

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

GENERAL MEETING

SIXTH DAY

May 10, 2016

***MEETING HELD AT THE EVANS K. GRIFFING BUILDING
IN THE MAXINE S. POSTAL LEGISLATIVE AUDITORIUM***

300 CENTER DRIVE

RIVERHEAD, NEW YORK

Minutes Taken By:

***Lucia Braaten & Alison Mahoney
Court Stenographers***

Minutes Transcribed By:

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

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

P.O. GREGORY:

Good morning, Mr. Clerk.

MR. RICHBERG:

Good morning, Mr. Presiding Officer.

P.O. GREGORY:

Can I have all Legislators to the horseshoe. Please? Mr. Clerk, do the roll call.

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

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Here.

LEG. FLEMING:

Here.

LEG. BROWNING:

Right here.

LEG. MURATORE:

Here.

LEG. HAHN:

Present.

LEG. ANKER:

Here.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Here.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

(Not Present).

LEG. CILMI:

(Not Present).

LEG. BARRAGA:

Here.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Here.

LEG. TROTTA:

Here.

LEG. CILMI:

Cilmi's here.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Here.

LEG. STERN:

(Not Present).

LEG. D'AMARO:

Here.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present).

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Present.

P.O. GREGORY:

Here.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fourteen *(Amended Vote: Fifteen - Not Present: Legislators Martinez, Stern & Spencer).*

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Good morning, everyone. We will have the salute to the flag led by Legislator Fleming.

Salutation

Next Legislator Fleming will introduce Reverend Charles A. Coverdale, Senior Pastor of the First Baptist Church of Riverhead who will give the invocation.

LEG. FLEMING:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. I am honored to have the opportunity to introduce to you today the Reverend Charles A. Coverdale. The Reverend Coverdale has served as Pastor of the First Baptist Church in Riverhead for over three decades. His prior service was as a pastor of the historic Pond Street Baptist Church in Providence, Rhode Island. Reverend Coverdale was formerly an Assistant Professor of Business Administration at Simmons College in Boston and Bentley College in Waltham, Massachusetts. He also has taught at Leslie College in Cambridge, Massachusetts. He served as an Adjunct Professor at the American University in Washington D.C. and taught at the Harvard Divinity School Center for the Studies of Values in Public Life.

The Reverend has founded three non-profit organizations; the Family Community Life Center, very important to our community here on the East End, the Open Arms Care Center, and the FBC Housing Corps. Reverend Coverdale has served and continues to serve on numerous boards and committees and these are just a few; he served as Commissioner of Human Rights for Suffolk County; President, Long Island Council of Churches; Protestant Chaplain to the Suffolk County Correctional Facilities in Riverhead and Yaphank; member of the Suffolk County Martin Luther King, Jr., Commission Inc; East End Arts Council; The urban League on Long Island; the Peconic Bay Medical Center; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Since October of 2008, the Reverend has served on the Leadership Council of the Harvard Divinity School.

Reverend Coverdale was one of eight students out of 725 from the Harvard Business School, Class of 1971, to be featured in the Harvard School Bulletin, the 25th Reunion Issue, October, 1996, with a full-page article regarding his ministry, not only on Long Island but also throughout the world. He is a recipient of the Harvard Business School Alumni Achievement Award which is the highest tribute

the school can give to one of its alumni.

Reverend Coverdale is the father of two children, the grandfather of eight, and the proud great-grandfather of one. He resides in Aquebogue with his wife Shirley who is also a leader in our community, and President and CEO of the important Family Community Life Center, and who currently serves on the Suffolk County Women's Advisory Commission. We are really honored to have Reverend Coverdale with us today to open our meeting. Reverend Coverdale.

Applause

REVEREND COVERDALE:

Thank you, Bridget, and to all those Legislators assembled. It's with great pride and joy that you would have me stand before you and give the opening prayer. Let us pray remembering that people do have different faith traditions, and I'll try to embrace them in a general way, respecting each of your traditions.

Oh, gracious and heavenly God, we thank you this day for the privilege to be alive, for this day has never been promised to us but you have granted it. We come to this Legislature today in full thanksgiving of all you have done individually in their lives and collectively for the County. We come realizing that as we stand here, we have soldiers that are serving foreign lands, as well as in the United States of America, and we ask that you might particularly watch over them and bless them for their families are praying for them and seek their presence when they return with them. We ask that you watch over this Legislature, for even though they might have individual agendas representing various communities, they still have to work together for the benefit of the entire County.

We thank you for our County Executive and all those that serve in his administration. We thank you for the President of the United States and our Congress as well as our Senate. Now we ask that you give our Governor and the State representatives and the Assembly on this day, for each are doing something special to benefit us all. Now bless us, we pray. Bless the work that will be worked on today in this place, and may we work in harmony in the spirit of joy, even though we might challenge each other with differences. We ask in the name of him who created every good and perfect gift; in that name we pray, amen.

"Amen" Said in Unison

P.O. GREGORY:

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

Moment of Silence Observed

(Banged Gavel)

Proclamations

D.P.O. CALARCO:

We have several proclamations this morning. We'll start with our **Presiding Officer Gregory** who will present a proclamation to **Brigadier General Thomas Owens**.

P.O. GREGORY:

Good morning. It's my pleasure to stand before my colleagues to recognize Brigadier General Owens. Standing with him is his wife Karen. We also have Colonel Michael Bank, the New Wing

General Meeting - May 10, 2016

Commander and Command Chief, and Chief Master Sergeant Diana Manno. Brigadier General Thomas J. Owens II is a 1983 graduate of Cornell University where he received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering. In 1984 he received his Master of Engineering Degree in Electrical Engineering and Master at Cornell University. He received his commission in 1985 as a distinguished graduate of the Air National Guard, Academy of Military Science. Thomas also completed training in 1986 and is a command pilot with more than 3900 flying hours in the A-10, the F-16, the HC-130 -- I have fond memories of jumping out of that a few times in my life -- the HH60-G to include over 120 F-16 combat sorties. He has commanded at the squadron, group and wing levels.

He was promoted to Second Lieutenant November 7th, 1985; First Lieutenant, November 7th, 1987; Captain on March 17th of 1990; Major on March 30th, 1994; Lieutenant Colonel, May 27, 1999; Colonel on July 22nd of 2004; and now Brigadier General as of April 2nd this year. More.

For more than six years, Brigadier General Owens has served as the Commander of the 106 Rescue Wing in Westhampton Beach -- and standing beside me is our colleague, Legislator Fleming, who represents the area -- which is manned by more than 1,000 military and civilian personnel, and also performs search and rescue mission as well as being able to assist with State disaster relief and other State emergencies, as directed by the Governor of the State of New York. The 106th Rescue Wing operates the HC-130 King Tanker Aircraft and HH60 Pavehawk helicopters supporting the Air Force's Personnel Recovery Mission.

General Owens' awards include the Bronze Star, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Air Medal, the Aerial Achievement Medal, Joint Meritorious Unit Award, the Meritorious Unit Award, the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award with Valor Device -- that's impressive -- the Combat Readiness Medal; the National Defense Service Medal, Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, the Southwest Asia Service Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal and the Iraq Campaign Medal as well as Kuwait Liberation Medals from the Government of Kuwait.

So today we're pleased to have you, General. And we congratulate you on your service to our community and we congratulate you in your promotion and wish you much success. So thank you very much for coming here today and I wanted to present you with this proclamation.

Applause & Standing Ovation

(*Photograph Taken*)

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay. The **Presiding Officer** will stay at the podium and present a proclamation out to **Bruce Blanco, President of the American Legion Patriot Riders, Post 1244.**

P.O. GREGORY:

May is National Motor Safety Awareness Month. The safety awareness month was established because Spring is in full swing and around the country. Motorcyclists are returning to the road after a long winter. The National Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month is a time for drivers to be reminded to share the road with motorcycles and riders to be reminded to make themselves more visible. Mr. Blanco, who stands beside me, has been a resident of Suffolk County his entire life. He has been married to his wife Donna -- I guess you're Donna, all right -- 30 years and they have three children. His son, Marine Lance Corporal Michael Blanco, was only 19 when he passed away in 2010.

Since his son's passing, Bruce has made it his mission to honor his son by volunteering. Bruce joined the American Legion Patriot Riders Post 1244, Long Island Abate MC, the PGR, and works closely with local police and fire departments in any way he can. Chapters of the American Legion Patriot Riders are well-known for their charitable work, raising hundreds of thousands of dollars for severely wounded service members, local children's hospitals, schools, veterans homes and scholarships. He is currently the President of the American Legion Patriot Riders Post 1244. The American Legion Patriot Riders donate countless hours providing much needed kindness, companionship and compassion to our veterans and the veterans association, providing them with much needed kindness, companionship and compassion.

Under his leadership, the post has become one of the most active posts in New York State, the riders do military escorts for funerals, welcome home to our returning heroes, raise funds in various ways to provide care packages to our veterans. Bruce is committed to dedicating his life to serving our veterans and will continue to teach motorcycle awareness and safety. And he is also a former Suffolk County Police Officer, so thank you for your service to the community and our County.

Applause

(*Photograph Taken*)

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Thank you very much. The **Presiding Officer** will stay at the podium for one more proclamation which he will present to **Melissa Pandolf, Director of Kids Who Serve.**

P.O. GREGORY:

April is known as the Month of the Military Child. This awareness month was established to underscore the important roll children play in the armed forces community. There are many military children ranging in ages from newborn to 18 years in Suffolk County. Care of military children sustains our fighting force and strengthens the health and security and safety of our nation's families and communities. And Melissa served in the military for 22 years, the United States Air Force and Air National Guard. She formed Kids Who Serve, which is a 501(c)3 organization, approximately two years ago and its mission is to create awareness and educate school administrators, teachers, staff about the unique circumstances that military children face when their parents are away from home with military duty as well as when they come home.

In 2000 -- excuse me. In December, 2015, she began working for the Suffolk County Veterans Service Agency which has benefitted greatly due to her unique advocacy as a veteran and Director of Kids Who Serve. Organizations like this -- and General Barraga, I think he can back me up on this, and Sarah Anker who is a child of military family. You know, organizations like this are very, very, very critical to service members and units. When I served, you know, and we were away on deployments or exercises, it was always good to know that there was a social network that the children and families could use to get together. Because it's a difficult and stressful time and we rely on them, particularly in the military community, on these types of organizations to keep our families whole as best they can, because there are a lot of missing pieces in children, particularly they suffer in ways that are not necessarily visible. And so to have that support network is really tremendous, and it certainly helped me and my family when I was in the service. I'm very grateful for your efforts and you're doing a tremendous job. Congratulations, and thank you.

Applause

(*Photograph Taken*)

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Thank you. Our next presenter is going to be Legislator Kennedy who will present certificates to Distributive Education Club of America students from Smithtown East and West High Schools.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Good morning, DECA. Today we have the honor of having these students from Smithtown High School East and West. If you see this stack, this is just the award winners -- 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th place -- in the International Career Conference that these DECA Students attended. They worked on issues and wrote papers and did presentations that I have to tell you from firsthand knowledge were excellent and superior to anything that I've ever seen at the Suffolk County Legislature.

They wrote on issues such as hospitality, tourism, finance, marketing, international business, public relations, retail and food marketing, management, team decision making, independent business plans, sports entertainment and marketing research, and my favorite, finance operations research. I am more than impressed. Our youth is our future and these students from DECA from Smithtown High School East and West make us all proud. Thank you, DECA, and congratulations. Keep up the good work, and we expect to see a few years down the road behind the horseshoe.

Applause

*(*Photograph Taken*)*

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Our next presenter will be Legislator Krupski who will present a proclamation to the Southold High School Robotics Team.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Good morning. So this is part of the Southold Robotics Team. I think you have 30 members strong?

MR. GAMMON:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And they've been in business for about 12 years in Southold High School and they've been doing, obviously, better and better, and this year they placed 17th at the Annual Regional First Robotics Competition. And then they were invited to attend the first Robotics World Championship held in St. Luis, and they did their own fundraising to get to St. Luis and they won the Engineering Inspiration Award there. And, you know, the community's really proud of them, because you hear all these things about young people and all that. Here's a group of students who really are going in the right direction, they're really looking into the future.

I know one of their -- I'm not sure, one of their advisors is going to tell a little bit about their experience there. And also, the local experience, if you can tell the local experience of how local companies have really promoted them and supported them because they need qualified, trained workers for the future. Thank you.

MR. MARTINEZ:

Thank you. Hello. My name is Bob Gammon, I'm one of the mentors for Southold Team 870. And this year we had a very successful season, we finished top 8% in world; there were 25 different countries there, us along with Floyd.

It's a very interesting program that reaches a vast range of kids, from varsity athletes to kids that don't really know where they fit in the program. They can either be in the engineering part of things, the design team, they can work on website design, they can business plan, there's a million things they can do. And like I say, we're very proud of them this year to finish top 8% in the world.

Applause

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay. **Legislator Krupski**, you can stay at the podium, you will be presenting the next proclamation to **BOCES student Ceci Stevens**.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So we've known Ceci for a while now and her family, certainly, you know, growing up in Cutchogue. And Ceci has recently won an award here, which unfortunately I can't read.

(*Laughter*)

But she's a student in BOCES here in Riverhead and she's enrolled in the Automotive Technology Program and a member of the National Technical Honor Society. She was recently -- the reason she's here this morning, she's a recipient of a Vanguard Student Recognition Award presented by the Non-Traditional Employment and Training Program at the Center for Women in Government and Civil Society. Ceci basically is studying, you know, car mechanics, and it's something that maybe you want to speak about. It is non-traditional for a female to be in that field; however, she's really excelling at it and I'm sure giving a lot of competition to the other -- your classmates. So if you'd like to just say a few words?

MS. STEVENS:

Basically, the Vanguard is given to non-traditional genders, and since I'm a female in automotive, which is a mainly male-dominant field, I was awarded it. I have been in automotive for about two years now and it's a really great program, as is every BOCES. And I can't thank my teacher enough for putting in the extra effort to letting me really excel through the program, and our campus advisors and everything like that.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So, congratulations.

MS. STEVENS:

Thank you.

Applause

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Our next speaker, presentation will be by **Legislator Fleming** who will present a proclamation to **Ariana DeMattei**.

LEG. FLEMING:

Good morning again, everyone. I am -- I just want to point out we have some very high caliber folks out here in Riverside, Town of Southampton (*laughter*).

Applause

And thank you very much to the Legislators for meeting out here, for meeting throughout the whole committee week. It really makes a difference to our constituents, we've heard it all week. And I know it's a sacrifice for you and the staff, so thank you very much for doing it.

I am absolutely pleased and honored to offer this proclamation to Ariana DeMatteri who is a 15-year old sophomore, you would never know it from what she's done, 15-year old sophomore of Westhampton Beach High School. Four years ago, Ariana recognized that there were kids in her school community that didn't have the kind of economic means that many of the other students had and she started a program called Backpacks For Fellow Students, aptly named BFFS, that supplies backpacks to kids now in several schools, and what the backpacks have are the required school supplies to start the school year. I think what it shows is a really mature understanding about the difficulties that people have that go much further than the classroom itself, and how hard it is for folks who don't have economic means to really get started, especially kids get started well in school. So Ariana recognized that, it's really an amazing thing. And I understand she's just distributed her 1,000th backpack; is that right?

MS. DeMATTEI:

Yes.

Applause

And has raised over \$100,000 for children throughout the East End.

Applause

You're really an inspiration and, you know, I'm so deeply grateful that you're in our community as a model for all of us. Thank you, Ariana.

Applause

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Our next presentation will be Legislator Anker who will present a proclamation to Lolita Hellberg who has worked with the Miller Place Fire Department's Lady Auxiliary for 55 years.

LEG. ANKER:

And Edith Tilly; she's on here, too.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

And Edith Tilly as well who is also an active member of the Mt. Sinai Fire Department Women's Auxiliary for 42 years.

LEG. ANKER:

So I'm here today with Edith Tilly and Lolita Hellberg and they are very involved members in my community, in my district. Edith is a member of the Mount Sinai Fire Department Ladies Auxiliary for 42 years. She has also been a volunteer with the Port Jefferson Emergency Medical Services and ambulance for 40 years. Lolita has been a member of the Mt. Sinai Fire Department Ladies Auxiliary for --

MS. HELLBERG:

No, Miller Place.

LEG. ANKER:

Oh, Miller Place, I am so sorry. The Miller Place Auxiliary, Ladies Auxiliary for 55 years.

Applause

She's turning 90 years old. Ninety years old.

Applause

Look at that smile. Look at that smile. Thank you. Thank you, God, for allowing such beautiful people to be part of our communities. Edith and Lolita have selflessly served our fire departments and communities, and as members of their respective ladies auxiliary groups, they have helped and assisted in emergency fire calls and provided support for the fire departments. Through their selfless and dedication, they have helped create a safer place for our residents.

So it gives me great honor to present them proclamations for their community service. And many years to come, because you are mentors. You ladies have set an example of what we can do, you know, as members, but also as women and serving our communities. And again, it gives me great pleasure to present you with recognition that is greatly deserved. So thank you so much.

Applause

(*Photograph Taken*)

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Thank you, Ladies. **Legislator Anker** will stay at the podium and present a proclamation to the **Davis Town Meeting House Society**.

LEG. ANKER:

So I am here today to honor the Davis house -- Davis Town Meeting House Society. I have a lovely group here of board members and members. The Davis House -- excuse me, the Davis Town Meeting House Society is recognized for the dedication to the history or Coram and for celebrating their 5th anniversary. The society is a not-for-profit organization that was formed exclusively for the charitable purpose of restoring and championing the conservancy efforts of the historic Lester H. Davis House which is listed in the National Registry of Historic Places and also is a Brookhaven Town landmark.

The Society and its members have worked diligently to fundraise and restore the house. The exterior restorations are complete and now the Society is raising funds to help restore the interior. The Suffolk County Legislature thanks the Davis Town Meeting House Society for their hard work. And I am very proud to present a proclamation for the Society, but also individual certificates of recognition for the board members and the members of the Davis Town Meeting House Society. I just want to mention, too --

MS. DOUGLAS:

It's a long name.

LEG. ANKER:

It is a long name, I know, but it's okay, though, because -- bear with me, it's not -- how old is the Davis House? The Davis House is --

MS. DOUGLAS:

From 1750.

LEG. ANKER:

1750, 1750. It is an absolutely beautiful structure. I had lived in Coram about 20 years ago and the house was pretty much close to being demolished; very, very close. It sits on the corner of Coram-Mount Sinai Road and Route 25 in Coram, and I highly recommend for those who have visited the location, please visit. It has transformed into a beautiful representation of the 1750s. I mean, there's hardly anyplace you can find such an authentic architectural home. And we have the great honor of also recognizing the last member of the Davis Family, Lester H. Davis III. He was -- he came from Atlanta?

MS. DOUGLAS:

Georgia.

LEG. ANKER:

Georgia, his family brought him up. And is that his wife also?

MS. DOUGLAS:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

How old is Lister?

MS. DOUGLAS:

He's 90.

LEG. ANKER:

Lester is 90 years old also, 90 years old. And again, we recognize him with a proclamation also for his dedication and preserving the historic value of the area. So again, it gives me great honor to give you a proclamation and recognition (*sic*) of your efforts in beautifying not only the Davis House, but also Coram. Thank you so much. Thank you.

Applause

(*Photograph Taken*)

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay. Next presentation will be Legislator Muratore who will present a proclamation on behalf of the Suffolk County Legislature to Anthony Gallino.

