the amount of \$60,000 from the United States Department of the Treasury, Internal Revenue Service, for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the IRS STEPP (Suffolk-Treasury Enhanced Prosecution Program) with 82% support (Co. Exec.). Same motion, same second. All in

favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 1954 - Accepting and appropriating federal funding in the amount of \$17,548 from the United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the Long Island Cyber Crime Task Force (LICCTF) with 79.14% support (Co. Exec.). Same motion, same second. All in favor?
Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
I guess they really like that 17,500 number.

LEG. TROTТА:
That's the maximum amount.

P.O. GREGORY:
Oh, okay. ***I.R. 2018 - Accepting and appropriating grant funds in the amount of \$384,177 from the United States Department of Transportation, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, for a dedicated Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Enforcement Project with 80% support (Co. Exec.).***

LEG. BROWNING:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. We have some individuals here from the Administration who want to try to get -- from Aging. Where is she? There she is. Okay. If you go into your Manila folders, we're going to take ***I.R. 2023*** out of order. Second by Legislator Schneiderman. It's 100% grant. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions, to take out of order?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Same motion -- I'm sorry. I'll make a motion to approve ***I.R. 2023 (Accepting and appropriating 100% reimbursable new federal grant funds from the New York State Office for the Aging for a Fully-Integrated Dual Advantage Program (FIDA) (Co. Exec.)***, second by Legislator Schneiderman. Everyone have it? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Is Tom here for anything? Tom, are you here for anything?

DIRECTOR RONAYNE:

I.R.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Which one? Well, make sure you tell Justin or somebody.

PUBLIC WORKS, TRANSPORTATION & ENERGY

All right. ***I.R. 1941 - Revising the County Road System Map and authorizing the Commissioner of the Department of Public Works to file the revised Official Suffolk County Road System Map in the Office of the Suffolk County Clerk and in the Department of Public Works pursuant to Section 115 of the New York State Highway Law (Co. Exec.).***

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So moved.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Krupski.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1957 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 11 - Selden (CP 8117) (Co. Exec.).

LEG. MURATORE:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Muratore, second -- I'll second. On the motion anyone? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Corresponding bond, **1957A**, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1958 - Authorizing planning steps for the voluntary acquisition of land and if necessary public hearings pursuant to Article 2 of the Eminent Domain Procedure Law of the State of New York in connection with the acquisition of properties to be acquired for the expansion of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 11, Pump Station No. 6 from the Town of Brookhaven, Suffolk County, N.Y. (CP 8117) (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Muratore, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1959 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 13 - Windwatch (CP 8123) (Co. Exec.).

LEG. CILMI:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Cilmi, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Corresponding bond resolution **1959A**, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***I.R. 1960 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 15 - Nob Hill (CP 8138) (Co. Exec.).***

LEG. CILMI:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Cilmi, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1960A, corresponding bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. **1961 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 20 - William Floyd (CP 8147) (Co. Exec.)**. Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1961A, corresponding bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1962 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 7 - Medford (CP 8150) (Co. Exec.).

LEG. CALARCO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Calarco, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1962A, corresponding bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yeah.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1963 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 16 - Yaphank (CP 8158) (Co. Exec.).

Motion by Legislator Browning, I'll second.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1963A, corresponding bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1964 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 1 - Port Jefferson (CP 8169) (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

No. Actually, I'm going to have some questions.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. I'll make the motion.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Krupski. On the motion, Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes, yes. Thank you. I was hoping you can explain what we're doing in Port Jeff here. I know it's -- my notes have to implement the improvements necessary in order to provide sufficient treatment to meet effluent limitations to and protect down stream processes. So a million dollars?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah. This resolution looks to appropriate a million dollar to construct a new head works building within the Port Jefferson treatment plant. The head works building will have two new screening devices which removes all the grits and the solids and all the big stuff that comes in, and, essentially, then that's removed and disposed of.

LEG. HAHN:

So where is that building going to be?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It would be on the site. It would be at the -- right at the beginning of the process. So as the influent comes in, it will essentially, before it goes into the screening process, and I can't say exactly

where on the site, but it would be in the south -- okay, southeastern corner, most likely, because that's where everything comes in, and prior to the pump station, where it's forced into the treatment plant itself.

LEG. HAHN:

Do you know what kind of buffers there are? Like I'm not quite aware of the layout of that. I mean, I'm aware of the layout of that location, but I don't know how many feet we have, you know, between where you want to put this and the neighbors, etcetera, so --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It would be within the confines of the site right now, pretty much at the -- you know, more or less where the entry, the initial pump station comes in. So it comes onto the site and then it's pumped upstream. It would be at that location. No -- really not much -- I couldn't imagine it being any closer or much closer to any homes than our facilities already are.