LEG. MURATORE:

Well, good morning, everyone. You know, it's always a pleasure and a privilege to come before this body and before the citizens of Suffolk County, but today it's actually special because I'm recognizing a friend, Anthony J. Gallino.

Anthony is a resident of Rocky point; he's been there a long, long time. Recently Anthony was elected the President of the New York State Association of Fire Districts, which as we know includes all of -- you know, all of New York State. So that's quite an honor and quite a privilege, and probably quite a very heavy job. Besides this, Tony is a retired New York City Highway Patrol Officer. He is presently the Chief Deputy Highway Superintendent for the Town of Brookhaven, so he takes care of our roads here in Brookhaven.

Prior to be electing President of the association, Tony held two other board positions. He was 2nd Vice-President in 2013 and 14, then he moved up the ladder to 1st Vice-President in '14 and '15. So Anthony's impressive resume also includes serving as the former Brookhaven Commissioner of

Public Safety and the former Brookhaven Director of Emergency Management.

So the residents of Suffolk County want to say thank you. Thank you to Tony for all you do for this County, all you do for the town and all you do for the people of New York State. So Anthony, thank you very much and congratulations.

Applause

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay. Our last and best presentation will be **Legislator Browning** who will present to the **William Floyd Robotics Team**.

LEG. BROWNING:

Come behind me if you want. I don't think I'm going to be calling out everybody's names; it's a pretty hefty stack here. So I will give -- here you go. You want to hold these for the kids?

Okay. So I'd like to say welcome to the William Floyd Robotics Team, better known as *Hurricane Floyd*. So we are here --

Applause

Yep. We're here to recognize them today for becoming the 2016 Long Island Regional Champions. They just came back from St. Louis, and out of 6,000 competitors, they came in 133rd, so we want to congratulate you for that; that's not too shabby.

Applause

So, and if anybody has ever had an opportunity -- never had the opportunity, you should go watch these kids in action. It's pretty tremendous. But we're here today with their team advisor, Joe Carpinone, and the team co-advisors, James Carson, Josh Yun and Chris Ryon. They also received guidance from Brookhaven National Lab Computer Engineer Jack Fried.

So like I said, better known as *Hurricane Floyd*, they took home also the title at the School Business Partnership of Long Island for inspiration and recognition of science and technology; SBPLI's first Robotics Competition. The competition was held at Hofstra on April 2nd, and they faced off against 50 other teams from Long Island and around the world. William Floyd, in alliance with the Sachem School District -- and I believe Sachem will be coming to Hauppauge -- they partnered with them, and also Marista Pio from Hamburgo, Brazil and overcame two tiebreakers to secure the title in a thrilling finish.

During the six bill periods, students designed the entire robot on a computer with design programs such as AutoCAD. So I can't imagine what these kids are all going to do for a living in the future and we certainly need that. The team then constructed, working prototypes cut from plywood using the school's 80W laser -- now I'm really lost here.

(*Laughter*)

And it was later perfected and cut out of aluminum with the school's CNC rider; what does CNC stand for?

MR. CARPINONE:

Computer Numeric Control.

LEG. BROWNING:

Computer Numeric control. (*Laughter*) It's all double-dutch to me.

In addition to winning the overall competition, the William Floyd Robotics Team received the Innovation In Control Award which recognizes an innovative control system or application of control components -- electrical, mechanical or software -- to provide unique machine functions. So I'd like to say a special congratulations. When I was a bus driver, I used to love going with the robotics kids, they were a lot of fun. They couldn't bring it here; their robot is on its way from St. Louis, so they could not bring it today. But I want to say a special congratulations. Keep up the good work. And again, we have some great teachers employed who are so dedicated to our kids. I want to say thank you to our teachers, because without you guys and everything that you do, these kids wouldn't succeed. Thank you.

Applause

And I have a proclamation for the school and, again, certificates for all of the kids and their teachers. So again, thank you.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, congratulations.

That's the last presentation that we have. I just want to make an announcement; there will be an Executive Session for all Legislators at 12 Noon today.

We're going to go on through our agenda. Next is the ***Public Portion***. We don't have any presentations by any State or local officials. We have many cards. Just a reminder, each speaker has three minutes to speak, and the first card up is Linda Sharp. And Linda -- excuse me, Dermot McGrath is on deck. Again, three minutes for each person, no questions, we can't answer any questions; you may have questions, but we can't answer them.

MS. SHARP:

Shall I begin? Yes? My name is Linda Sharp. I've been married 40 years, four zero, and I continue to be married.

LEG. FLEMING:

(*Applause*).

(*Laughter*)

MS. SHARP:

Despite the court system which became a party to my case, and it's all about, you know, dollar signs. I lost over \$6 million, and I'm not the only one. I'm an 11th generation American with no public confidence, no public confidence. Everybody out there is either about to be indicted or going to jail and getting a special extra time to take care of their business while they're waiting to go to jail. I don't have any public confidence. Everything got covered up, shamelessly. I'm surprised *In God We Trust* doesn't fall off the wall. And I'm sure it's going to fall off the wall because -- I'm not going to waste any more of my three minutes to talk about the ugly stuff that my family went through. We suffer from post traumatic stress and we haven't been military. We got it right here in Suffolk County, Long Island. We got a post traumatic stress without military benefits.

General Meeting - May 10, 2016

I am 11th generation American and I expect more from my country. I'm on the verge of asking to be a refugee just to escape from you people. I am a hostage in my own country. I live at 9 Lynch Street, Huntington Station, and I want out of here. I definitely want out of here. I don't trust you people because you don't follow even the Constitutional law; even that gets swept under the table. And I'm ashamed for all of you that get your paychecks, regardless of who gets hurt. You are disgraceful, as far as I'm concerned.

I and my son have post traumatic stress and eight Judges in my Index Number, 2739399, eight judges recused themselves, but that didn't cause a red flag to go up, it didn't. It passed the first Judge, eight of them saw the writing on the wall and they didn't want to be part of the cover up so they opted out.

(Beeper Sounded)

Well, what happened to me? What happened to my income?

P.O. GREGORY:

Ms. Sharp? Right here, in the middle. Your time's expired, please wrap up.

MS. SHARP:

Of course! You spend more time on photo ops than you spend on people's problems.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

You were aware that you had three minutes and you used it the way you wanted to use it. So your time's expired, please wrap up.

MS. SHARP:

I disagree with you, but it won't matter anyway. Because I know there is a God to handle people that use little people like me. So have your fun with me, but when God gets to you, you'll have to answer. So be it. But you don't want to fix the problem.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you.

MS. SHARP:

You give us a problem, but it's under this lumpy rug you're creating.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Have a good day.

MS. SHARP:

No, I can't have a good day. I want out of Long Island, please! It's a joke.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you.

MS. SHARP:

No, don't thank me. Fix this.

P.O. GREGORY:

Please step away from the mic. Thank you.

MS. SHARP:

Good luck!

P.O. GREGORY:

Dermot McGrath; and then on deck, Hector Gavilla.

MS. SHARP:

Can I get a transcript? (*Ms. Sharp approaches stenographer*). Do you have a transcript or a card?

LEG. HAHN:

Step away. Step away.

MS. SHARP:

Where do I get the card for the transcript, or is there a transcript?

MR. McGRATH:

Good morning.

P.O. GREGORY:

Good morning, Dermot.

MR. McGRATH:

I'd like to talk briefly about the Red Light Camera Program. Can you hear me all right?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes, Dermot.

MR. McGRATH:

Each year there are increasing numbers of irresponsible motorists driving on America's roads and highways, totally oblivious to their surroundings. Facebook addicts, texting addicts, drug addicts, drunken drivers, all of whom are endangering the lives of innocent people. Local community governments throughout the United States have had to take drastic action to try and stop this cancerous situation from getting completely out of control. Suffolk County Government is one of a growing number of communities across the country that have adopted the Red Light Program. As originally set up, it was an excellent idea. Unfortunately, I believe it has morphed into a mismanaged bureaucratic cash cow source of revenue for County government.

I have become one of many thousands of victims of the stealth program. Last October I had to pay an exorbitant \$80 fine for not coming to a complete stop behind the white line at a traffic intersection while making a right turn on a red light. I committed my crime on Great East Neck Road in West Babylon, a stretch of road that has seven, I repeat, seven big brother spy cameras on this one stretch of road. Local businesses and residents in the Town of Babylon are cynically calling the road *scam alley*. I paid the \$80 fine; I had no choice, I would have had my driver's license revoked by the County's uncompromising traffic court staff if I didn't pay it. They treat us ticketed motorists as if we were 18th century indigent servants living on a colonial plantation. *You broke the law*, they say, *pay the fine or lose your license. Next defendant, step up please*. Wouldn't a simple "No Turn on Red" sign hanging from the traffic light have eliminated any confusion about making a right turn? Why didn't the County government think of this?

This method of raising money to lower the County budget deficit will bring on a lot of bad publicity for Suffolk County, not something you need at this moment in time. We're seeing many political investigations currently taking place in the Empire State. It doesn't bode well for those County officials who are up for reelection in the Fall, especially during this volatile election year when huge

numbers of average American citizens have lost faith in our country's political leadership. The Red Light Program needs to be completely revamped and the sooner the better. Let's bring integrity back into government and make our country great again. Thank you.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Hector Gavilla; then on deck, Angela Huneault.

MR. GAVILLA:

Good morning, everybody. My name's Hector Gavilla and I oppose the Red Light Camera Program. I just want you all to know that I am a very good driver. I do not encourage anyone to run red lights, and if you look at my record, it's impeccable, okay? What I oppose is this unholy alliance between a major corporation like Xerox and Suffolk County because Xerox' intention is to have this program to make a profit, and when you have a partner like that, it only leads to potential corruption. And I don't think any of you are -- or most of you are really listening to your constituents. Eighty dollars is a lot of money, and as we've pointed out, that \$80 that you're charging, you're charging illegally and there's no reason for that. You're only authorized to charge \$50. Why are you pilfering from the constituents? You have to listen to your people. And I know there are some of you who may have voted for this originally, and I know now you've changed your minds, but you have to let your constituents know how you feel today, and don't be afraid to go against the system.

Now, when you were told about this program, you know, I have a feeling that it was like a snake oil salesman coming to you and saying, *This is a great program, it's going to save lives*. But the reality is I just passed around a Newsday article where unfortunately there was a pedestrian who was walking along the street at a red light camera intersection and the red light camera did not save his life. So it's really a lie when you tell people that the red cameras are going to save people's lives because they don't. They're very good at surveillance. They're very good at recording accidents, but they will never prevent an accident and that's a fact.

But what they have done, according to the 2014 Red Light Safety Program Report, which I handed out at the last Legislative meeting, what they have done is they've increased the amount of rear-end collisions. Before the cameras were installed, the average rear-end collisions at these locations were about 302 per year, then they went up to 429 a year. Now, you're grabbing at straws if you're trying to say that it's reduced accidents because it has not. Accidents are actually on the rise and people get very nervous when they approach the light because they don't know exactly when it's going to turn red.

We have a lot of issues, including that there's no law enforcement officers that are involved in issuing the tickets. You basically have an employee of Xerox, an employee that's working in the Dennison Building that just needs a high school degree to supposedly review all the videos. So what's going on here, when you have a regular citizen just looking at it who's not a cop giving out tickets? This is about revenue, it's so obvious to everybody involved here.

And I have to tell you one last thing, that we have a website that I set up, redlightscam.com. We have a Facebook page, and seriously, I have over 5,000 followers --

(Beeper Sounded)

-- and those people are telling me that we're doing the right thing. None of them have agreed with any of you who support the Red Light Camera Program.

P.O. GREGORY:

Please wrap up, Hector.

MR. GAVILLA:

All right, thank you very much. Okay, I just wanted to mention, please support Robert Trotta's bill to suspend the program and review it. This is a mistake and it's a travesty. Thank you and have a great day.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. You, too. Angela Huneault; and then Vince Taldone on deck.

MS. HUNEALT:

Hi. My name is Angela Huneault, I'm the Assistant Liaison for Riverside Rediscovered, and on behalf of Riverside, the Hamlet of Southampton, I thank you all for coming here, and we look forward to seeing you more often here. It is a distance for us to go to Hauppauge, and having you literally three minutes from my office has been fabulous all week. We've enjoyed being here and seeing how things are run and how things happen.

We also would like to thank you for keeping the \$4 million in the 2016 budget so that that traffic circle can be redone, which will be taking place very shortly, as far as I've been told. And I also invite each and every one of you to take a drive around that traffic circle and see those vacant buildings and how Riverside looks right now, so that when we're before you in a couple of months or in a year asking for your support as we revitalize that area, you remember what it looks like now to what it's going to look like when we revitalize it. And I also welcome you all to go to *riversiderediscover.com* to see what the people have asked for, that we're -- we know we're going to be putting it there. So we thank you for your support in advance. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you.

Applause

Okay. Vince Taldone; and then on deck, Paul Pressman.

MR. TALDONE:

Hi. My name is Vince Taldone, I'm a resident of Riverhead. I'm on the Board of the Flanders/Riverside/Northampton Community Association, as well as the Board of Five Town Rural Transit, Inc, which is a public transit advocacy group here on the East End.

I'm here basically to plead with you for Legislative intervention on a collapsing public transit system on the East End. Things are getting worse by the day. I contact Legislators, I contact the County Executive, DPW for sure, and I'm sure they've briefed you on it, but I don't know if you know the full extent of what's happening in the street. The S-92, the busiest route in Suffolk County nine months out of the year, is overcrowded to the point where multiple days a week it leaves passengers in the street waiting hour after hour for a bus they can squeeze into. The situation is so bad that the County is diverting buses from the local routes in Southampton and putting old school buses on the route with little paper tags that say, *This is the 10-D or E*, or whatever it might be, and convincing people, no, they're not taking them to school, they can get on the route.

Desperate situations calls for desperate measures to meet demand, I understand that. But I also know there's a whole bunch of new buses being delivered to the County, none of which have been seen on the East End. And the East End S-92 has multiple buses that are so old that after accidents, parts could not be found from the bankrupt manufacturer, so they just sit in the yard. And the County is scrambling to meet the demand with no plan in place other than to discourage people from getting on the bus and finding a car *if you can get one, call Uber, do anything, don't get on the bus because we don't have room for you.* That's almost absurd. I mean, it's the dream of almost every transit agency in the country to have so many passengers who want to use the transit system.

So I don't know what the County briefs you on, I'm not often at the meetings in Hauppauge. I am visually impaired, it's a three hour -- a two-hour ride each way plus waiting times, it's the whole day if I want to come to Hauppauge, and I will because it's important. But we really need your help. We need for you to intervene. There's so many issues. We have bus shelters with broken glass that falls on to the sidewalk, it could take the County a month or two to come out and clean it up. There is no procedure, they don't have people on staff. They have to hire a contractor to replace the glass, and there's no arrangement with towns even. You'd think maybe possibly get the towns to agree to go out and at least clean the site so it's not a danger.

Now, when I write to the County and I say, *You have a dangerous situation here,* I've caused a problem for myself as a taxpayer, because if the County does nothing and somebody trips and sues the County, that settlement is going to be paid by me and you, all the residents of this County. And what's worse is here on the East End, we're a tourism industry.

(Beeper Sounded)

I'll finish up. We are a tourism industry and it's really important how things look. And we take great pride in our bus shelters, we have many volunteers who clean them and empty the trash and do the best they can to make it look like a respectable place to wait. So if this Legislature does not intervene, I suspect, as we enter the peak season, we'll be in the worse condition ever and I just don't know what to do about it. But thank you.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Mr. Taldone. Paul Pressman; and then on deck, Susan Tocci.

MR. PRESSMAN:

Good morning, Legislators. I am back again to talk about public transportation. I'm going to pass around the issues that I'm going to speak about today because I have a meeting with the ADA in regards to these issues.

I would like to know -- the AVL system that we had to use because we got a grant for is the biggest waste of money. I have spoken to more drivers, I have been on these buses, okay, they're causing havoc for both buses, for the drivers and the riders. The system was down during the rain storm last week. The problem is that trying to change from the old system, which actually worked and was fine, to this new AVL system is causing electrical -- electrical problems on all the buses. Therefore, the buses can't even put the signs of what bus it is on the bus, so they have little signs now in the windshield of the buses. There is no -- any kind of thing so that any of the people know where the stops are. And the bus driver told me the other day that they will refuse to make announcements on the buses of where the stops are even though every bus is equipped with a sign that says *"ADA regulations require bus drivers to make announcements at all stops"*, yet they refuse to do that.

The other problem is this. There is no replacement buses available. As the last gentleman spoke about the 92 and the problems; there are no buses to replace any that break down. There is no money for them. I would like to know what the Legislature is doing with the \$31 million that Mr. Bellone is getting from the MTA surplus that they got from the State that is earmarked for Suffolk County. It was in Newsday; where are those \$31 million going? There hasn't been a --

Applause

There hasn't been one bus. And I have spoken to every driver on every bus route that is absolutely disgusted with Suffolk Transportation which runs 90% of the buses. I take the bus every day. I go to the Board of Elections and I work at the Board of Elections. Mr. Barraga was at my primary the day I was working there and the first thing he said he to me is, "*Mr. Pressman, did you take the bus today?*" My answer was, "*I couldn't, the bus didn't run that early in the morning. The bus didn't run that late at night for me to get home.*" And that's the regular line bus. Forget the SCAT buses, they don't run after eight o'clock. We've been trying to push that for the last how many years? I have a meeting with SILO tomorrow. I have a meeting -- I will be at the next meeting on May 23rd and on June 1st with the Suffolk County Legislator subcommittee.

Something has to be done. It cannot wait any longer. You've waited 35 years to change the schedule with this AVL system and it's not working. You've wasted more money than you could have used. Thank you very much.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Mr. Pressman. Okay, Susan Tocci.

MS. TOCCI:

I'm going to pass.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. M. Kanzenberg? And then on deck -- I don't know if it's Michael McDamett?

MR. KESSLER:

Somebody's phone? Sir? Good morning. My name is Mary Kanzenberg, I reside in Commack for 35 years. I spoke with you last week to support Robert Trotta's bill to stop the Red Light Camera Program. In 2014, studies showed an increase in rear-end collisions. The study showed Commack Meat Farms had an increase of 100%, but all cameras in Commack had an increase in rear-end collisions. Dorothea and Commack Road grosses the largest yet revenue, yet it's not a black dot area, no fatalities, no major collisions here, and you can make a right-on-red here. Commack and Vanderbilt has high fatalities, numerous accidents, was rated a black dot area and no camera and zero rights-on-red are allowed. No camera -- are allowed. I'm sorry. There's no camera because there's no revenue. It's clear to me that the camera program cannot exist on red light runners only. Otherwise, Commack Vanderbilt, its worst intersection, would clearly have a camera to improve our safety, right?

This program is not improving safety, it's about revenue. In 2012, my representative, Steve Stern, was on Meet the Leaders and was excited that the County would get this revenue from the camera program and it would help balance the budget. I hope you, representing Commack, you do not feel so excited about this revenue since your camera program has failed its residents.

General Meeting - May 10, 2016

Last week I mentioned to you about the delay in responders to the ambulance calls. As a nurse, this really concerns me. I called the Chief of Commack Ambulance, spoke to Allen Groverman who said, "Red light cameras do slow down members in their private vehicles from responding to the scene." He also went on to say, "Ambulance crew members have complained that many drivers are apparently afraid to make rights-on-red and do not move out of their way." Gathered all this information in one phone call. I would like you to provide us, your constituents, with data showing why rights-on-red are part of this program.

It's clear in every study, most fatalities are from red light runners causing T-Bone collision. There is zero data to support violations of right-on-red causing any harm. The truth be told, right light programs would not survive without -- with just red light runners. I have not received any tickets in 30 years, but recently three, all failing to stop for five seconds then turn. Gas shortages and pollution was why right-on-red stop-and-go program was put into play, but now stop and wait five seconds then go was put into play to bring revenue. I am now requesting a refund, because recently in Florida Supreme Court ruled against red light cameras --

(Beeper Sounded)

-- because of lack of law enforcement involvement. A huge civil action was filed. Are all of you prepared to return 33 million you bring in every year? I'm wrapping up. This program didn't do what it was set out to do, it failed and now the statistics are supporting its failure. Your constituents are angry, and every ticket you issue for a red -- a right-on-red is a scam, has no bearing on safety. A civil --

P.O. GREGORY:

Ma'am, please wrap up.

MS. KANZENBERG:

I'm wrapping up. A civil lawsuit should be filed on every ticket that was issued and any accidents in these areas, these camera -- lawsuits should file since you are all well aware of the failure. Thank you very much. I'm sorry I went over.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you.

MS. KANZENBERG:

Support Robert Trotta's bill. Great bill.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. I'm sorry; is it Michael Mc -- I can't understand your handwriting. Is that you, sir; Michael McDermott?

MR. McDERMOTT:

It's one of those odd Irish names; Michael McDermott, yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

McDermott? Okay, I couldn't tell if it was an E or an A. Okay. And then Meryl Cassidy on deck.

MR. McDERMOTT:

Good morning. My name is Michael McDermott, I was the Governor candidate in New York State in 2014; I guess you didn't watch the debate. But I ran for Governor and I'm currently the Chairman of the Suffolk County Libertarian Party. And I'm here because in early 2014 we tried to put forth a People's Resolution, which is allowed in Suffolk County, about stopping and removing these red light cameras which we felt were dangerous at that time, even though there was no empirical evidence that has since come up. We were told by the Suffolk attorney that that was unconstitutional, to put up a resolution for that. We're currently working on litigation to force you guys to let us put up a resolution so that the people can vote on it.

I'm here to support Mr. Stephen Ruth and the removal, the permanent removal of these red light cameras. Not the temporary removal that I think you're thinking about, because we really have to get rid of these things. I have had too many close calls of my own at these lights. I'm more concerned -- and it's not just at these lights, it's you don't know where the cameras are half the time so you're watching the green, either speeding up to get through it or you see a yellow and you have to jam on your brake or try to get through it and when the yellows turn quickly, the red light comes on, you get a ticket and it's an absurd situation. I've been now trying to stop at red lights counting one Mississippi, two Mississippi, and if I go I get a ticket; I have to wait for the third Mississippi and then go.

And it's not that I'm promoting that you don't stop at red lights or that you quickly make turns, it's just that this red camera -- these red cameras are really very dangerous. There have been over 10,000 deaths due to red cameras nationwide, many of those in Suffolk County. Those that voted and allow these -- this program to continue are directly responsible for those deaths, in my opinion. That's you folks.

I'm calling for the removal of these cameras immediately, the return of the monies that drivers have paid for these unconstitutional, not allowed to face your accuser because it's a camera, you can't, and to compensate those families that have lost -- excuse me, Mr. Nolan.

Mr. Nolan? I hope you guys are listening because I only have three minutes and you're talking amongst yourselves. You have an Executive Session later.

Applause

As Chairman of the Suffolk County Libertarian Party, which is a political party, I call on we the people to step up and oppose these politicians --

(Beeper Sounded)

-- who support this program. If anyone is interested in running for the County Legislature, please let me know, because we really have to do something. And I'm hoping that you guys will vote for Trotta's bill and make it permanent, not temporary, and not just before an election year. Thank you.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Meryl Cassidy; and then on deck, oh boy, Linda Testagrose? I hope I got that right.

MS. CASSIDY:

Before my time starts clinging down, I just want to let you know, I'm not going to have time to read all my good words here, so I'm going to skip over a lot. So please read what I'm handing out, because they're all good words.

Okay. I'm here today wearing two hats. I'm the Executive Director of Response of Suffolk County, Suffolk County's 24/7, 365-day a year crisis intervention and suicide prevention center, and the Chairperson of the Suicide Prevention Coalition of Long Island which is an organization made up of stakeholders throughout the community who have come together with a shared passion to do something about the public health epidemic of suicide.

There was a CDC report that came out a couple of weeks ago that indicated that the suicide rate in America has reached a 30-year high and it prompted a wave of alarm. What's driving this disturbing, upward trend? Why are current efforts failing? What is to be done? And so on the first page of my remarks, I outline a bunch of societal trends that might answer those questions, but I think the more important thing to look at is our mental health system and to acknowledge that our current system doesn't work.

Our policies and practices regarding suicide create an irrational incentive structure where people understand they have to attempt suicide or do something drastic to get help which is of questionable -- the help they get is often of questionable utility, while community-based approaches like ours that are less expensive and work are underfunded. There's a bias in society and in the law regarding legal capacity to make decisions regarding one's own life and care when it comes to suicide. There's an assumption that suicidality or even mental illness equals incompetence, and the vast majority of people who are thinking about suicide or attempting suicide or dying by suicide are nowhere close to incompetent under our current legal standards. This assumption is dangerous, it shuts down a very important conversation at the point where the conversation is most needed, and it leads to coercive, knee-jerk responses that can be experienced as punitive and retraumatizing for people in suicidal states.

The field is beginning to understand this. No study has found that in-patient hospitalization, which is the prevailing approach for suicide care, actually reduces suicide. In fact, there's strong evidence that inpatient hospitalization may actually increase suicidality over the long term; I know that's very disturbing. This is particularly true for a substantial percentage of suicidal people who are survivors of trauma. And they experienced the loss of liberty, the one-on-one observation, the seclusion and the restraint to be traumatizing and harmful. And we listen to the voice of suicide attempt survivors and you know what they tell us that works? Connection; connection to family and friends, connections in the community.

So my purpose in coming here today is to educate and inform, but also to sound an alarm and to incite a call to action. We do not have enough resources directed at suicide prevention, and our funding at Response was cut another 10% this year. Yet despite this, we respond to over 25,000 callers a year, we have trained over 50 new crisis counselors in the past year.

(Beeper Sounded)

The last thing I just want to say is that we do a lot of follow-up work with suicide attempt survivors, and that follow-up work is focused on connection; connection to supports and services, connections to life. So as you think about the County budget next year, please consider restoring our funding. It's the least invasive, most effective action you can take to prevent suicide in Suffolk County. Thank you very much.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Linda Testagrose; I'm sorry if I mispronounced your name.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Linda left.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Thank you, Ma'am. Kevin McAllister; and then on deck, Stephen Ruth Sr.

MR. McCALLISTER:

Good morning, Mr. Gregory and esteemed Legislators. My name is Kevin McAllister of Defend H2O. I'm here, of course, to speak about water. You may recall in 2005, that was June of 2005, the Forge River was thrust into the spotlight. I will call it Suffolk's Cuyahoga River in Ohio that was on fire; in this instance, it was on fire with a massive fish kill, crab kill, odors, discoloration. That set in motion some recognition that wastewater was a big influence on our surface waters. I had petitioned in 2005 the DEC to include the Forge River as impaired waters relative to nitrogen pollution, and that opinion was accepted in 2010. The entirety of our South Shore of Suffolk County was also added on that dubious risk for the same reason.

As I attended Mr. Bellone's water plan announcement roughly two weeks ago, it was for me a reason for optimism. So we're putting it in context. You know, I've been talking about the need to address wastewater with innovative alternative systems for 11 years now. In seeing that ultimately there was at least some action and a proposal to create a mechanism for funding and applying said funding to all things water, to restoring water. And in fact, we are in restoration mode. This is not protection mode any longer. I challenge every Legislator to pay attention to a nearby pond, a stream, a larger embayment. It's on the impaired waters list and we have to reverse this trend, because it's a sad legacy, certainly, for Suffolk County with respect to our connections to waters with life-style and our economics.

Relative to Mr. Bellone's plan, one thing I want to leave you with is certainly priority has to be clean water. Jobs and economic growth are subordinate issues. And I was a bit taken aback when I saw, you know, the local 505, you know, the pipe layers union; and I'm being silly, but I'm trying to impress a point. You know, this isn't about jobs, and we have to be very distinctive. Sewer districts, you know, as we're seeing the push, as I have, there's no panacea there. And the assumption that because we put a sewer district in place in Southampton or Montauk or the Mastic/Shirley that we're going to clean up a nearby water body doesn't necessarily hold water; it has to be scientifically validated. And I will speak to the Mastic/Shirley system.

(Beeper Sounded)

You know, that's wrought with, I'll say, disingenuous representations. Anyway, I'm out of time. I ask you to take action. You have an action before you today, some tabled resolutions, 1257 and 58. Presumably these have been vetted and, you know, please act. Please find the political courage to save our waters. Thank you.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Kevin. All right, Stephen Ruth Sr.; then on deck, Roseanne Roussedu.

MR. RUTH SR:

Good morning. My name is Stephen Ruth Sr., I have been a resident of Suffolk County for roughly 46 years. I pay over \$50,000 a year in property taxes. In August, 2015, my son took a stand against the Red Light Camera Program, a failed program in many towns and states. The only guarantees in the program were that the company in charge would make a profit. The fees charged by Xerox would be paid whether the cameras generated tickets or not. In an effort to guarantee the

minimum ticket required by Xerox, the length of time between the red and green -- the yellow was shortened, thus a ticket trap was developed that would give some new -- give a new income stream to the County. As time went on and various requirements were bypassed, no engineers had signed off and the approve -- on the approving -- approving the lights. Not only the data pertaining to the program was hidden, but the videos capturing accidents and fatality were never released to the families.

Every step of the way, inept or coming handling of this issue has been suppressed by the Legislature and the news media. The issue has been in the hands of the County Legislators for months, no decision forthcoming. Are these meetings just for public placation, or do they have some validity? How high dose the death and injury tally have to accrue? Isn't it the job of the Legislators to act in the benefit -- in behalf of the voting public? Aren't you responsible for your actions? You voted to bring in this program, you are ignoring the deaths and injuries you created. You are refusing to do your job.

I find it very hard to justify your compensation of over a hundred thousand a year each; 18 Legislators, that's \$1,800,000 being paid in compensation to our Legislators. That's \$36,000 per week. How much did you contribute to the families you destroyed? You should not only be prosecuted for your actions, but also your inaction. You should be replaced with caring people, those with a heart as well as a love for our great country.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Ms. -- I'm sorry, it was Roseanne Rousseau; and then on deck, Sharon Frost.

MR. NOLAN:

You have to extend the public portion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, I'm sorry. Before you speak, we have to extend the public portion. I'm going to make a motion to extend the public portion. Second by Legislator Fleming. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. The floor is yours, Ma'am.

MS. ROUSSEAU:

Good morning. My name is Roseanne Rousseau, I'm a resident of West Islip for the last 40 something years. I think I'm a successful rule follower. I earned my Bachelor of Science by following the rules; I earned my Doctorate by following the rules; I'm a published author because I followed rules; I successfully raised a child who's not a drug addict or an alcoholic by following the rules; I paid off my mortgage after 30 years because I followed 30 years worth of rules. I'm a licensed driver for over 45 years, I have an impeccably clean license because I followed the rules. Then came along the red light scamera program. I'm a failure at that for some reason. And you know why? Because there's no rules. It's arbitrary. I don't know how long you're supposed to stop, apparently, because I got my license a long time ago.

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

MS. ROUSSEAU:

And I don't remember any educational program that brought me up to date with how long I was supposed to stop at each particular location, and, apparently, it differs. So I had to tell my podiatrist that I could no longer afford to come to him, and he said, "Why?" I said, "Because it costs me \$80 every time I turn right to come to you." So he said, "Well, do yourself a favor and follow the rules." I said, "I do follow the rules." I never ran a red light. She's right, the person who spoke before me. It's not about red lights. You can't earn enough money doing that, so you got to get people on turning at the red light.

So if you -- if it really was a good program and it really was aimed at protecting lives and stopping accidents, you'd put up a sign and say, "No Right on Red." There's no more shortage of gasoline or oil. No right on red is fine. So guess what, I try to do no right on red and the people behind me are ready to jam into my rear, so it's dangerous.

I can't afford to even go get a calzone. I went down 109. I don't know the rule at the camera there, so I went and got a \$6.50 calzone, which ended up costing me \$86.50, because I made a right on red. I counted to five, I thought. But then I thought, oh, wow, I didn't do the one Mississippi thing, I only counted to five without the Mississippi's.

So, you know what, if you really wanted a camera program that really was for the benefit of the people, give us rules. And for the senior citizens like me, send me back to a program that updates me on what's expected of me and I'll follow the rules. I didn't run any red lights, but I didn't stop for the requisite amount of arbitrary time at each particular intersection.

It's a dishonest program. If it was meant to save lives and keep us all safe, it would be, but it's not. There was recently an article in Newsday that said specifically that accident rates are up.

I would like people to support Trotta's bill and remove these cameras, because they're not for our benefit. Senior citizens are on a -- we're on a fixed income as it is.

(*Applause*)

I can't afford to live here anymore. I thought after I paid off my mortgage, I'd be like, whew, I could relax. No, I can't, because it's another scam somewhere trying to pickpocket me. I can't afford to be here anymore. My daughter's not here, she can't afford to stay here. Let's get rid of these scameras, please.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Sharon Frost, and then on deck, Corey Humphrey.

MS. FROST:

Hi. My name is Sharon Frost. I work for the Suffolk County Soil and Water Conservation District. I'm here today to support the funding of the ag waste storage facility through -- for the Corwin Duck Farm through the quarter percent sales tax grant. This will give the County the unique opportunity to fund an implementation of a project that will prevent the leaching of nitrogen into our ground and surface waters on the duck farm.

General Meeting - May 10, 2016

I developed the Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan that was requested by Mr. Corwin for the duck farm, and it was given to the DEC last April. And I'm telling you this because it's a current -- a current conservation plan. This ag waste facility is among several recommendations in the plan that will assist the farm in reducing the nitrogen leaching.

The storage facility is designed to handle 100% of the dry manure that's generated on the farm annually. The farm raises about a million ducks a year, and there's about 125,000 ducks on hand daily, which produces about 50,000 pounds of manure daily, which contains 3,750 pounds of nitrogen, which is quite a bit. It probably can fertilizer, I don't know, like 25,000 lawns. Anyway, half of this is dry, half of it's liquid. Mr. Corwin has an ag waste treatment system that handles the liquids. This facility will handle all of the dry manure.

Right now, the manure is trucked off the farm and is stored on bare land, and is only spread, you know, during the season, like you would do on your lawn. And, unfortunately, the ducks are also pooping in the wintertime when you wouldn't spread manure.

Since the facility is designed with an impervious surface and a roof, and it will hold the manure and -- until it can be trucked to farms or other -- until it's ready for spreading.

*(*Timer Sounded*)*

Sorry. And it will prevent 100% of the leaching of nitrogen from the dry manure. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Ms. Frost, are you going to be around for when we take up the bill later on?

MS. FROST:

If you'd like me to be.

P.O. GREGORY:

One of the Legislators had asked that you be around.

MS. FROST:

Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Thank you. Mr. Humphrey, and then on deck, Douglas Corwin.

MR. HUMPHREY:

Hello. My name is Corey Humphrey. I'm the District Manager with the Suffolk County Soil and Water Conservation District. I'm here to speak on behalf of my district.

We support the project, the Crescent Duck Farm on Meetinghouse Creek, Aquebogue. I strongly encourage this Legislature to allocate the requested funding to the Soil and Water Conservation District to administer this project. This project will greatly increase the water quality in Suffolk County, both surface and groundwater. Upon completion, this upgrade will make significant strides in Suffolk's battle against nitrogen in our waterways. The result of this project includes improvement to the water quality of Little Peconic Bay, Reeves Bay, Peconic River, Meetinghouse Creek, just to name a few, and, most importantly, restore critical habitat for native species, shellfish, clams, oysters, scallops, finfish, crustaceans, and a wide variety of migratory species that utilize the embayment, including herring, shorebirds and water fowl.

So why give this project to Suffolk County? Well, the County has a very rich history of agriculture. It's a leading producer of poultry, over 100 duck farms since the late 1800s. Agriculture on the Island has created many variable markets for local prosperity, employing thousands of residents, and has become synonymous with what we think of when we think of Long Island's heritage.

Poultry production within Suffolk County in the 1960s saw approximately 7.5 million ducks sold annually, with all of that revenue coming back to Suffolk County. That's 66% of the ducks consumption in the United States. Two-thirds of the ducks consumed in this country came from Long Island.

Since the '70s, pressures from regulation and environmental quality control has forced almost all the producers to fold their family businesses. We're talking generations leaving the Island. With the demand for quality agricultural products steadily growing, the ability for Suffolk County's agriculture producers to keep up with the market has become increasingly difficult. As the last major producers in the region, we feel it's of great importance that we work with Crescent Duck Farm to ensure the protection of our natural resources, the security of our heritage, and the preservation of our culture here on Long Island.

So why Soil and Water? Well, we're one of 58 County districts. We're tasked with developing and implementing projects that protect, preserve, and restore Suffolk County's natural resources. We are grant writers, program administrators, technicians, technical specialists who serve Suffolk County's residents. Our focus is bringing partner agencies and local agriculture producers together to implement these BMPs, or Best Management Practices, and the goal is to protect our natural resources here in Suffolk County. Soil and Water has over 50 years of experience with Suffolk County, protecting natural resources. We've authored and administered millions of dollars in grant funds with the County, and that number keeps growing every month, I'm proud to say.

We're the perfect entity to help facilitate this project. The Soil and Water has a great standing relationship with local agriculture, support from New York State Department of Ag and Markets, and the technical ability to oversee the completion of this project. We have several working agreements with partner organizations, such as NRCS, Cornell Cooperative Extension, and we're a trusted agency within the County.

(*Timer Sounded*)

Two seconds, please. Clean water is a key component to the quality of life in Suffolk residents. We are fortunate to have this opportunity to surround ourselves with some of the world's most gorgeous natural landscapes, bountiful seas and rich soils that are major economic generators for Suffolk County, but this isn't free. We must capitalize on these opportunities like this to present real quantifiable improvements to our waterway.

Thank you for your time. Please do not hesitate to call me if you need for anything. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Mr. Corwin, and then Steve Ruth. Good to see you again.

MR. CORWIN:

Nice to see you again. Well, thank you for holding this meeting here in Riverhead. My name is Doug Corwin. My great-grandfather started Crescent Duck Farm back in 1908 on land that our ancestors bought back in the 1640s. We breed, hatch, grow, process about 4% of the country's

General Meeting - May 10, 2016

ducks right here in Aquebogue. Also, we also own a feed milling business in Eastport. I'm fortunate. We're fortunate to have most of the better restaurant trade in the northeast. However, we sell to distributors across the U.S., including Puerto Rico or the Bahamas, Saipan, the Dominican Republic. Also, each year, we sell eight containers of feathers to mainland China.

I'm blessed with a wonderful family that helps us work our farm. My older generation is still pitching in. I've got siblings working with me. I've got boys, 30, 32. Overall, we employ about 82 people on a year-round basis.