LEG. HAHN:

I know there were some screening issues where there wasn't adequate tree replanting the last time some things were built. So I just -- I just want to make sure that we're conscious of that, and this time we're careful, you know, just to make sure that we take care of that buffer.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah. The reason the -- we did try to plant along that, along that southerly line, but the problem is the lots are so heavily treed that the plantings never really took to the extent that we did. So, you know, our hope is still that the areas that are treated will start to revegetate sufficient so that it hides us from the neighbors.

LEG. HAHN:

You don't anticipate any buffer having to be touched in order to put this new building up?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, I see no reason why.

LEG. HAHN:

Do you know the square footage of this new building?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. Maybe we can talk.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Sure. Yeah, we'll make sure, you know, that your office is informed of the process.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You're welcome.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Anyone else? Okay. We have a motion and a second on 1964. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

General Meeting - 12/15/15

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Stern)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. **I.R. 1964A**, corresponding bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

(Not Present)

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Stern)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. *I.R. 1965 - Appropriating funds in connection with application and removal of lane markings (CP 5037) (Co. Exec.)*. I'll make a motion to approve.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Schneiderman. On the motion? Was that -- did you have your hand up, Legislator Kennedy?

LEG. TROTТА:

Yeah, quick question.

P.O. GREGORY:

I think she had her hand up.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No, that's all right. I just wanted to second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, okay. Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

We're paying someone to do this, we don't have the equipment to do it ourselves.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

These are for the thermal plastic stripes, not just -- not the -- not the painting of the lines. Generally, they're the stop bars, grade crossing bars, and it's a -- it requires training and a specific piece of equipment.

LEG. TROTТА:

We don't have it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We don't have it.

LEG. TROTТА:

All right. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You're welcome.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

LEG. TROTТА:

Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1965A, corresponding bond resolution --

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen.

P.O. GREGORY:

-- same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTТА:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yup.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen -- 17.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. If you will, we're going to take three CNs. We'll try to get Mr. Ronayne out of here, he's been waiting patiently. In the red folder we have three resolutions, I.R. 2025, 2026, 2027. I make a motion to take ***I.R. 2025 - Approving the appointment of Daniel Murphy to the Veteran's Grant Advisory Committee (Co. Exec.)***, out of --

LEG. STERN:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions, to take out of order?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***I.R. 2025*** is in front of us. Legislator Stern, would you like to make the motion?

LEG. STERN:

I'll make a motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to approve by Legislator Stern. Who was that?

LEG. MURATORE:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***I.R. 2026 - Approving the appointment of Michelle McNaughton to the Veteran's Grant Advisory Committee (Co. Exec.)***. I'll make a motion to take out of order, second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

The motion is before us. Motion by Legislator Stern to approve. Anyone?

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

Calarco?

LEG. MURATORE:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Muratore seconds. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***I.R. 2027 - Approving the appointment of Tim Scherer to the Veteran's Grant Advisory Committee (Co. Exec.)***. I make a motion to take out of order, second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 2027 is in front of us. Motion by Legislator Stern, second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. Back to Page 10. ***I.R. 1966 - Appropriating funds in connection with traffic signal improvements (CP 5054) (Co. Exec.)***. I'll make a motion to approve. Do I have a second?

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yeah.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1966A, corresponding bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***I.R. 1967 - Appropriating funds in connection with Assessment of Information System and Equipment for Public Works (CP 5060) (Co. Exec.)***. I make a motion to approve.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by -- motion by -- second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Corresponding bond resolution, **1967A**, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

No.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. *I.R. 1980 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with improvements to CR 80, Montauk Highway at CR 31, Old Riverhead Road (CP 5569) (Co. Exec.).*

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor? On the motion?

LEG. TROTТА:

Is this the traffic circle?

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No. That's a road realignment out in the Westhampton area.

LEG. TROTТА:

This is the engineering and design.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yeah, it's the road realignment in the Westhampton area.

LEG. TROTТА:

Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1980A, corresponding bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

No.

LEG. TROTТА:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

No.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1981 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with strengthening and improving County roads (CP 5014) (Co. Exec.). I make a motion to approve.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Corresponding bond resolution, **1981A**, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***I.R. 1982 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating additional funds in connection with construction of sidewalks on various County roads (CP 5497) (Co. Exec.).*** Same motion same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1982A, corresponding bond resolution, same motion, same second, roll call.

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

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yup.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1983 - Accepting a 100% reimbursable grant from the US Department of Housing and Urban Development - Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery Program for improvements to CR 12, Oak Street and authorizing the County Executive to enter into an agreement to accept this grant and amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds (CP 5575) (Co. Exec.). Same motion, same second. All in favor?

Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1983A, corresponding bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

LEG. TROTТА:

Why is there a bond if we're accepting money?

MR. NOLAN:

We have to first-instance the funding.

LEG. TROTТА:

Okay.

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

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yup.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yup.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 2003 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in

connection with resurfacing of CR 50, Union Boulevard from the vicinity of NYS Route 109 to the Vicinity of NYS Route 27A (CP 5599, PIN 076057) (Co. Exec.). Legislator Martinez, is this your District?

LEG. MARTINEZ:

No.

P.O. GREGORY:

No? All right. Same -- all right. Same -- I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 2003A, corresponding bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 2004 - A resolution appropriating funds in connection with planning and design of Nitrogen Reduction Projects and authorizing the filing of an application for a low interest loan (CP 8197) (Co. Exec.). I'll make a motion.

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Corresponding bond resolution, **2004A**, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Next three resolutions we passed earlier.

WAYS & MEANS

Ways and Means: ***I.R. 1802 - A Local Law authorizing the County Executive to execute agreements for the sale of the John J. Foley Skilled Nursing Facility to the Brookhaven Memorial Hospital Medical Center (Browning).***

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Calarco, or anybody?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

(Raised hand).

LEG. HAHN:

No, he said it.

P.O. GREGORY:

All in favor? Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1938 - Authorizing the transfer of certain property to Suffolk County Department of Public Works (SCTM No. 0200-657.00-03.00-042.000) (Co. Exec.).

LEG. HAHN:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Hahn, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1940 - Approving list of surveyors as designated by the Division of Real Property Acquisition and Management (Co. Exec.). Motion. I'll make a motion. Do we have a second? Second by Legislator Spencer. Anyone on the motion? Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1945 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law - Town of East Hampton (SCTM No. 0300-070.00-02.00-025.000) (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, I'll second. Anyone on the motion? All in favor?

Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 2019 - Appoint member to the Suffolk County Board of Ethics (Anthony M. Parlatore, Esq.) (Calarco). Motion by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. TROTTA:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Trotta. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. In the manila folder, we have ***I.R. 2022 - Accepting Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery Grant funds in connection with the planning of wastewater infrastructure (Co. Exec.)***. I'll make a motion. Do I have a second?

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah.

LEG. STERN:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Schneiderman. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 2023. Oh, I'm sorry, my apology. We did 2023.

I.R. 2028 - Authorizing amended Tax Warrant for Resolution No. 996-2015 (for the Town of Brookhaven and Shelter Island) to be signed by the Presiding Officer and the Clerk of the County Legislature (Presiding Officer). I make a motion to approve.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Schneiderman. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 2029 - Amending Resolution No. 994-2015, implementing budget, staff and taxes for

the Fiscal Year 2016 (Discretionary). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 2030 - Amending Resolution No. 995- 2015, implementing budget, staff and taxes for the Fiscal Year 2016 (Mandated) (Presiding Officer). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. If you go to the red folder, we have a few CNs. ***I.R. 2024 - Authorizing an agreement with the Shinnecock Indian Nation to accept funds associated with placement of dredge material on Shinnecock Nation's Shoreline and amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with dredging of County waters (CP 5200).*** Motion by Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 2031 - Requesting Legislative approval of a contract award for a sole responder to provide legal counsel services to the Suffolk County Board of Ethics.

LEG. STERN:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Stern, second by Legislator D'Amaro. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 2032 - Accepting and appropriating grant funding from the State of New York Governor's Traffic Safety Committee passed through the STOP-DWI Foundation for the Suffolk County STOP-DWI Program to fund Drug Recognition Expert overtime with 78.86% support. Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. Second?

LEG. CILMI:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 2033 - Accepting and appropriating grant funding in the amount of \$180,460.63 from the State of New York Governor's Traffic Safety Committee passed through the STOP-DWI Foundation for the Suffolk County STOP-DWI Program to fund DWI enforcement related high visibility road check patrols with 86.39% support. Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 2034 - Authorizing the renewal of the lease of premises located at 365 East Main Street, Patchogue, NY for use by the Department of Health Services.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Please note my recusal for the record, as per my statement filed.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. I'll make a motion to --

LEG. TROTТА:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Did someone say something?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yeah, Rob.

P.O. GREGORY:

I'll make a motion to approve. Do we have a second?

LEG. TROTТА:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

I need a second. There is no motion. Second by Legislator Lindsay. And on the motion, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

What is this?

P.O. GREGORY:

I believe it's -- well, anyone here? I believe it's for the Patchogue Health Center relocation, or lease.

MS. SANTERAMO:

We have the Health -- they're coming in, they're right there.

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

MS. SEIDMAN:

I'm sorry, what was the question?

LEG. TROTTA:

What is this?