When I got out of Cornell back in 1980, there were roughly 35 duck farms here on Long Island. Now we're it. A lot of economic reasons for it, but the major, major one, there's been a huge need to be responsible and treat duck waste to stay in environmental compliance. My family has had a proud history of doing such and being very proactive in that. Back in the '30s, we were the first people to put in liquid manure separation. In the '60s, we put in eight acres of aerated lagoons. In the '90s, with engineering help from the Soil and Water Group and with help from the Peconic Estuary Plan, we put in six acres of artificial wetlands to act as tertiary treatment of our wastewater. Starting about 12 years ago, we constructed a brand new and much more advanced waste treatment plant that I showed the Presiding Officer not so long ago. We got a half a million gallon anaerobic digester and a pair of half-million-gallons sequential batch reactors. This plant took three years for the family to build and cost us about three-and-a-half million dollars. It works well. It still needs one major costly upgrade, which this is what we're talking about today, and it's -- we're working with two engineering firms right now to find the best way to do so.

But today I'm here to ask about another major upgrade to lower our nitrogen footprint. We would like to proactively build a fully concreted and covered manure solid waste storage. Our Nutrient Management Plan that Sharon devised is required by the DEC, and specifies some sort of facility be constructed.

What we're proposing, and I've got plans here that I've already submitted to NRCS, is a 65-by-400 foot structure that will allow us to handle solid waste prior to exporting it to the East End's farms and nurseries. The structure is going to cost, I think, about \$700,000. It will help us improve water quality and odor control in Aquebogue with its NRCS design.

My family views it as something to last well into the next generation. But without grant help, I doubt we can build something quite as good that's going to help us meet what we need for the coming generations, since I've got this major upgrade I need to do on my wastewater plant.

I thank you very much for the time and consideration. I hope you help us support us to help keep the Long Island duck industry here.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Mr. Ruth, and then on deck, Marie Guerrero Tooka.

MR. RUTH:

Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. As I stand before you this morning, there has been a tremendous amount of wrongdoing in Suffolk County. I would like to address only the altering of yellow lights.

You have, unfortunately, have caused numerous fatalities and destroyed many families with -- because of this matter. Can you even fathom what you have done and how many individuals were affected by these deaths, parents like John Luke, Sr., who have been here before you and you

General Meeting - May 10, 2016

couldn't even give him your condolences? Extended family members, colleagues, friends and even schoolmates have been affected. I don't know how else to elaborate on how corrupt you seem to the general public by putting our safety in jeopardy and manipulating yellow lights just to increase revenue, and then you have the audacity to call it a safety program.

I would like to move on to the first person on my list to be charged in a citizen's arrest. County Executive Steven Bellone, who you should be charged with racketeering, corruption, fraud, official misconduct and conspiracy against the people of Suffolk County. The entire Suffolk County Legislature should be charged with the same charges. Matthew Driscoll, DOT Commissioner, should be charged with the same charges mentioned previously. Dennis Brown, County Attorney, should be charged for official misconduct for not carrying out his duties, as his position calls for.

P.O. GREGORY:

Mr. Ruth, this is totally out of order. This is -- this is out of order. This is not an appropriate venue to do what you're doing.

MR. RUTH:

Paul Margiotta, Executive Director of the Traffic Agency should be --

P.O. GREGORY:

Mr. Ruth.

MR. RUTH:

-- charged with corruption, fraud, official misconduct --

P.O. GREGORY:

Mr. Ruth.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

It's freedom of speech.

MR. RUTH:

-- conspiracy and racketeering.

P.O. GREGORY:

He is out of order.

MR. RUTH:

Tom Spota, Suffolk County District Attorney, should be charged with conspiracy, racketeering, fraud, official misconduct and corruption. Let us not forget the one million felonies and theft of \$20 million that was imposed as a surcharge on the red light ticket.

P.O. GREGORY:

Mr. Ruth, you are out of order.

MR. RUTH:

By the way, where did all the revenue go, into who's pocket? We want a comprehensive evaluation.

I represent the people of Suffolk County and all of the innocent lives lost. I am acting on their behalf. Understand this, we are your constituents who voted you into office. The residents of Suffolk County have had enough of the fraud, corruption, and, most importantly, taking of lives, some of whom are children.

(*Applause*)

This is because all of you agreed to bring more revenue -- all of you agreed to bring more revenue into Suffolk County that could be divided amongst you. Sheriffs, I ask at this point to please make the arrests of all of them. This is only a preview of what is yet to come.

P.O. GREGORY:

Stop. This is -- this is ridiculous.

MR. RUTH:

The people of Suffolk County have --

P.O. GREGORY:

Mr. Ruth, you're out of order. Mr. Ruth, you're out of order.

MR. RUTH:

Sheriffs, this is a citizen's arrest. I am asking you to remember the oath you took to uphold the Constitution and make the arrests. Sheriffs. Sheriffs, please uphold the Constitution and make the arrests --

P.O. GREGORY:

Please, you're out of order. Step away from the mic.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

He's right.

P.O. GREGORY:

He's not right. This is ridiculous.

MR. RUTH:

Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

He's right.

P.O. GREGORY:

No, he's not.

MR. RUTH:

And thank you, God.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

You don't like what he's saying.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Charge them. You're responsible for deaths.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

That's the problem. You don't like what he's saying, but it's true.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Next, Marie Guerrera -- is it Tooka? I'm sorry if I mispronounced your name.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

This is a sham.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

You're pathetic.

P.O. GREGORY:

And Pollock. Excuse me if I messed up. I can't understand your first name.

MS. TOOKA:

Where's Mr. Trotta? Oh, there he is. I know he's been up and down the whole time. Thank you. My name is Marie Guerrera Tooka, a victim and whistle-blower that is horrifically being injured by the "Suffolk Crime Family." The criminal enterprise involves four Police Departments, three towns, Suffolk County agencies, including the District Attorney, Child Protective Services, and, most importantly, the judiciary. Many Judges assisted the enterprise to give private actors my property through armed robbery, extortion, bribery, threats, and fear of my life and my children, and the torture of over 60 farm animals, consummating the Hogs Act. Mostly people with powerful positions, including John Scott Prudenti, his sister, Ann Marie Prudenti, and their cousin, Gail Prudenti, have misused their power and destroyed many lives. They sat back and watched our animals being tortured, and prosecuted me, instead of prosecuting their buddy, Judge David Reilly, and convicted felons who murdered my animals.

Abess Farm was preserved by Suffolk County. This farm was earmarked for the good of humanity, to give underprivileged children a chance to thrive in society, with equal opportunity to compete with the privileged selected few children. Public officials are so jealous, they stopped every movie I made to steal this wonderful farm, and destroyed endless opportunities for our youth and homeless Veterans.

Suffolk County officials and employees are part of a conspiracy to destroy our constitutional God-given right to people like me who expose their wrongdoings of corruption. This epidemic of criminal activity by people in power is long overdue for an investigative office policing the corruption that has ruined millions of families across America. Nepotism, cronyism and bullying by public officials is a systemic epidemic, intertwined with private actors, has poisoned our government beyond another committee or a new office. The last thing the residents need is a new government office to watch their corrupt "Good Ol' Boys" club. We, the people, need the fourth branch of government, which is our constitutional right.

(*Applause*)

We are back to where we started when the Legislative body stripped the Fifth Amendment from the people to have a Grand Jury to go before without being tainted by a prosecutor or a Judge. We can clearly see now why our forefathers put this in place. Look at the mess Suffolk County has done to the people, leaving the middle class with little means to thrive, and the poor to become homeless and hungry. Drugs and alcohol are destroying our families, and the political force is assisting it right here in Riverhead.

The investigation for the "Suffolk Crime Family" is simple. Across the hall is the records room. It is all the evidence you need to prove corruption. Index and docket numbers is all you need to start finding the cases with the evidence to prove that our County is so corrupt that we need to clean house and start over. This needs to happen, everyday common people to establish a new common law Grand Jury --

(*Applause*)

-- so it is bomb proof of the "Suffolk Crime Family".

(*Timer Sounded*)

One more second. Fraud upon the court is a systemic crisis in our justice system. We do not need another office run by the same local government, we need the fourth branch of government. John Scott Prudenti, Steve Bellone and many others need to do more than resign, they need to become whistle-blowers to get time off their sentencing when they are convicted of one of the most horrific crimes, the Hogs Act. Our justice system, both civil and criminal, are slowly killing people from trauma --

P.O. GREGORY:

Please wrap up.

MS. TOOKA:

-- PTSD, law abuse, that many are turning to drugs, alcohol and even suicide. To me, this is murder, a slow death of torture that is not visible to the eye. Anyone who is kidnapped and dragged into the arena of the justice system is --

P.O. GREGORY:

Ma'am, please wrap up.

MS. TOOKA:

I have one more -- 30 more seconds.

P.O. GREGORY:

No. You --

MS. TOOKA:

How many times have you talked while people were talking, sir?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yeah, but we have not interrupted when you talked.

(*Applause*)

MS. TOOKA:

You have been talking the whole time everybody is talking. You have not been quiet once.

P.O. GREGORY:

But we have not --

MS. TOOKA:

I have 30 more seconds left.

P.O. GREGORY:

No, we have not interrupted your time. I have ten more cards and we have to get to --

MS. TOOKA:

With the grace of God, many people are going to come forth --

P.O. GREGORY:

Please step away from the microphone.

MS. TOOKA:

-- and tell their story of the corruption they experienced, and soon they will have --

P.O. GREGORY:

Ma'am, please step away from the microphone.

MS. TOOKA:

-- of the wrongdoing by the powers that be in Suffolk County. Now it is clear that Suffolk County is in debt.

P.O. GREGORY:

Please step away from the microphone.

MS. TOOKA:

The people are paying for the corrupt political players to have parties by not --

P.O. GREGORY:

Please step away from the microphone.

MS. TOOKA:

And in castles that celebrate pain and suffering of victims like me. Who wants to finish me hearing -- who wants to hear me?

P.O. GREGORY:

You can turn in your comment.

(*Applause*)

This is -- look, this is not a game show. We have -- we have rules.

MS. TOOKA:

It's not a game show.

P.O. GREGORY:

No, no. My turn to talk. We have rules. We ask you to follow the rules. You're not being discriminating -- everyone else gets three minutes to speak.

MS. TOOKA:

Are you following the rules?

P.O. GREGORY:

I'm listening to you.

MS. TOOKA:

How many times did you talk to Mr. Nolan?

P.O. GREGORY:

I'm not interrupting you talking, though, am I?

MS. TOOKA:

You're interrupting me.

P.O. GREGORY:

Am I? Thank you very much.

MS. TOOKA:

Everyone heard me anyway.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you very much. Thank you very much. This is not a game show. Everyone has the same rules to follow by, we're asking you to follow them.

MS. TOOKA:

This is not a game show.

P.O. GREGORY:

Not being discriminatory in any way. Miss or Mrs., I can't understand what you wrote for your first name, but your last name, Pollock? There you go, ma'am. All right. And then Mariel Bernhardt.

MS. POLLOCK:

Can she go first?

MR. RICHBERG:

They flipped them.

P.O. GREGORY:

Ms. Bernhardt, right?

MS. BERNHARDT:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

You switched with -- okay.

MS. BERNHARDT:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. I'm sorry.

MS. BERNHARDT:

Suffolk County has approved a 167% law enforcement budget increase, while almost simultaneously tabled a proposed bill to fund a subpoena-empowered special investigative law enforcement committee probe. This budget increase would bring the current budget from 1.5 million this year to 4 million next year, and then to a staggering \$12 million the following year. That's a 700% increase in two years, while a paltry budget of \$100,000 to find out where the money is going has been shut down. The reasoning we're expected to swallow is that this budget increase is needed to save money on overtime. We're supposed to believe that we can save money by increasing the budget 700%? That doesn't even make sense.

General Meeting - May 10, 2016

I want to know why we need to spend so much money to fortify our police force when on Flanders Road, Route 24, on a one-mile strip of land containing the headquarters of four law enforcement agencies, there's one of the most corrupt crime, drug and prostitution infested areas in Suffolk County, and yet there is no oversight budget to find out why.

Why was James Burke ever appointed as Suffolk County Chief of Police, when Steve Bellone, as Suffolk County Executive, had apparently been warned of his corruption? While we're at it, I want to mention that former Southampton Councilman Brad Bender recently pled guilty to selling 60,000 pills of Oxycodone. We're supposed to believe that we don't need an oversight budget? Where is our Sheriff, our first line of defense?

When I critically analyzed the situation, I could only conclude, to my chagrin, that a portion of law enforcement is on the take. They have to be. Either that, or they're turning a blind eye, and all the while judicial cronyism and nepotism are practiced in place of the rule of law in our County Courts and in courts across the country, right up to the Federal level, letting them off the hook. The corruption is flagrant, unabashed, completely out of control, and seemingly totally systemic.

The Oversight Committee was apparently voted down 5 to 2, the reason being that it may interfere with the Federal investigative probe currently being conducted here in the County. We need an independent committee to keep an eye on everybody. Listen, we need to institute the Fifth Amendment and call for a common law Grand Jury, because we citizens of Long Island are the common law, and we'll use our common sense to find out where the money is going and how it is being spent. It's really very simple. Either we call the people out, or the corruption never ends.

I propose we temporarily table the law enforcement budget increase, and not only retable and fund the investigative committee, but quintuple its proposed budget. Further, let's head it up by someone like our very own Long Island "Red Light Robin Hood," Stephen Ruth, until we find out what is going on in this County. We need to root out corruption, folks, and call in the Grand Jury.

*(*Applause*)*

It's our right when provided to us by our framers. It's time to choose sides. Are you going to side with corruption, or are you on the side of the people? We are your people --

P.O. GREGORY:

Please wrap up.

MS. BERNHARDT:

-- your brothers and sisters, sons and daughters, parents and grandparents. We are, so square up. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Bernhardt. Ms. Pollock. She set the stage for you. Everyone's heated up, all right.

*(*Laughter*)*

All right. Dale Javino is next on deck.

MS. POLLOCK:

That's a very big hard act to follow.

P.O. GREGORY:

It is.

MS. POLLOCK:

Yes. I'm in her -- and I'm in her corner. I'm an 82-year-old resident of Suffolk County. I'm here today to talk to you about predatory lending, mortgage fraud, identity theft perpetrated on me by the Emigrant Mortgage Bank.

At the height of the mortgage -- of the financial crisis in 2008, Emigrant Mortgage Bank offered me a no-income loan based on the value of my property. At the closing, I was presented -- no papers were sent to me during the whole procedure of the loan. And at the closing, I was presented with a letter that was called a "special letter," which allowed this bank to sequester \$275,000 of this loan money to pay themselves the interest up front due on this loan. When I pointed out to them that this was not my signature, I never saw or signed that piece of paper, they said if I did not agree with that, the deal was off, and they threatened me by telling me that. They knew full well the interest money would run out in 2010, which would then allow them to foreclose my loan, steal my two-and-a-half million dollar home, enrich themselves, leave me penniless, homeless if the -- homeless.

I was 78 when this loan took place. I feel it's elder abuse. At the time, the fraud -- the fraudulent documents kept showing up with my RESPO request, with the Banking Commission request. They blatantly offered the same fraudulent documents in the court briefs. They have never submitted the note with an affidavit, front or back. They have never offered the ink-signed papers to show that these were original signatures. I have never been allowed -- been given due process.

My house was sold on the steps of Town Hall last summer after being foreclosed and being at the end of my resources to defend myself. They bought it for their own -- their own real estate company at a minimal amount, and now they're trying to evict me from my home, putting me out on the street. I recently had a stroke. I'm barely recovering from this event. And while I was away, they posted an eviction notice on my house.

I have not been able to get -- I submitted this fraudulent action of Emigrant Bank to Steve Bellone -- to District Attorney Spota way back in 2008, and he told me that it was -- he wrote me back and said it was a private matter.

P.O. GREGORY:

Ms. Pollock. Ms. Pollock.

MS. POLLOCK:

I've got to finish.

P.O. GREGORY:

No, Ms. Pollock.

MS. POLLOCK:

Since when is -- since when is fraud, elder abuse be called a private matter? Where are the courts? Where are the defenses against this kind of action?

P.O. GREGORY:

Ms. Pollock, if I may.

MS. POLLOCK:

I'm being defrauded by these banks.

P.O. GREGORY:

Ms. Pollock.

MS. POLLOCK:

I see every day their notice in the Southampton Press that these homes as being sold on the stair of Town Hall by Emigrant Bank. They're thieves, they're liars, they're crooks, and they should all be in jail.

P.O. GREGORY:

Ms. Pollock.

*(*Applause*)*

MS. POLLOCK:

And you need to help me, because I have no way of keeping the roof over my head at 82 years old, after being a good citizen in this community, an environmentalist, a human potential consultant, a person who helped humanity to become better.

P.O. GREGORY:

I don't disagree. I was just saying that my Chief of Staff wanted to talk to you, because we didn't have your information. And several Legislators wanted to reach out to you, and we didn't have -- you only put your name on here, so we wouldn't have contact information. So my Chief of Staff, Lora, is going to try to help you out. All right?

*(*Applause*)*

MS. POLLOCK:

Okay. I Will say this, that Steve Bellone has -- Congressman Lee Zeldin's organization has been trying to help me.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

MS. POLLOCK:

Because it's just so shocking.

P.O. GREGORY:

Our hearts -- our hearts go out to you. We're going to try to do what we can for you.

MS. POLLOCK:

It's outrageous, and they got away with all that fraud, all that fraud.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

They're going to help you. They're going to help you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Javino, Dale Javino. I'm sorry. Javino? Javina? No? Okay. Okay. Dorothy Fiore, and then on deck, Shawn Pug, or Pugh. Excuse me. Dorothy?

MS. FIORE:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

MS. FIORE:

I'm not somebody who normally speaks in public. I've come here to watch you people for the last --

P.O. GREGORY:

Please speak a little closer to the mic, though.

MS. FIORE:

I'm not someone who normally speaks in public. I have come here to watch you people for the last few days. I have to say, like Mr. McDermott, I haven't seen any of you pay attention. I've watched Ms. Martinez and Ms. Kennedy, you look bored out of your mind. You don't pay attention. When people are standing up here talking, they're speaking and telling you what's in their hearts. You're not even listening to them. The only thing that Mr. Calarco seems interested in is his little clicker, is the only thing I've seen you show any interest in.

*(*Applause*)*

When people are standing here, they're pouring their hearts out to you and they're telling you what is important to them. The least you could do is show interest in what they're saying.

I came up here to speak only to say that I stand behind Mr. Ruth, and that these red light cameras are a fraud. But after watching the inattentiveness to all of you, the least you can do is pay attention when somebody steps up to this podium. That's all I have to say.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Shawn Pugh. Shawn, and then Charles Clampet, Clampert.

MR. PUGH:

Good afternoon, Legislators. My name is Shawn. I'm a resident of District 4. I'm here as a concerned constituent, worried that the Suffolk County Red Light Camera Program is more dangerous to Suffolk County motorists than anticipated.

Fortunately, I was not surprised, but, nevertheless, disappointed when I read the recent Newsday story confirming that crashes were up 44% at Suffolk County intersections with red light cameras. In addition, rear-end collisions at Suffolk County intersections with red light cameras increased by 9.3% from the time the program began through 2013, and with the data released in 2014. To hear that type of data is very alarming to Suffolk County residents.

According to figures from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, out of 6 million car accidents that happened on U.S. roads every year, 40% of them, 2.5 million, are rear-end collisions. I'm not sure motorist safety was the number one concern for the introduction of the Red Light Camera Safety Program in Suffolk County. If safety was the goal, then the red light cameras are failing us miserably, and are not making our intersections any safer for Suffolk County residents.

Driver behavior is also being negatively impacted by the red light cameras. Particularly, when drivers approach the intersection, they're more concerned with looking up above near the traffic light instead of focusing on the immediate potential dangers of pedestrians, bikers and anticipating oncoming traffic or other roadway hazards.

General Meeting - May 10, 2016

The administrative team for the red light safety program within Suffolk County has not been forthcoming with data and videos -- excuse me -- data and videos of many accidents or incidents that occurred on or within the red light camera zones. Why wouldn't the Suffolk County red light safety program not want to highlight and share this important data with the County motorists on a consistent basis?

Based on these recent incidents, accidents, and concerns, Suffolk County should now begin taking steps to follow the lead of our neighboring New Jersey by removing the red light program in Suffolk County permanently and suspending it.

(*Applause*)

In closing, please support Robert Trotta's bill and remove the red light program. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Mr. Clampet. I don't see him. Oh, there you are. Oh, okay, you were behind the podium. And then Rose VanGuilder.

MR. CLAMPET:

Before my time starts, Mr. Gregory, are we allowed to do anything while we're up here? We can dance, we could sing, we could do whatever for three minutes?

P.O. GREGORY:

You can do whatever you want --

MR. CLAMPET:

Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:

-- within the rules.

MR. CLAMPET:

All right. I hope this is part of the rule. (Singing) *Keep your eye on the sparrow, when the going gets narrow.* That was by Sammy Davis, Jr. Keep your eye on the sparrow. If you can't do the crime, don't do the time.

Now I need to know each and every one of you, I know you're not going to answer me, were you paid by the PBA that's sitting in the back right over there? Were you paid by the PBA to be in office? Is it a fair playing ground? No, it's not.

(*Applause*)

The PBA sits in here. And when Sheriff DeMarco stood up and was talking in Hauppauge, that gentleman right there in the back stood right up on the -- right next to the wall and was listening to every word that DeMarco had to say. And you want to know something? Deputy, I'd like know where your \$4 million is. Is it gone? I know you can't compliment -- you can't say anything. But isn't it amazing, the \$4 million, and you guys are working without a contract? Every one of you should be ashamed of yourselves.

The red light camera is a scam. How much did Xerox pay each and every one of you to be it sitting in the chairs that you're sitting in right now?

(*Applause*)

The cameras, the cameras, people died. AAA came in and asked for the video. People asked for the video of the people that died on the corner.

You know, Mr. Calarco, you had mentioned something the last time about the sign that was up by Phyllis Drive. I sat in George's Luncheonette, it's right there. I watched the guys install this new sign. The sign was out. Twenty people said they all seen it. All the people in the store front seen the truck there putting in the sign. You cannot say the sign was there before that guy wound up hitting that other guy. So you can't say that. If you don't have the facts, then don't say anything.

Please, if you can, listen to Rob Trotta, listen to the other people. Wasn't it nice to get nice money from the PBA? Wasn't it nice to get money from the Xerox Company? Isn't it a shame that other people have to fight for their lives, \$80, senior citizens up here speaking about it? Come on, this is wrong. Every one of you know that it's wrong. Stand up -- stand up for the people, because you'll be voted out. You need to stand up for the people. You want that seat? You like that cushy seat that you're sitting in? Then do the right thing, get rid of the Red Light Camera Program. Have a good day.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, there she is, Rose VanGuilder.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

Hi. Good morning. Good afternoon. I think it's right in between. I want to thank you for allowing me to speak.

P.O. GREGORY:

Can you please pull the mic up a little bit closer to you?

MS. VAN GUILDER:

Yes. Hi.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

Good morning. My name is Rose VanGuilder. I am president of the Alliance for Independent Long Island, the Long Island and Rockaway Ratepayers Alliance. I have filed a United States Attorney complaint and an FBI complaint against the Red Light Camera Program.

(*Applause*)

It is illegal, it is a scam. And you all should be ashamed of yourselves. You have caused the death of many innocent lives. And before you pass another legislation, make sure you know the ramification of the laws you pass, because you maybe caused the death of many innocent people. I recommend that you end this program immediately today, if possible.

(*Applause*)

General Meeting - May 10, 2016

I had the honor of meeting with Thomas Barraga and we discussed several things, and we will be, hopefully, working together. I live in his district now. I had the honor of living in the district of William Lindsay. I met your second cousin today. He lives on -- he works on 5th Avenue. I hope you will do the right thing, because if you don't, I know that the Attorney General will be looking at your particular work status. Many of you are working a second job. You are supposed to be full-time lawmakers. I called up the Governor, Senator John Flanagan, and Speaker Heastie. I want ethics reform for New York State. I want our lawmakers in New York State to work full-time.

(*Applause*)

Sheldon Silver just got a 12-year sentence. He has to pay \$5 million. Dean Skelos will get his sentence this week. Senator Sampson will get his sentence next week. New York State citizens, people have had enough with corruption in New York State. We will not put up with it any longer.

(*Applause*)

That was my message to the Governor, Senator Flanagan and Speaker Heastie. We will not tolerate corruption in New York State in all levels of government. And this Red Light Camera Program is corruption in Suffolk County.

(*Applause*)

I will tell you one other thing. I am going to file a \$1.9 billion lawsuit against LIPA. They overcollected this amount of money from the LIPA ratepayers. Guess who collected \$1 billion?

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:

Ma'am. Ms. VanGuilder, please wrap, your time is up.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

Yes, I will.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Thank you.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

This is the end of it. It was Kevin Law, when he was CEO of LIPA. I have the proof, and I sent the email to all the lawmakers in Suffolk County and in New York State. I am working with a lawyer currently in Suffolk County and I shall be doing this. So you will have the extra money, so you will not need the Red Light Camera Program, or the --

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

-- plastic bag program.

(*Applause*)

By the way, Senator Felder in New York State is putting through a law to make it illegal to have a plastic bag program.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

You will not have that bill go through.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

MS. VAN GUILDER:

Oh, I am a delegate --

P.O. GREGORY:

No, no, ma'am.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

-- for Donald J. Trump.

P.O. GREGORY:

Congratulations.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

He will be the President of the United States of America, God has declared.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes, he has.

MS. VAN GUILDER:

Amen.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Now --

MS. VAN GUILDER:

Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Good job. Good job.

P.O. GREGORY:

Dale -- one more time, Dale Javino. Javina? Javine? I'm not sure if it's an O or A or E. Okay. Anyone else that would like to speak that hasn't spoken, please come forward, state your name for the record. All right. Don't run over each other. Please, state your name for the record.

MS. KHAN:

My name is Madiha Khan. I'm currently a pre-med student at Stony Brook University. I actually made it a commitment not to speak here. I've been to numerous meetings here. I see how it goes. You guys kind of just look around, stare through us, stare at your computers, and, you know, I guess text or whatever.

I'm against the red light cameras, and mostly because once before, a man named John Luke, Sr. has come before and stood in front of you. And he explained to you how his son was crossing a four-lane intersection with about a 2.5 to, I would say, three-second amber light and was struck and killed. I don't know how you would feel if that was your son or your daughter. I know I would be devastated.

If you guys don't do anything about this, it's really a travesty. I think, with the story, would it be different if it was your son or your daughter? I don't know, maybe it would. But we voted you in office and we're really hoping that you do something about it. That man comes to our house for breakfast once in a while and we have to face him, and I don't know if you guys would be able to face him. So I'm really hoping you guys do something about it.

I'm a stepmother of a 17-year-old, and he's the same age of the boy that was killed, and if that was him on the road, my world would be torn apart. So I really hope you guys think about it. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you.

MS. TOCCI:

Hello. I'm Susan Tocci. I'm a resident of Flanders here my whole life. It's been -- I came here very relaxed, and I'm leaving pretty stressed. These people have high anxiety in here today. I know they said a lot of negative things, but as I sit here, I see a lot of positive things. I have my wrong glasses today, so I can't see too far, but I do see Ms. Fleming, Ms. Browning, Mr. Spencer, these three here all paying very much attention to every speaker that was up here, and I do appreciate it.

I also wanted to thank you for holding this Legislative meeting in Riverside. It's -- I have seen today a lot of people from William Floyd, I believe Mattituck, a lot of people on the East End, and I think it's important that you continue to hold meetings on the East End. I thank you for it.

This -- you know, I am sorry for all this -- I've been to Legislative meetings before that haven't been so stressful, and I hope you don't hold it against Riverside and you do come back.

*(*Laughter*)*

We're glad to have you here. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

Okay.

MR. STRAUSS:

Good morning.

P.O. GREGORY:

Good morning.

MR. STRAUSS:

Alex Strauss, 184 Radio Avenue, Miller Place, New York. It's amazing how we can read reports and you can take what you want out of a report. The Newsday article said that 40% had extra rear-end collisions. What about the 60% of the cameras that had nothing? Hmm, that's more than 50%. That means that they were working.

Rear-end collisions, let's see what the reason why a rear-end collision happens. When I started to drive, which was a long time ago, we were told for every ten miles an hour that you drive, you leave a car length. So if you're going 50 miles an hour, there should be five-car lengths between you and the car in front of you. If you don't do that, you'll probably have a rear-end collision. Hmm, what does that got to do with the red light cameras? I have no idea. When you come into any intersection, you should be cognizant of what the heck's going on with that camera -- with the light, not anything to do with the cameras, or how much money is made. You should be able to drive and look at the light and see whether it's going to be red or green or yellow. You should be able to stop in time.

You know, maybe somebody has these -- this information, but I haven't heard of anybody getting killed because of a red light camera. If it's an accident and somebody gets killed -- somebody in Miller Place got killed on a red light camera intersection. Yeah, he was crossing the road with the light green and he got hit by a car. Had nothing to do with the red light camera. I don't know of anybody that's been killed by a red light camera for a reason that. If somebody has the information, please let me know, I'd like to know.

The information that was on the Newsday article was taken one year after the cameras were installed. Maybe, if you took the information now, there would be a bigger drop in the amount, because people are getting used to what the red light cameras are. Maybe that's why. But as far as rear-end collisions, it's because people are not driving properly, has nothing to do with the red light cameras.

I'd like to see in it the -- what they say are the other intersections that don't have red light cameras, if there has been an increase in rear-end collisions there. Hmm, wonder why, wonder why we haven't got that information.

(*Timer Sounded*)

Well, my time is up, and I'll go according to the rules and leave. Thank you. Have a grade day.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Al. Anyone else like to speak that has not spoken? Okay. All right. Motion to close the Public Portion, second by Legislator Martinez. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. We have a request prior to we go into Executive Session to take I.R. 1392 out of order. It's on Page 6 on the agenda under Government Operations. So I will make a motion to take ***I.R. 1392 - Amending the Suffolk County Classification and Salary Plan in connection with new titles for use in the Department of Economic Development and Planning (Senior, Principal and Chief Community Development and Planning Specialist) (Co. Exec.)*** out of order, second by Legislator Fleming. Okay. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

On the motion. This is to take out of order.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Oh, to take it out of order.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yeah.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Okay. I'm sorry, go ahead.

P.O. GREGORY:

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion passes. It's off the agenda now. No, I'm only kidding.

(*Laughter*)

All right. I make a motion to approve, second by Legislator Flemming. Anyone on the motion?

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Which one are we one?

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1382.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Thank you. We had -- we had a discussion before at the committee hearing concerning these new titles.

P.O. GREGORY:

People, can you please clear the room so we can get on with our business. Please, Cathy, Ms. Stark. All right. Go ahead, Kevin.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Thank you. If we could have the -- I know Amy Keyes is here from Economic Development. We can reconvene our discussion about these titles.

We had a -- at committee, we discussed, you know, the need for these new titles. I know that Amy gave an impassioned plea for a career path for these Urban Planners, but I'm truly concerned about the -- creating new titles within the existing -- in addition to the ones that we already have right now. I think we're facing a financial crisis that we haven't seen, a \$185 million budget deficit over three years, and I think a career path for Urban Planners is not as important as us trying to do what we can to balance this budget.

And as I said at the Economic Development Committee meeting, I believe -- I don't have anyone come to my office asking for more Urban Planners. They're asking for more Police Officers on the street, and I think that's where we need to direct our resources. And we're not at a time where we can expand the use of these Urban Planners. Many of the functions that we talked about that they were going to be doing in Economic Development is under the purview of the towns and villages as per their zoning authority. And most of that work that's going to be done is going to be done through them and through their planners and any consultants that they need to hire in conjunction with any type of development that's going on. So, you know, I'm opposed to this.

I'm in support of economic development, but I'm opposed to the creating of any new titles at a period of time when we cannot afford them. I know I'm told that there's money, these titles are in the budget. But as I spoke with Dr. Lipp, if we have any chance of trying to salvage balancing our budget or coming close to it, if we filled every position that was budgeted in the budget right now, we'd have no hope of doing that.

So we've already overextended ourselves in terms of hiring new Police Officers. We're putting in a class of 175 Police Officers, which I fully support, and I think everybody around this horseshoe does that as well. We need to roll up our sleeves and figure out a way to pay for that, and I think -- I don't think there's a sense of urgency in bringing Urban Planners to here, we need more Police Officers on the street, so.

P.O. GREGORY:

Anyone else on the motion? Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I have a question about the titles, and I know this came up when we were working on the budget last Fall. What would these -- what would these people be doing? Would these be -- and would they be new hires?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

So these positions, what was included in the 2016 budget was the entry level Community Development and Planning Specialists. It was approved with three new titles -- three new positions at that title. And we're envisioning what these people will be doing, and we've -- just to be clear, these aren't new -- we're not asking for additional positions, we're asking to create new titles.

We are -- have been hiring Urban Planners since Economic Development and Planning was formed in 2012. We just -- what we're trying to do with this resolution is modernize the titles so that they match the work that's being done. So we've been hiring folks with urban planning background and experience since 2012, but we've had to shoehorn them into titles that, quite frankly, aren't appropriate, given the work that they're doing.

And the work that they're doing is working to -- so when a regionally significant project, a major transportation project, any project that requires by jurisdiction the review of the Planning Commission comes into the County, comes into the Planning Department, there are several different reviews, basically, and that happen. On the one hand, you have the current -- the existing Planners. And when I say "existing planners," I mean folks that are in the Planner, Senior Planner and

Principal Planner titles. That -- they conduct an environmental review, they conduct a review of basically -- I don't want to say legal review, but basically a regulatory review to make sure that the project is allowable, to make sure that the project is environmentally sound.

And, on the other hand, what we've been doing since 2012, since we started hiring Urban Planners, is that there's a community-based review, a review to make sure that the project is in line with the community visioning that's happened. There's outreach that happens to make sure that the community is in support of the project, to make sure that the overall site design, the street layout, transit options that in the area all make sense with the project. So those are the two, and they work in collaboration together. So those are the two reviews that happen.

So these titles will -- we have people on staff now that would be slid into these titles, because they match their experience, they match their work duties. So it's work that's happening now. So that's what they're doing now, that's what they would continue to do.

So in terms of your other question, new hires, we do envision hiring new people. That's why we asked for the new positions in the 2016 Operating Budget. So, yeah, they -- right now, we don't have resumes in front of us, so I can't tell you if it would be -- if this resolution is adopted and the Senior Principal and Chief are created for this title. I don't know what combination of people will come. It really depends on the resumes, and depends on the experience that we get, you know. But, yes, I mean, we do envision hiring new people. That was why we asked for the new positions in our operating.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. I -- you know, you mentioned community outreach, and I -- coming from local government, I think I'm very sensitive to the County planning versus the local planning, and I really -- you know, is it overreaching of the County to go into the planning business when you already have every local municipality, village and town has Planning Departments and they have their own local vision?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Sure. I also -- I started in the Town as well. I did -- I worked for four years in the Town of Islip. I'm very familiar with what Town Planning does. I have family that work in the Town Planning Department. It's not overreaching, it's not duplicative. We -- there is an appropriate level of involvement and work that goes on at the County level. If it's a project on a County roadway, if it's a project that is deemed large enough and significant enough to impact an entire region, the County has to get involved and does get involved. We don't step on the toes of our partners in the Town, we partner with them, we work as appropriate. But I don't think it's fair to say that it's redundant any more than having a County Park System, or having a County Public Works Department is duplicative, even though those services exist at the Town level. We just -- we act as jurisdictionally appropriate.

So we certainly don't conduct planning activities and review on every project that gets built, because some of them really are just appropriate at the Town level. But there are projects that rise to that level, and that review has happened for decades and will continue. So it's as appropriate, absolutely.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Do you want to question, or are we going to go into Executive Session?

LEG. CILMI:

Well, yeah, I have a question. Amy, hi.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Hi.

LEG. CILMI:

I just wanted to give you a chance to correct something that you said, I hope, because what I heard you say was that you've been hiring Urban Planners since 2012, but shoehorning them into positions that don't really fit what they're doing. So I'm wondering, if we don't have positions that are appropriate for the work that they're doing now, why are we hiring people?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

May be appropriate. What I should say is not specific enough. So there are titles that exist within the County, Neighborhood Aide is what comes to mind, because I know that's titles that we've placed people with urban planning backgrounds in that are flexible enough and broad enough in their scope that it is appropriate. They are doing the duties as listed in their title, but the titles don't speak to the skill and specificity of what they're doing. So it's not -- we haven't been placing them inappropriate -- in inappropriate titles, we just have not been placing them in the best titles, titles that make the best sense.

And when we spoke with Civil Service about this issue, because, basically, what has been happening since 2012, when we first started seeking people with this background and education, after a year or so, they would be leaving and moving on to municipalities that had a career path. Where they saw -- they looked around and saw there was no opportunity for advancement, because they were in a title that didn't -- that didn't have a clear -- clear room for advancement, that didn't speak to their education or experience, and they left us. A number of them left of us for -- I can think of just in my year-and-a-half in Economic Development, that left specifically to go to municipalities that had a career path for Urban Planners.

LEG. CILMI:

So, just to be clear, then, what you're telling us is that you hired people as, for example, Neighborhood Aides that are performing urban planning functions. What sort of salary are they getting paid? Are they getting paid as Urban Planners? Are they getting paid as Neighborhood Aides? How different would an --

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

They're getting paid at --

LEG. CILMI:

How different would an Urban Planner be in terms of the scope of work than a Neighborhood Aide?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

It would be more -- it's more specific. The work duties that are included in these titles and the entry level titles that we created, and in last year's -- or in this year's Operating Budget process just spoke to the -- a more specific list of duties. So it's not -- and in terms of what they're getting paid, I don't know off the top of my head what a Neighborhood Aide grade is, but they're not -- they are paid whatever the grade and step of their --

LEG. CILMI:

Do you have the job descriptions in front of you of both Neighborhood Aide and Urban Planner?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

No. Neighborhood Aide is one title that we've use. They have used other flexible titles. So I wouldn't be comfortable saying that every Urban Planner that the Department has hired since 2012 worked as a Neighborhood Aide. They worked in titles that were flexible, that were broad --

LEG. CILMI:

So what you're telling me, though, is that you've hired people that the budget didn't really authorize you to hire.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

No, that's not what I'm telling you.

LEG. CILMI:

If the budget wanted you to have Urban Planners, then the budget would have had positions available in it for Urban Planners.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I don't think it's any different than hiring somebody into a flexible title that has a law degree, or has a Masters in Economics, if that's the title that's available at the given time. And, actually, what we're trying to do is speaking to exactly what it seems like your concern is, which is be forthright to tell you we -- since you formed the Economic Development and Planning Department in 2012, it became clear that there was a need for people with this level of expertise in the Department. And what we want to do, and that's why we put the entry level titles in the 2016 Operating, and why we're coming to you today with this resolution, what we want to do is be forthright. These are who -- this is who we're hiring, this is who we need. These are the titles -- these titles, these work duties, this -- these minimum qualifications speak to what we need.