MS. SEIDMAN:

This is a lease extension for the Patchogue Health Center for three years.

LEG. TROTTA:

And that won't get us to the end?

MS. SEIDMAN:

No, that will get us to the point where we will have planned what our next move will be, hopefully with regard to the future of a Patchogue Health Center.

LEG. TROTTA:

There's four years left on this, correct? Why not make this a four-year lease?

MS. SEIDMAN:

I didn't negotiate this lease, so, you know, I'm not sure why it's a three-year lease.

LEG. TROTTA:

Who negotiated it?

MS. SEIDMAN:

I'm sure there are many factors involved.

LEG. TROTTA:

This is from seven -- what, are we there now without a lease right now; is that what's going on?

MS. SEIDMAN:

I'm sorry?

LEG. TROTTA:

This says from 7/1 of 2015.

MS. SEIDMAN:

Correct.

LEG. TROTTA:

So we're there without a lease right now.

MS. SEIDMAN:

Correct.

LEG. TROTTA:

So we're just going month-to-month. I don't understand why we didn't negotiate a four-year lease, so that it will end --

MS. SEIDMAN:

I'm sorry.

LEG. TROTТА:

Are you tired?

MS. SEIDMAN:

Yes. What was the question?

LEG. TROTТА:

I mean, why didn't we negotiate a four-year lease? Because our obligation is for four more years.

MS. SEIDMAN:

I can't answer why we have a three-year lease and not a four-year lease. What I do know is without a lease, there's a possibility we will be evicted from the premises.

P.O. GREGORY:

But Legislator Trotta --

MS. SEIDMAN:

And the landlord is waiting for our signed lease to move forward.

LEG. TROTТА:

Okay. Good enough.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Trotta, I think Dr. Lipp has some information that may be pertinent.

MR. LIPP:

I don't know for sure, but using conductive reasoning, this was seemed to be, in all likelihood, the amount of timing we would need before we could move in to the new space that we're building.

LEG. TROTТА:

Maybe.

LEG. KENNEDY:

We might be building.

LEG. TROTТА:

How many square feet is this place?

LEG. LINDSAY:

It's in the resolution.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Twenty-one thousand five hundred.

MS. SEIDMAN:

Yeah, 21,000, that's correct.

LEG. TROTТА:

All right, I'm good. Thanks.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Anyone else? Okay. Oh, yes, Legislator Calarco.

LEG. CALARCO:

Just to put a few things on the record, because, quite honestly, I think one of the reasons why it's a short lease is because the community here has been asking for some time that this be moved off of Main Street where it's in the middle of their downtown area where they're looking to see economic development. There's actually a purchaser of this -- you know, a developer is interested in purchasing this property to do a development that partners with the plaza theatre property.

I have been very hesitant to want to approve any kind of lease at this property. And I understand the landlord apparently has reasons why he wants to have a lease in hand, otherwise he's going to move to evict us, and we have to continue to provide the services. But I would like some commitment from the Administration that this is indeed the last and only three years we're going to need to be here, provided we provide the funding to relocate this facility and we get the State funding in.

MS. SANTERAMO:

Legislator Calarco, you are correct in that we are -- the reason we have a short-term lease is because we are working with you and members of the community and HRH to find a suitable location to move, slated to hopefully with the funding that -- hopefully if we are granted the funding that we had earlier today as well.

LEG. CALARCO:

And I know the community had a question of a number of items that they would like to see us do in the short-term that are minor facelift-type stuff, just to give the building a little better face appeal for the neighborhood. And we are committed to doing those things in terms of trying to provide a little bit more cleanliness, eliminate a busted-up old sign that's not even being used and some other items?

MS. SANTERAMO:

Yes, we're working with DPW to see how we can evaluate the list and see what we're able to address, correct.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Recused.

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Recused: Legislator D'Amaro).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 2035-15 - Authorizing the sale, pursuant to Local Law No. 16-1976, of real property acquired under Section 46 of the Suffolk County Tax Act Theodoros A. Toumazou (SCTM No. 0600-045.00-01.00-013.004) (County Executive).

General Meeting - 12/15/15

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Krupski. I'll second. Anyone on the motion?
All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, that is all that we have on the agenda.

On behalf of the entire Legislature, I extend our best wishes to Legislator Jay Schneiderman and wish him success as Supervisor of the Town of Southampton.

Applause & Standing Ovation

I look forward to continue working with you in your new position.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Also, we extend our best wishes to everyone for a Happy Chanukah, Merry Christmas, Happy Quanza and a happy and health, prosperous New Year. Enjoy the holidays. We stand adjourned. Thank you all.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you. It's been great serving with all of you.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 8:39 P.M. *)

{ } - Denotes Spelled Phonetically