LEG. CILMI:

So if you're being forthright today, what happened to the last four years?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

We worked as was possible to get the job done. That's the answer I could give you. And we did not -- we worked within the bounds of the budget, within the bounds of Civil Service regulations.

LEG. CILMI:

That's not a good answer. And you don't know what the salary level of Neighborhood -- of Neighborhood Aide is versus Urban Planner?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Not off the -- I mean, it's not --

LEG. CILMI:

Are there individuals that are positions right now in the County that you will transfer to these positions if they are created?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I don't have an answer to that.

LEG. CILMI:

And would there be salary increases that go along with those positions, potentially?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

For those individuals?

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Not the positions?

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Potentially.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

What are the Planners doing differently, the ones you want to hire than the ones we have now?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

So, as I said earlier, the -- our current Planners, the folks that are in Planning titles, not -- we have Urban Planners that are not in titles that best fit them, but our current Planners that work under our Director of Planning conduct environmental and regulatory review on projects as they come to the County as appropriate. So projects that come to the County Planning Commission, they conduct a --

LEG. TROTТА:

What are these other ones going to do different?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

They're going to -- again, as I -- as I said, they're going to be -- conduct -- what they do now, just not in a title that fits them, is they work on basically the community side of a project. So they look at a project from an overall community perspective. How does this fit into the overall area? How does the street layout function? How do the transit options function? Is this in line with community visioning goals?

LEG. TROTТА:

So is this -- so you're saying the ones we have now aren't capable of doing that?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

No. I -- this came up at committee. I would not say that our current Planners are incapable any more than I would say that a doctor is incapable of being a lawyer. It's just a different type of education and experience. So I'm sure if they pursued Urban Planning Masters Degree, if they trained, if they worked in the field on transit-oriented developments, etcetera, they would be capable. They're a very talented group of people who absolutely work in collaboration with the people we have on staff that have urban planning background. They're both essential, they're just dual functions, not -- it doesn't mean one is better than the other or --

LEG. TROTТА:

Specifically, what's different?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

You're talking about basically site design and community outreach versus how -- SEORA review, environmental review, land use review. That's what our current Planners do. So one is looking at long-range, one is looking at specific site. Our current Planners looked at demographic trends, and try to predict how our population is going to grow and move over time. That's not something that Urban Planners do.

LEG. TROTTA:

It doesn't seem that much different to me. It seems like that we have this already.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

It's subtle. It is -- it's a subtle difference, but it is a difference.

LEG. TROTTA:

I mean, I just don't see why we need them, and the Towns have it. I mean, is this in the jurisdiction of the County to even do this?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Yes. In -- it would be in accordance with General Municipal Law Section 239 that deals with projects as they are referred to the Suffolk County Planning Commission. So we individually --

LEG. TROTTA:

How many Planners do we have?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Currently, you mean, people that are in the Planning title, like --

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Five.

LEG. TROTTA:

So are they overworked?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

They are all busy, but these people would not replace any of the work they're doing.

LEG. TROTTA:

I just don't see the necessity.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Stern, and then we're going to go into Executive Session.

LEG. STERN:

The matters that those Planners are involved with, are they -- are they purely jurisdictional? Are they involved only in those cases that are referred to the Planning Commission, or are they involved in matters that are also discretionary, where the County might think that it would be appropriate for them to be involved?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

You're talking about the Planners conducting the environmental and regulatory review? Okay. They are -- they're in both. They are involved in projects as they -- some of them are -- exclusively work on Planning Commission projects, and some of them work on other environmental issues, water quality issues as they come up. They're under the direct supervision of the Director of Planning.

LEG. STERN:

And for those projects that they are involved with, that have been deemed to be regionally significant, who makes that determination, and are there standards?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

So projects that are regionally significant, we certainly look to the Long Island Regional Economic Development Council. They -- that term, as it applies to pursuing State and Federal grants, is a designation that comes from the Council. So I think that's -- that would be the -- that's the appropriate answer.

LEG. STERN:

Okay. So there is a standard?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Yeah, absolutely.

LEG. TROTTA:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Mr. Clerk, we have a motion and a second to approve?

MR. RICHBERG:

Yes, we do.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

I offer a motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

LEG. TROTTA:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

A motion to table by Legislator McCaffrey, second by Legislator Trotta. Roll --

LEG. FLEMING:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

On the motion.

LEG. FLEMING:

I just have a question actually for Amy, or for the I.R. staff. Do we have a Fiscal Impact Statement for this resolution?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I mean, I have the Fiscal Impact right in front of me. It says no fiscal impact, as filed by Civil Service, because we've committed to working within the bounds of our existing budget. So if we need to swap, earmark and swap a title, depending, again, upon the resumes that we actually get when we're able to recruit, we've committed to working within the 2016 Operating Budget, so it's budget neutral.

LEG. FLEMING:

I'm sorry, just to follow up. So -- but the starting salaries for the titles that you're looking to replace the current titles with are very different from the current titles, aren't they? I mean, aren't you going to be -- aren't you going to be constrained a little bit by Civil Service with regard to what you can offer at these higher titles?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Well, constrained by our budget, absolutely. So we're constrained by our overall personnel budget. We can only hire as it works within our budget. It's going to be a -- it could be a combination of these titles, it could be -- we may not find anybody who has the appropriate education and experience. It's a very specified minimum qualification. So we are -- the constraints that are placed upon us are working within the 2016 Operating Budget. We can only work within the money which you -- you know, you approved, or not you specifically. Sorry.

LEG. FLEMING:

I appreciate that. Do you have an immediate need for these new titles?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

It would allow us to recruit effectively. We've had -- as I kind of touched upon, we've had an issue with retaining folks with this background, because we don't -- the County does not have a clear career path for folks with urban planning backgrounds. So in order to reduce turnover, and in order to be able to recruit effectively, yes, we need to be able to show a career path. The title -- the entry level titles that were included in the 2016 Operating Budget, which is just the Community Development and Planning Specialist, in order to even recruit effectively for that entry level title, we feel strongly that we need to be able to show clear opportunities and room for advancement.

LEG. FLEMING:

No, and I appreciate that. I guess my question is are you -- are you competing at the moment for a particular candidate with other municipalities?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

No. We don't have resumes in front of us.

LEG. FLEMING:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. You're done, Legislator Flemming?

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. We're going to go into Executive Session. We have a couple of more Legislators that have questions. We're about 15 minutes late to go into Executive Session. So I am going to make a motion to go into Executive Session to discuss litigation and collective bargaining with the Deputy Sheriffs Union.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Everyone, please clear the room.

*(*Executive Session: 12:10 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. We're back in. We're out of Executive Session and we are going -- we're going to recess for lunch until 2:30.

*(*The meeting was recessed at 1:30 p.m.*)*

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

*(*The meeting was reconvened at 2:35 P.M.*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Good afternoon, Mr. Clerk. Ms. Clerk, excuse me, Madam Clerk.

MS. ELLIS:

Good afternoon.

P.O. GREGORY:

Can you please do the roll call?

*(*Roll Called by Ms. Ellis - Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature*)*

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Here.

LEG. FLEMING:

Here.

LEG. BROWNING:

Here.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Not Present).

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present).

LEG. ANKER:

Here.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Not Present).

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Here.

LEG. CILMI:

Here.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Here.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Here.

LEG. TROTTA:

Here.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

(Not Present).

LEG. STERN:

Here.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Here.

LEG. SPENCER:

Here.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Present.

P.O. GREGORY:

Here.

LEG. HAHN:

Hahn's here.

MS. ELLIS:

Fifteen (Not Present: Legislators Muratore, Lindsay & McCaffrey).

Public Hearings

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, we are in the public portion -- excuse me, Public Hearing portion of the agenda. And we have the first public hearing, **2017-2019 Capital Budget -- Capital Program and budget**. And I don't have any cards on that public hearing. Is there anyone that would like to speak on it? Please come forward.

MR. NOLAN:

Close it.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. I'll make a motion to close the Capital Program and Budget Public Hearing. Do I have a second?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MS. ELLIS:

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

(Public Hearing on) IR 1000-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to increase awareness of dry cleaning chemical use (Hahan). I don't have -- all right, I have several cards, I'm sorry. First being Kate Winnebeck.

MS. WINNEBECK:

Can everybody hear me? Go ahead?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MS. WINNEBECK:

I am Kate Winnebeck, Senior Environmental Health & Safety Specialist at the New York State Pollution Prevention Institute, or P2i. P2i is dedicated to helping New York State residents and businesses find implementable and cost effective sustainability solutions. Through the P2i's Professional Wet Cleaning Program, we've worked with cleaners across the State, including all fabric cleaners in Farmington, to reduce the use of toxic PERC and increase the use of professional wet cleaning in the State garment cleaning industry. As you may know, PERC is classified by the International Agency for Research on Cancer as Group 2A, probably carcinogenic to humans and is also a suspected developmental, gastrointestinal, kidney, reproductive, respiratory and skin or sense organ toxicants.

Professional wet cleaning is an environmentally preferable alternative to dry cleaning that uses water and biodegradable detergents to clean garments labeled *dry clean only*. I have managed the wet cleaning program since its inception in 2009. P2i was provided with a draft version of the legislation last summer and was pleased to see that much of our feedback was incorporated into the current version. Our feedback was based on the six plus years I have worked with this industry speaking with a hundred plus individual cleaners and connecting with dry cleaning experts in other agencies, including the Massachusetts Toxic Use Reduction Institute, the New York State DEC, California's

Non-Toxic Dry Cleaning Incentive Program, the Northeast Waste Management Officials Association and EPA Region II.

In summer of 2015, the P2i surveyed New York consumers to better understand dry cleaning habits and knowledge across the state. We found that consumers lack a basic awareness and understanding of the dry cleaning process as well as the process their own cleaner uses. The majority of respondents, 86%, don't know what solvent or process their cleaner uses for cleaning and only 17% had heard of professional wet cleaning. Based on these results, a key component of P2i's Consumer Outreach Program will be to provide awareness of the hazards associated with cleaning, understanding of dry and wet cleaning processes and options available.

Our survey also found that more than half of respondents are more likely to or definitely would use garment cleaning services more if they are advertised as environmentally friendly, with half of those responding they're willing to pay 10% more for our service advertised as environmentally friendly. These results reinforce the consumer demand for environmentally preferable garment cleaning. Our researchers found that cleaners can successfully convert from PERC dry cleaning to professional wet cleaning resulting in an environmental benefit while increasing profit. Our fabric cleaners converted their operations in September, 2011, and have realized a 12% reduction in operating costs with no loss in customers. Similar results were shown in Manhattan and have been shown in Massachusetts and California. Thank you for allowing me to present P2i's important work in this area.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Okay. No questions, that's it. Thank you very much. Karen Miller.

MS. MILLER:

My name is Karen Miller and I represent the Huntington Breast Cancer Action Coalition and Prevention is the Cure, and I'm here in support of IR 1000-2016, a Local Law to increase awareness of dry cleaning chemical use. While I personally recognize the important services provided by dry cleaners in my community, I have been keenly aware of the variety of chemicals used in the process of dry cleaning. When trying to make the best choice of which dry cleaning store I'm going to use, I've been struck with the following marketing terms utilized to attract my business -- *eco-friendly*, *green*, *organic*, and how about *natural*, and realizing those terms were meaningless in helping me to make a decision on which dry cleaner to use.

As an environmental health advocate working for 30 years with a well-recognized grassroots organization, Huntington Breast Cancer Action Coalition, and proud to be a founding board member of the Pollution Prevention Institute -- Kate Winnebeck was previously here -- I know the very first step needed to make the best choice for my family is access to information. But without disclosure, transparency and easy access to know the solvents used in each establishment, how can I or anybody else make a choice? Perchloroethylene, liquid carbon dioxide, liquid silicone, hydrocarbon, Rynex I've seen. This important Local Law will help provide guidance for me and the residents of Suffolk requiring all dry cleaners to disclose the primary solvent used in the process of dry cleaning and develop and require each establishment to display an easy-to-read, color-coded signage. Also, I'm very, very happy about a web page that will be provided to help me and my neighbors know more about each solvent and the process.

All of us here in Suffolk County are already on the map, highly regarded for being a very progressive County with the ability to encourage businesses and customers to work together to reduce toxic chemicals that trigger neurodevelopment disorders, cancer and many other chronic illnesses, to be an educated consumer. What a concept. Please pass IR 1000-2016 into law and continue to perfect -- to protect Suffolk County. Thank you very much.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Ms. Miller. Marisol Maddox.

MS. MADDOX:

Hello. My name is Marisol Maddox, I work with Green Inside and Out Consulting which has been working with Legislator Hahn on this issue. I'm here in support of the legislation.

I guess my number one reason for supporting this is that I feel this legislation would really allow consumers to make more informed decisions. I think that the very loose terms of green and organic can be misleading to people, and I think that that needs to be more clear so that if somebody sees organic, it's not that it's nontoxic, it's that it could be hydrocarbons or something that's not actually that much better than PERC. I think that having this signage in the businesses would make it very clear to consumers that they can make better decisions, and it would not place any undo burden on these businesses since the signage, which would be clear and concise, would be supplied by the County.

PERC is known to be highly toxic, as was mentioned earlier by Kate, and people should be able to avoid it if they want to. Personally, I have a friend who moved to Huntington about a year ago and she had a newborn baby and she lived right next to a dry cleaning facility, and when I was talking with her about this issue, she brought up the fact that she was concerned about if her baby is possibly inhaling some of these chemicals, and I couldn't really tell her with any confidence that he was probably okay. And so I think that it needs to be easier for people to figure out what chemicals they are being exposed to so that they can try to limit it. And so that's, I think, a pretty important part of this legislation. Thank you so much.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Okay, that's all the cards that I have. Is there anyone else that would like to speak on IR 1000? Please come forward. Okay, seeing none.

LEG. HAHN:

Motion to close.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to close by Legislator Hahn. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen. *(Amended Vote: Seventeen - Not Present: Legislator Spencer).*

P.O. GREGORY:

(Public hearing on) IR 1027-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to clarify affordable housing requirements at developments connecting to a County sewer district (Calarco). I don't have any cards for this public hearing. Is there anyone that would like to speak on this matter? Please come forward. Okay. Legislator Calarco?

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion to close.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to close IR 1027. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Stern & Spencer).

P.O. GREGORY:

(Public Hearing on) IR 1179-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to enact a Campaign Finance Reform Act to limit campaign contributions from County Contractors and Public Employee Unions (Trotta). I don't have any cards on this public hearing. Is there anyone that would like to speak on it? Please come forward. Seeing none --

LEG. TROTTA:

Resource one more time.

P.O. GREGORY:

Resource? *(Laughter)*.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to resource by -- motion to recess by Legislator Trotta. Second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen *(Amended Vote: Seventeen - Not Present: Legislator Spencer)*.

P.O. GREGORY:

(Public Hearing on) IR 1252-16 - Calling for a public hearing for the purpose of increasing and improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 14 – Parkland (CP 8151) (County Executive). I don't have any cards for this public hearing. Is there anyone that would like to speak on it? Please come forward. Okay, I'll make a motion to close.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Spencer).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***IR 1309-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to limit nitrogen content in lawn fertilizers (Lindsay).*** I have some cards, the first being Skip Wade.

MR. WADE:

Good afternoon. I'm here on behalf of people that don't speak and that's my grandchildren. And I'm a golf course superintendent and I've been golf course superintendent at Cherry Valley in Garden City for many years, 15 years. And I reduced my nitrogen load from four pounds of nitrogen down to a half of pound, and then when I left that place I went to Cantiague Park and I reduced my pesticides -- I mean my fertilizers as far as using no fertilizer on the fairways, using organic fertilizer on the greens and reducing all the chemicals, too.

I am for this bill because I know I can do it because I have done it, and I can teach anybody how to do it. I want to be able to educate people. I can take your parks, I can take your golf courses, give me an opportunity to make that happen and I can make it a good place for Suffolk County. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Thanks, Skip. Good to see you. And Mr. Charles Clampett. There he is.

MR. CLAMPETT:

I don't like the nitrogen in the ground and I don't understand why the County doesn't use Round-Up on the County properties. I was told that they don't use it; am I right or wrong? And we should get rid of Monsanto Corporation, that's the culprit right there. Just look into Monsanto Corporation, the GMOs; we shouldn't even be using that at all. Thank you.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. I don't have any more cards on this public hearing. Is there anyone else that would like to speak on it? Please come forward. Okay. Legislator Lindsay?

LEG. LINDSAY:

I would like to make a motion to recess. We've made some revisions to the bill after meeting with industry experts and all interested stakeholders and I just want to get one more cycle, we'll probably release it next cycle. So if we could -- I make a motion to recess, please.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

(Public Hearing on) IR 1310-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to regulate pet grooming businesses operating in Suffolk County ("Ginger's Law")(Calarco). I have one card, Laura Hughes. Are you here, Laura? Laura Hughes? Oh, there you are.

MS. HUGHES:

Hi. Good afternoon, Legislators. My name is Laura Hughes. I would like to speak again on Resolution 1310, Ginger's Law. Back in 2012, I had to watch my dogs become severely ill. Then I had to listen to the groomer deny, deny, deny, then ignore me, ignore me, ignore me. Then I had to listen to local agencies tell me no one had jurisdiction to help me with my situation; not as a pet owner, not as a consumer. I regret that day very much, but my goal is to make sure other dogs and their families will not have to experience such this. So here today is the Honorable Robert Calarco giving my Ginger and giving my Gizmo a voice, and a voice for all the other dogs of Suffolk County with his resolution. I am very grateful and very proud of his efforts.

Last time I spoke, Legislator Trotta had asked me what would change if this bill would become law. I would like to address that question one more time, if I may, because it's a really good question. Pet groomers are a business that assume the care, custody or control of the personal property of others. The animal left in their care are considered the personal property of another. This resolution will give the ability to commence accountability and oversight which will help protect animals and consumers as well. Groomers will be held to safety standards and be accountable for their negligent and unscrupulous actions. This resolution will not allow groomers to ignore their customers when something has gone wrong. The Consumer Affairs will now have jurisdiction over pet grooming businesses.

Pet grooming is a commercial service business and if this bill is passed, they will have come to comply like many other businesses operating to the public today. As it is right now, when something goes wrong, the pet owners can only rely on the groomer's ethics and their answerability. This bill will add integrity to their industry also. Thank you again, and please pass Resolution 1310. It's a win/win; protecting animals and protecting consumers. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Laura. Is there anyone else that would like to speak on this matter? Yes, I see a hand.

MS. DES GAINES:

I did drop off a card. Sorry if they didn't bring it up. Good afternoon, Members of the Legislature. It's my privilege and honor to be here today to speak on behalf of Ginger's Law, Resolution 1310. I am highly supportive of this bill. Basically, this regulation will help avoid unscrupulous, money-hungry pet groomers who don't have the concern or care for the safety. This will legitimize their business and it will just help with safety issues, as outlined in the resolution. They're all wonderful.

I find it funny that there's a requirement for cosmetology licenses for hair salons, but there's never been any thought to having pets have that same standard, when we're just asking for registration which will help make them more accountable, we'll know who the owners are. Should there be an incident of negligence, we can have some recourse to know who the owners are of the business, and that would be a tremendous help for the grieving, as Ginger's law shows the grief that comes about when terrible things happen.

So I thank Legislator Calarco for his fine work. This resolution and the amendments are phenomenal, will really, really help so, so much and it's just so important. Again, let's let Suffolk County be the leader; we've done it before and we can do it again. So thank you all. Have a wonderful day.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Ma'am. Okay. Anyone else? Okay. Not seeing any hands or anyone else --

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion to close.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to close IR 1310. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

(Public Hearing on) IR 1322-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to further incentivize the creation of affordable housing and to clarify requirements for residential developments connecting to a sewer district (Calarco). I have one card, Mitch Pally.

MR. PALLY:

Good afternoon. My name is Mitch Pally from the Long Island Builders Institute, and I am also today testifying on behalf of Marianne Garvin from the Community Development Corporation of Long Island who is at a conference in Atlanta and asked me to also testify on her behalf in support of this legislation.

General Meeting - May 10, 2016

Very rarely can a piece of legislation say that it will have both economic development and environmental benefit if it's approved by the County Legislature. Resolution 1322 relating to County sewer connections for affordable housing is just such a bill.

First, because of the many financial and zoning issues involved, it is becoming more and more difficult for many developments to meet the 20% affordable housing requirement for a County sewer connection. This forces the developer not to connect to the County sewer system, but to engage in other activities to take care of their septic flows, none of which are as environmentally beneficial as the County connection. By reducing the requirement to 15%, we are very confident that more and more projects will be able to connect to the County sewer system, thus providing significant environmental benefits to the County and all of its residents, especially at a time when water quality issues are so paramount.

Second, by reducing the connection fees for affordable units, more and more affordable units will be built as part of the development projects, thus helping the County and our towns to meet the ever increasing need for affordable housing in our communities. Thus, this legislation by itself will enable Suffolk County to meet two of its very important goals of the recently enacted Suffolk County Master Plan which was approved unanimously by this Legislature, the reduction of nitrogen and other pollutants going into our groundwater and the development of additional affordable housing units. We are hopeful all of you will agree and enact this measure into law. Thank you very much.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Mitch. There is a question Legislator Krupski has for you.

MR. PALLY:

Yes, sir.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Good afternoon.

MR. PALLY:

Good afternoon, sir.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So you mentioned the 15% and that -- in the legislation under the -- this is a sliding scale for percentage of development units that are affordable and the reduction in the fees.

MR. PALLY:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I mean, how big of an incentive is that? I mean, right now it's a 20% requirement that this is to be affordable. If you made it 15%, I mean, are you able to quantify who would want to hook up and who wouldn't?

MR. PALLY:

Well, we've gone back over the last number of years when the 20% requirement has been in existence, and it is our understanding there's only been eight projects in the County over that entire period of time that has been able to meet the 20% standard and therefore to be able to connect. We have a number of projects that are ongoing at the moment that may not --

(Beeper Sounded)

Do I continue?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes, please.

MR. PALLY:

Oh, sorry. Okay. (*Laughter*). That may not or may not be able to meet the 20% standard. Because financing is becoming more and more difficult, that issue of how -- what you have to do for your septic is more and more of an important part of the situation. So we believe, and there are a number of projects out there that at 15% we believe we will be able to connect to the County sewer system, that it will be financially feasible for them to do so, thus providing the benefit, the environmental benefit of being able to connect, because we all agree that connecting to the sewer system is the best way to go.

The sliding scale that is also part of this legislation is very important because we believe it will incentivize more and more developers to include numbers above 15%, or 20 depending upon which municipality you happen to be in, because the reduction in connection cost is an integral part of the financing necessary. There are a variety of other fees that one has to pay, we believe that this will incentivize builders to increase the number of affordable units in their projects, and as a result of that it meets our goal and your goal of providing more affordable units throughout Suffolk County. That's why we've worked very closely with Legislator Calarco to try to come up with numbers that make sense and will incentivize and we believe we are in the process of doing so.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

What do you think about -- would it also be easier for people to build affordables if they're able to move them off-site from the project, or buy out and put that into -- I mean, right now the County -- we spend a lot of money subsidizing affordable housing, right?

MR. PALLY:

Correct.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And that's what -- and I understand the purpose of this bill is to have the private market provide some affordable housing, right?

MR. PALLY:

That's correct.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So we wouldn't have to subsidize so much. So if you -- if the County -- what do you think about a buyout provision? Instead of building the affordables and buying it out, the County then would not have to borrow money to subsidize affordables.

MR. PALLY:

We understand that issue and, you know, that issue and the issue of whether you're building the units on-site or some other site.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Right.

MR. PALLY:

Obviously, from our perspective, the more flexibility a developer has the better; I'm not going to argue that point. However, we are in the business of building units for people to go into, that's what

we want to do. And obviously the market rate units subsidize the affordable units, because the cost of the unit is the same.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Right.

MR. PALLY:

It's just a question of the income levels of the person being able to going into it and, therefore, the price you are able to charge.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Well, the cost to build doesn't have to be the same.

MR. PALLY:

Well, it is -- in most cases it is the same to the large degree, because you want to have -- most of the successful projects, unless it's a 100% affordable project, which there are some; we're not arguing that point, and those are successful. In many cases where you're meeting the 10, 15, 20% requirement, or 15 which you hopefully will meet here, you want to integrate those units into the project. You don't want to have a market rate building and an affordable building; you want to have the affordable units within the context of the project itself, so your cost of developing any individual unit is basically the same. You may have different amenities on the inside depending on the pricing range, but those don't tend to be the major factor in the building. The factor is the building of the unit itself. What type of, you know, floor I put in or whatever, those type of amenities, those tend to be a small percentage of the total cost.

The main factor of the cost is the development of the building itself, the sewage treatment connection or the septic system that goes with it and all the other things you have to do, the roadway and everything else that you have to put in. So, you know, we understand the flexibility issue. What we're trying to do with Legislator Calarco is encourage and make it more financially feasible for our members and our builders to connect to the County sewer system, which we all agree is the best from an environmental standpoint, and to build more affordable units which we all agree is a goal of Suffolk County and our personnel. So we think within the structure of what we can do, this bill will do both.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

MR. PALLY:

My pleasure.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Thank you. Hey, Mitch. How are you?

MR. PALLY:

Good afternoon. How are you, sir?

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Good, thanks. I have a question. I agree with you about the 15%, I think any incentive we can make for our developers to hook up to the sewer system, I think it's great. My concern is kind of on the local government side, as Legislator Krupski brought up. My concern is impinging on the zoning

authority of the local municipalities --

MR. PALLY:

Right.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

-- who may think that it's a better idea to put these units here and then the other ones somewhere else. You know, for instance, you can have a situation where you have a waterfront community where a lot of -- I know you talked about the construction and things like that and a lot of the cost, but a lot of it, you know, is land cost.

MR. PALLY:

Sure.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

And the land that maybe -- you know, across the highway, away from the water may be less expensive and give the ability for them to be able to meet that goal, or maybe even 20% by putting that development in a different location with less cost. So -- and we think, or at least I do, I think that the local municipalities are the best ones to determine whether or not that should be the case. And so I agree about the 15%, but I disagree about mandating that it has to be on-site because we're taking away the zoning authority.

MR. PALLY:

Right. We're not -- this bill does not do that. This bill does not change County law in any way, shape or form. This bill -- in regard to where it has to be. If this County Legislature believes it wants to provide opportunities on-site and off-site, I leave that to you. The bill we're working off of, 1322, does not do that; 1322 keeps the current law in effect with regard to having to be on-site. You know, we're not changing that issue in this regard. The other bill that was called before may have that effect, but I'm not here on that bill. What you do on that bill is up to you. 1322 is the one we're concerned about.

You do have the -- the problem with on or off-site, there are a variety of issues relating to on or off-site. Some of them are economic, some of them are demographic, some of them are racial, some of them are all the factors that come into play when we try to site affordable housing in this County or on Long Island as a whole. So I don't want -- you know, it was our goal not to get into that issue. We may refocus ourselves on that issue, but, you know, the local municipality, the town or the village which does the zoning, has a variety of constituencies it is answering to just like you do in this context. And so that's why we did not want to get into that issue in relation to this bill itself.

The County bill, County law requires the 20%, or what we would hope would be the 15% to be on-site. If that's what the County law requires, we will do that. If the County Legislature, in its wisdom, decides that it wants to change that and provide more flexibility, that's your issue on a separate bill, we hope. We don't want to not have this bill passed because of that issue.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

I think, and maybe one of us isn't sure. I think that this bill clarifies the fact that it needs to be on-site; is that correct, Rob?

D.P.O. CALARCO:

No, it does, Mitch. There is a provision in here, and I can appreciate -- and this is why I was trying to work up the ways of making it more cost effective for the developers to do the project. Because as we all know, we had a debate about on and off sites with a resolution that would given a pass on

the on-sites, this would clarify that it should be on-site which was part of the debate before.

MR. PALLY:

Right, we understand. But that's current law now.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

I think the law is --

MR. PALLY:

Unclear?

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Unclear. There was a prior resolution that would have made it clear on could it be off-site.

MR. PALLY:

Right.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

That resolution failed and so this is an effort to clarify that at the same time of meeting the concerns. When we had talked a few times, part of the concern, if I remember correctly, it wasn't necessarily the towns didn't want you to have the affordable housing components, they just didn't necessarily give you the density that made the affordable housing component cost effective for the developer. Is that about accurate?

MR. PALLY:

There's no question about that, and that's one of the benefits of connecting to the County sewer system, because if you connect to the system, it has always been our evidence that you get increased density because of that because you're connecting to a sewer system, therefore you eliminate the issue of how big a sewer septic system has to be or a sewage treatment plant. We're not building any of those, we're just connecting directly to the County sewer system, therefore in many of those cases where that has happened we've been able to get increased density. And when you get increased density, you get more affordable units as a percentage. Fifteen percent of a hundred is more than 15% of 50, if you understand the science. So that's what we're trying to get.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

It makes it more cost effective for the developer to actually do that.

MR. PALLY:

No question about that, making it more cost effective.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

So we're not impinging on the Town's ability to say, *We don't want you to have ten per acre, you know, just for an example, We think the community's character is more appropriate to have seven per acre.* And seven per acre getting 20% of affordable isn't necessarily cost effective for the developer which causes them to go in different routes. This would make it more of a cost effective mechanism for them to get to it, either because they're going only to 15% which is -- remember, State law now says they must do 10% for any project that's over, what, I think five units?

MR. PALLY:

Over five units, that's correct.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

So there's already a requirement by State law that they go to 10%. So while this is saying it's for our connection, you have to give us at least 5% more. And then if you want to go above 5% more, this is really where it gets into what works right for the developer and the municipality, then you could start getting more economic benefit in terms of reduction in key fees for giving us more affordable housing. But we have to have, you know -- we have to give a get for our give, and that's in essence the way it would work without actually having to put up money, which we do for the Affordable Housing Program. But at the end of the day, all projects have to go through the towns and the villages, whoever the appropriate municipality is, and they have to approve the concept of the project.

MR. PALLY:

Right.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

A town and a village cannot -- and we've seen this actually battled in court and won over and over again in many municipalities. A town and a village cannot say to a developer, *You are not allowed to build affordable housing*. They actually can't do that. That's been ruled in the courts a number of times. I think Glen Cove, Oyster Bay, a number of towns in Nassau County have been sued and successfully sued over those kind of policies. So we know that they cannot just say, *You can't build affordable housing*. The developer has the right to build that housing if he so chooses to make it at that price point, that's his decision to make. What we're doing is helping make it financial viable for them.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Right. And we're not debating the bill, but then you're forcing the municipalities to increase density in those areas, where I would rather say, *I'll put these here and put the other ones over there*.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

They do not have to increase density. The towns and the villages could put whatever density they want. The point of the bill -- the point of the 20% conversion to connect to the County's treatment systems was always to help create more affordable housing. But if the towns are saying that the density doesn't work at 10, which is what makes the 20% connection fee -- 20% affordability viable for the developer, then we have a situation where it doesn't make sense for the developer to connect to the sewers, which is bad for the environment, but also then doesn't give us our affordability units out of those, and that makes sense. Like, listen, there's times where it doesn't make sense to build ten units per acre because it doesn't fit the character of the community, that's something that the towns and villages have every right and responsibility to protect. But this gives the developer, more flexibility in connecting to our system to meet whatever it is, the density is that the towns and villages feel they need to have.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

I agree with the 15%, but I disagree about being able to separate. I think the towns and villages should decide how to do that, but that's for when we talk about the bill, so.

MR. PALLY:

And I just want to raise two points. This bill does not in any way infringe upon a town or a village's ability to zone property and provide density. We don't come to the County until we know how many units we're going to get from the town or the village.

The second thing -- and I would say, listen, we all love flexibility. The most successful projects on Long Island which include affordable housing as part of a larger development, you can't tell the difference between the affordable unit and the market rate unit; you can't tell the difference from

the outside. We don't want to be able to show the difference, we don't think anybody else wants to be able to see the difference. When you go down the road and you see a project on almost every multi-family project on Long Island, a percentage of those units are affordable and I will bet you you can't tell from the outside. And that's the goal, because nobody should be told, you have to live in affordable units or not, or your unit is going to be less than somebody else's unit from the outside. Obviously there may be issues on the inside with various granite tabletops and all that kind of stuff, I leave that, you know, to people doing that and what everybody is paying. But the goal is -- to us, in many cases, inclusionary means inclusionary. It's in the project, that to us is the best way to build it, because that way, in our perspective, nobody can point to that project and say, *That's an affordable project*, or *That's an affordable unit*. We would prefer nobody be able to do that, and that's why this bill is so important to us.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Hi, Mitch. How are you?

MR. PALLY:

Good. How are you, sir?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Good. Going from 20 to 15% I think makes sense, okay. I don't really take issue with that. If it's going to help to, actually in the long run, create more units by lowering the threshold --

MR. PALLY:

Yep.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- by 5%, I think that makes sense. It just makes it more cost effective for the builder --

MR. PALLY:

Right.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- which in turn will get us more affordable units. I also don't have an issue with the affordable units being mandated to be on-site. I think, as you just mentioned, the most successful projects are those where you are integrating both types of units, market rate and affordable. And I don't really see that as impinging on any zoning authority, frankly, because towns can still make whatever decision they want to make.

MR. PALLY:

That's correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah.

MR. PALLY:

And they're still subject to State law on the matter, so.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So my question to you is more about the sliding scale. You had mentioned a statistic earlier. Did you take a look at how many projects, say over the last couple of years, would have fit into these

categories and what the savings would have been?

MR. PALLY:

Well --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Were you citing a statistic?

MR. PALLY:

I did not cite that statistic. What I did cite was that the number of projects that had been able to meet the 20% criteria.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MR. PALLY:

Which was significantly limited for a variety of reasons, many of which are cost --

LEG. D'AMARO:

So they wound up not hooking up.

MR. PALLY:

So they wound up not hooking up and, therefore -- and then in some cases we didn't get any affordable units --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MR. PALLY:

-- depending upon the time period. In some cases we only got the State requirement where the State requirement was the minimum in that context. So we believe very strongly that the number of affordable units in a variety of different places will be increased as a result of this.

In addition, you know, as you know, each affordable unit is subsidized to some degree by somebody. It's either the County and sometimes where you have County programs, it's the State sometimes where there are State programs, in other places it's the market rate units which subsidize the affordable units. That's basically what we're doing here. By helping us to enable to reduce the connection fees by some sliding scale, we believe we'll be able to reduce the costs of those units and therefore increase the number of units that we build.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, that's where I have some issue. First --

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Legislator D'Amaro, just for the point of clarification. So I have had a few conversations with the Administration on this particular bill and we are working on the sliding scale. In fact, I know I spoke to Mitch earlier in the week about -- or late last week, I guess, about a few amendments, so I will be recessing this bill in order to work the sliding scale a little bit more to refine the numbers.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. So that is where I have some issues --

MR. PALLY:

I understand.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- with the scale, because I believe it's the sewer districts that benefit from the connection fee.

MR. PALLY:

Well, in some regard. Our belief is that the number of units that are going to be built are going to substantially increase the number of sewer connections, therefore increase their fees.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I don't know. When you're looking at numbers like 60 and 70% rollback, I don't know that that's really the case. So what I would rather do is work not -- hypothetically, and I'd rather maybe go back in the last five years and apply this bill to all the projects and see what the impact would have been.

MR. PALLY:

We can do that.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah.

MR. PALLY:

I mean, most of those projects have been built by my members, obviously, and I can find that out.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And I'm not saying that the County wouldn't be willing to subsidize to some -- whatever extent.

MR. PALLY:

I understand.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But when we get to, you know, 30% is a 60% reduction of connection fee, that's substantial. That's substantial.

MR. PALLY:

And that helps because by reducing the cost of the unit and the overall cost of the project, it enables you to build more in regard --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. Well, that's my other issue, because there's nothing here that mandates that the cost savings be passed on in that form.

MR. PALLY:

Well, what the cost savings are going to do --

LEG. D'AMARO:

I understand the market place would intervene.

MR. PALLY:

Right.

LEG. D'AMARO:

However, again, when you're looking at these numbers, 60, 70, 80% reduction, there's no real guarantee other than the free market that these cost savings or reduction in connection fee will actually manifest as a cost savings to an ultimate home buyer. So, you know, there's some issues in there for me.

MR. PALLY:

Well, we are restricted -- you know, we are restricted now by what you can sell the unit for or rent a unit, depending on whether it's --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, but this would apply to the whole development.

MR. PALLY:

Right, that's what I'm saying.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay.

MR. PALLY:

By reducing the cost of the development totally, it will actually reduce the cost to everybody who was living there in that regard.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Maybe.

MR. PALLY:

Well --

LEG. D'AMARO:

I'm just making my point.

MR. PALLY:

I understand. I understand.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MR. PALLY:

From a developer's standpoint, if the cost of development is five million versus five and-a-half-million, and I'm just picking numbers, obviously.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MR. PALLY:

Your financing is going to be less --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MR. PALLY:

-- because you only have to finance five million as opposed to five and-a-half million. When you do that, obviously, the cost of each unit goes down, depending on the density which is a separate issue, and, therefore what you can sell them or rent them for is going to go down. You're not going to rent them or sell them for a number you can't fill them for.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Uh-huh.

MR. PALLY:

The goal is to put people in the unit because if you don't put people in the unit, it doesn't matter what the number was, you don't make any money and people don't do that.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I agree with you. I agree with you except --

MR. PALLY:

Our goal is to reduce those costs.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I agree with you except that, again, when you get into substantial decrease or subsidy, there's some cushion there, even if you pass on some of that savings. So again, rather than us talk --

MR. PALLY:

I understand.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Speaking hypothetically, what would have been the impact had we put this in place? I would like to know not only the impact to the building community, which would be favorable, but I want to know to what extent. And then also I'd want to know what's the impact to the sewer districts. I mean --

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Sure. No, we'll -- as I said, we're reworking the ratios right now, so it's certainly something I'll take account of and look at. Obviously these are key monies, so these are not the rate that the unit is going to be paying going forward. All the units would be paying their sewer district use fees or taxes, what have you, but this is just that key money connection.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah. Again, my point, Mitch, is that I think having a sliding scale, I think that having a 15% threshold should incentivize more workforce housing.

MR. PALLY:

Yes. I hope so.

LEG. D'AMARO:

That's good. But I want to just get a real sense of what the real impact is in terms of dollars and cents.

MR. PALLY:

I understand.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Thank you.

MR. PALLY:

We will do that.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thanks.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So Mitch, you said earlier that the builders would like the flexibility of being able to move affordable units off-site.

MR. PALLY:

Well, I'm sure -- you know, we like flexibility, okay, there's no question about it. The question is, you know, we work with the towns and villages which are our zoning -- I was going to use the word partners, I guess that's true sometimes and not partners other times, depending upon the project, to make it happen. Because, you know, without their consent --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Right.

MR. PALLY:

You know, the connection could be zero.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Right.

MR. PALLY:

It doesn't matter, because the County, because of land use issues, is not going to force a municipality to build something that it doesn't want to have built.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Right.

MR. PALLY:

In a location it doesn't want to have built in that regard.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

But would you be comfortable with taking that sentence out? Right now it's sort of -- it's nebulous as far as whether the units could be moved off-site.

MR. PALLY:

Right.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

We did vote last year to approve a project where the units were moved off-site.

MR. PALLY:

I know that, yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And if it works, like you said, if you can make the municipality your partner and say maybe they want to redevelop a blighted area or an area near transit or something, and they want to incentivize it with a builder to say, *Put the affordables here, we'd love to have that development here.*

MR. PALLY:

Right.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Would you be comfortable with this legislation if that sentence were removed?

MR. PALLY:

I would be comfortable if it was in separate legislation. I mean, I want to pass -- you know, the 15% on the sliding scale is very important to us. I don't want to cloud -- you know, the more issues you cloud into the bill, the more issues become contentious in that regard. We would prefer obviously that we do what we need to do.

We understand, you know, there may be a different interpretation; maybe there are 18 different interpretations of the other sentence, okay. You know, we've discussed that internally. It depends to a large degree on the municipality, okay. Some municipalities very much want you on-site and we -- we want to be on site. It is less expensive for us to build the units on-site than it is off-site, because you're already there, you're already building. Whether I build 200 units or 250 units, I already have to build my road, I have to build everything else that goes along with it, I have to get my sewer connection or my sewage treatment plant, whatever it is.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Sure.

MR. PALLY:

We would prefer to build on-site, okay; it's better for us to do so. I'm not saying whether it's better for anybody else. You asked the question of the builders; for the builder it's better and easier to do it on-site. What requirements the County or the town may have is obviously separate issues. Obviously, as you can understand, when we go to the towns, depending on the town, that is to some degree a negotiating situation, they may require something else. State law, as you know, allows you to buy out, okay. I'm not thrilled with that, because to us, building the unit and putting a family in it is more important than writing a check, because you never know what happens to the check. I'm not saying anything -- you never know if it actually builds something. We want to build something so a family lives in that unit, and from our perspective, it is obviously easier to do it on-site. But each municipality is different. You know, if you ask me the views of ten towns, each town might have a different view, or a somewhat different view. That's why, you know, when we were talking to the Legislator about these two issues, to us these were the two most important issues. I'm not arguing that other issue is not important, to us it's not as important as these two. And I don't want to threaten the opportunity to get these two by that issue.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Thank you, Mitch.

MR. PALLY:

Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Thanks, Mitch.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. I don't have any other cards for IR 1322. Is there anyone else that would like to speak on it? Please come forward.

MR. MOHR:

Good afternoon. Russell Mohr from The Benjamin Companies. We are in support of IR 1322. We actually have a project in front of the Town of Brookhaven right now, and one of the key components is that we are analyzing the financial feasibility with regards to connecting to the sewer district which is about 4,000 linear feet away, versus building on-site sewage treatment plant. It is cost prohibitive with regard to the key monies. And I support everything that Mitch from Long Island Builders has said today with regard to the reduction based on a sliding scale, I understand you're working on those numbers. In addition, reducing it from a 20% requirement to the 15% requirement makes a tremendous difference, and it's over and beyond what we're looking to do with the local level. So we are in support of the bill and thank you very much for your time.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Thank you. Anyone else? Okay. Legislator Calarco?

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion to recess.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to recess by Legislator Calarco. I will second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

(Public Hearing on) IR 1367-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Charter Law to implement one-year rolling debt policy under 5-25-5 Law to mitigate budgetary shortfall)(County Executive). I don't have any cards on this matter. Anyone like to speak on it? Okay. I'll make a motion to close.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

(Public Hearing on) IR 1370-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to further regulate synthetic cannabinoids and synthetic cocaine in Suffolk County (Spencer). I don't have any cards on this public hearing. Is there anyone that would like to speak on it? Please come forward. Okay. Legislator Spencer?

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion to close.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to close by Legislator Spencer.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MS. ELLIS:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

(Public Hearing on) IR 1395-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law suspending the Red Light Camera Program (Trotta). I don't have any cards on this matter -- no, I'm kidding.

(*Laughter*)

I'm just seeing if you're all awake. All right, we have multiple cards. All right. So first up is Kristi Ladowski; and then on deck, Dr. James Vosswinkel

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Vosswinkel.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yeah, there you go. Vosswinkel.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

We're coming up together.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, right, right.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

I'm quick, I'm a surgeon. But we need Power Points to talk; we're doctors. Sorry.

P.O. GREGORY:

You guys have three minutes, though. You realize that.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Oh, I'm quick.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

I'm a surgeon.

LEG. SPENCER:

What kind of surgeon?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Trauma Surgeon at Stony Brook. Good afternoon and thank you for your time. Briefly, we just want to speak from an injury prevention and public health perspective. The problem in Suffolk County is every week there's an average of over a thousand cars involved in a crash, over 300 people come into our emergency departments, 30 are hospitalized and two to three people die. If you look at our statistics, unfortunately we have the highest number of fatalities in New York State; it's a problem we're all dealing with in the medical community. If you look at fatal crashes that occur at intersections, 45% occur there or 65 of 145 from the 2013 data. We do lead, unfortunately, the State once again.

The good news is that most motor vehicle crashes are preventable, with greater than 90% of all crashes involving human error. The problem is crashes don't happen every time someone uses something unsafe. All too often the driver gets away with something, poor judgement or behavior, so they do it again and again. The unsafe behavior becomes a problem, it becomes a habit, it may cause a serious crash. A solution can be if a driver got a ticket or caused a crash every time they did something unsafe, the bad driving habits wouldn't develop.

If you look at the National Highway Traffic & Safety Administration data, what is effective? Speed limits have been shown to be effective as well as automated enforcement. If you look at effectiveness, once again, from the National Highway Traffic & Safety Administration, what do red light cameras do? They decrease the amount of side impact crashes, they decrease the overall crash severity, but they do increase rear-end crashes.

In Suffolk County, in a recent report, red light cameras have shown that the overall accidents have increased by a slim margin. The severe crashes, the T-bone or the right-angle crashes, have decreased by 21%; the rear-end accidents have increased by 42%, and overall, the accidents have decreased by about 4.2%. So from a public health perspective, it's important to minimize severe injury and death.

Right-angle or T-bone impact crashes have that high incidence of severe injury and death that rear impact crashes don't have. When placed appropriately, the data does support that right light -- excuse me, red light cameras can reduce high impact motor vehicle crashes and reduce severe injury and death. Those are some of the references we quoted.

LEG. BROWNING:

That was quick.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right, Legislator Lindsay, then Legislator Hahn. There's questions for you.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Good afternoon, sir.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Over here.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Oh, sorry.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Thanks for coming in today and thanks for your presentation. In general, have you seen an increase in accidents over the last year or two years, three years?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

So I can speak from this perspective. Stony Brook is the lead agency in the County. In New York State, Suffolk County has always led the State in motor vehicle fatalities, it's a bad problem. If you look at the regional data from all our trauma centers, we actually have a better mortality for people that make it into the hospital. So the data concedes that people are dying at the scene, they're just not getting into the hospital. So the most effective thing we can do is to try to decrease that severity of injury in the field and/or get the patients to the hospital quicker. So those are the two points that the medical community in Suffolk County is doing. So overall crashes wouldn't be the data I could really give you, it's more a perspective of what's coming in and how we're doing treating them and the overall statistical data on deaths.

MS. LADOWSKI:

But I can add to that. With these same reports, if you look at the 2010 to 2014 data, those fatal car crashes that occurred at intersections, they went from about 50% in 2010 and now they're down to about a little under 40% in the 2014 data. So they have been declining at the intersections.

LEG. LINDSAY:

What about the overall number of accidents?

MS. LADOWSKI:

They've been slightly going down as well, but sometimes they go down, sometimes they go up. So one year they go up, one year they go down. So 2015 they're, unfortunately, expected that they went up and the 2014 data went down, so it's kind of like every year it's up and down.

LEG. LINDSAY:

In your research, do you look at cause of the accident? Of these accidents?

MS. LADOWSKI:

They have all of that outlaid in these same reports that you can access, so it breaks it down by was it at an intersection, was there alcohol involved, was there speed involved? They have all of that.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yeah, I've seen the data and that's what I was trying to lead to. You know, my research and what I found is that there is a huge increase in the number of inattentiveness on behalf of drivers -- texting, using your phone, Facebook, what have you -- while driving and that has led to some of the behavior that you talked about that these habits have developed has led to some of these more severe accidents where you're not even hitting the brake because you're not looking at the road while you're driving.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Correct. The other issue is we have been looking at blood alcohol content and substance abuse; if you look at our severely injured patients, over 50% incidents. So in addition to inattentiveness, it's also impaired driving.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you. I'm going to work into making this into a question, but I very much appreciate your presentation because it's been frustrating sitting here listening to folks talk. I was present, yet not a Legislator, when the original red light camera -- I worked here as an Aide when the original red light camera legislation was passed, and we did discuss the expectation that the rear-end collisions would go up. That was known, it was expected. It was a choice because we wanted to decrease the T-bones for exactly the reason that you outlined. It also was said that the first year might be the worst as people, you know, didn't know how to handle the red light cameras, but the injuries wouldn't be there the way they are with a T-bone. I personally had a college roommate who -- whose father was comatose for 15 years and then died eventually from his injuries from a red light runner T-bone crash. My roommate was also injured in that accident; she was on the other side, not the side of the T-bone. But they're deadly types of accidents. And you know, I have been in rear-end collisions and they're unfortunate, but they don't have that kind of injury that a T-bone does. So the Legislature weighed all of that and made the choice to decrease the severe injury and death related types of crashes and everything you laid out you did it in a spectacular way and so thank you.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Thank you.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

I'm still waiting for the question, Legislator Hahn.

*(*Laughter*)*

D.P.O. CALARCO:

She tried.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

You said something about impaired drivers.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Yes, sir.

LEG. TROTТА:

What percentage are impaired drivers?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

I can only speak to the Stony Brook data, because every center does it differently. We're looking at probably about 50, 60% of our severe --

LEG. TROTТА:

So 50 or 60% who have come in with serious injuries are impaired drivers; is that a fair --

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

At Stony Brook.

LEG. TROTТА:

Okay. And you mentioned something about distracted drivers.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Correct.

LEG. TROTТА:

And what percentage was that, do you think?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

That we can't tell you.

MS. LADOWKSI:

We didn't necessarily comment on that, and that's something harder for the data to show

LEG. TROTТА:

I am no fan of these cameras. And having been a cop for 25 years, in the trauma center I was the sector car operator, so I'm familiar with that. I've never seen -- like if someone's going to run through a red light, if they're impaired or they're texting, they don't care whether there's a camera there or not, they're going to do that.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

If they do it intentionally, correct -- or unintentionally.

LEG. TROTТА:

Yeah, no one's going to do it intentionally.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Correct.

LEG. TROTТА:

But if someone's drunk or if someone's texting, they don't care if there's a camera there. They're making a mistake, they've made a conscious decision to make a mistake. So you talk about the decrease in right-angle injuries and accidents, but you have no knowledge that those were severe injuries or they were -- what they are. Those reports don't say anything about the severity of the injuries.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Looking at -- so, to take it a step backwards. Impaired driving doesn't necessarily just cause accidents at intersections, it doesn't necessarily cause -- or distracted driving doesn't, okay. A pedestrian is struck off the road --

LEG. TROTТА:

I'm not talking about that. I'm talking about --

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

No, but back to my point. Most of this data is coming from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. They try to tease out whether it's distracted or not, and they're looking at purely mechanism at intersections. They're purely assuming that at all intersections, with red lights and without red lights, that they're comparing them between with red light cameras, there are less T-bone accidents at intersections. Now, you have to assume that without a red light camera, you're also having distracted driving or impaired driving. So they're trying to tease out this intersection versus that intersection to make it an independent variable.

LEG. TROTТА:

What do you think of an intersection where they put the cameras up and the accidents with injuries increased by a hundred percent?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Accidents with injuries could, but what is the severity of the injury and what is the death at that intersection?

LEG. TROTТА:

But we had one where there was none with injuries or two over a year period and it went up to let's say 15 or 20, so.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

I don't believe you can look at one intersection. You have to look at everything else, and I did carefully say *when properly placed*. Maybe that's not the right intersection to have that camera at. I'm not a fan -- first of all, unfortunately, and I shouldn't admit it, but I've gotten tickets from red light cameras, okay. I'm not necessarily a fan of having every intersection patrolled. What we have to do from a public health perspective is an epidemiological point of view, which intersections would benefit the most, you put the red light camera in there; did you make a change.

LEG. TROTТА:

Have you ever had -- as a surgeon there, when you came in, did you say, *Was there a red light camera there?*

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

No.

LEG. TROTТА:

So you have no independent knowledge of whether or not you've ever treated anybody --

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Absolutely not, I'm just quoting the data.

LEG. TROTТА:

So you're talking about general -- so you really have no knowledge at all of any accidents that occurred with injuries at a red light camera.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

I would have knowledge, but I didn't do a study independently on my own.

LEG. TROTТА:

You just -- you're coming in here saying about this, but you have no independent knowledge of -- or do you have any independent knowledge of anybody you've ever treated at --

LEG. HAHN:

What is everyone else doing?

LEG. TROTТА:

It goes to whether or not he's credible to sit here and say whether this causes accidents or not.

P.O. GREGORY:

Just ask the question.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

First of all, I'm not pretending to be an expert witness. I am coming in purely quoting the National Highway Safety Administration data. Secondly, I can speak into detail the issues that the medical community is dealing with Suffolk County. In Suffolk County, and any other physician will tell you this, we have the highest amount of motor vehicle fatalities in the State.

LEG. TROTТА:

And we did before we had cameras.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

We did before we had cameras, but if the data purely shows that these do decrease the severity of injury, and you can look at different studies that they potentially do, what is the downside of taking them out?

LEG. TROTТА:

Where did you get that data from?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

All the sites are right there.

LEG. TROTТА:

You said potentially; it doesn't say that.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

It says report --

LEG. TROTТА:

You have data that says the severity of injuries has decreased?

LEG. HAHN:

Yes, he just said that.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Yes.

MS. LADOWSKI:

Yes.

LEG. TROTТА:

Because of all -- where'd you get that from? And in Suffolk County or a general?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

In Suffolk County the data is published; please look on the websites.

LEG. ANKER:

Look at the handout.

LEG. TROTТА:

The severity of the injuries? Was that in the report that --

MS. LADOWSKI:

The 2013 report did not report on it, even though the wording in it said it looked at it, but I don't have access to who analyzed that data.

LEG. TROTTA:

So it didn't say that.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

But we have mechanism that occurred and we know that T-bone accidents have a higher severity of injury.

LEG. TROTTA:

But you don't know that these accidents, you're talking in general.

LEG. HAHN:

Right.

LEG. TROTTA:

You're not talking --

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

I am talking in general.

LEG. TROTTA:

Oh, so let's just get this straight. You're saying a T-bone accident, which could occur at a stop sign, it could occur in a residential neighborhood, it could occur on the Long Island Expressway, someone cutting across, a T-bone accident, spun out and got hit, T-boned.

LEG. HAHN:

And we want to stop them from happening.

LEG. TROTTA:

So it's not necessarily at a red light intersection.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

The described T-bone actions at an intersection is somebody blowing through the light because they --

LEG. TROTTA:

Wait, wait, wait.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

No, no, no, no, no.

LEG. TROTTA:

There doesn't have to be a light there to be a T-bone accident.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

At an intersection, I said T-bone accidents at intersections.

LEG. TROTTA:

Oh.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Not on the highway, not in middle of the road.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yeah, but it could be in a residential neighborhood.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Oh, absolutely, it could be in a industrial neighborhood.

LEG. TROTTA:

You're trying to make the leap that these intersections where the cameras are are reducing T-bone accidents that they're the severe ones; that's a big leap to make. It could be on a country road out east where there's no traffic control device and where someone cuts across. So it could have nothing to do with a red light camera.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

We know that T-bone accidents across the board, at all intersections, have a higher severity of injury than a rear-end accident or even a head-on collision at an intersection. You would agree with that?

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Okay. We also know that red light cameras have been shown to decrease T-bone accidents at intersections.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yeah, but that's apples and oranges.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

How is that apples and oranges?

LEG. TROTTA:

Because let's think about it.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

I'm not here to argue. I'm here to give you my perspective.

LEG. TROTTA:

Let's think about the poor people who were making a U-turn, the four girls who were killed in a limousine where there was no traffic control device.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Correct.

LEG. TROTTA:

Okay?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Awful, horrible.

LEG. TROTTA:

Awful, horrible thing.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Correct.

LEG. TROTТА:

That was a T-bone accident.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Correct.

LEG. TROTТА:

Nothing to do with a light, zero.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Correct.

LEG. TROTТА:

As opposed to an accident at a light on Jericho Turnpike in Commack where someone goes and gets T-boned or where -- just going through the yellow light and -- it's actually impossible to happen because there's a one second delay. So if there's going to be a T-bone accident at a lighted intersection, it's more than someone, *Oh, I'm going to jump the light*, it's either a drunk or someone who's texting or someone who's doing something.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

No, you can't say that. I would say that's apples and oranges, too.

LEG. TROTТА:

Do you know how I can say that?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

No.

LEG. TROTТА:

Because 25 years I handled accidents like that and when there was a car accident --

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Listen, I'm not here to argue with anybody. That's your perspective. Any other questions? *(Laughter)*.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Fleming.

LEG. FLEMING:

Just quickly.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Please.

LEG. FLEMING:

Hi. I don't know if you have an answer for this, but I noted one of your slides said if a driver got a ticket or caused a crash every time they did something unsafe, bad driving habits wouldn't develop. Can I just ask you, following that line of thinking, if this program were to be kept in place exactly as it is we'd expect rear-end collisions to decrease over time?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

I don't think necessarily you can make that statement either.

LEG. FLEMING:

Okay.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

You know, what we're saying is traffic violations are not necessarily -- these aren't bad people, it's not intent. It's bad habits that people get into. Bad habits occur because we don't have consequences. So anything that can be done to break bad habits to stop them from forming is the solution to essentially most traffic human error type of issues.

LEG. FLEMING:

No, but I guess my question is if stopping short at the red light, you got into a rear-end collision, will people learn over time not to stop short at the red light and to take more caution as they're approaching a yellow light?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

I don't know if you could say that, I really don't know.

LEG. FLEMING:

Okay. I appreciate that.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you. I just had a quick question.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Please.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Based on the data that you're looking at and the conclusions from that data that you presented today, severity has gone down, overall has gone down, but there has been an uptick or a substantial uptick in rear-end collisions, right?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Correct. And not to interrupt but, you know, when you quote 3%, 4% up and down --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

I look at that neutral. What we do know is rear-ends have went up and T-bones have went down.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right, and T-bones are generally more severe --

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- than the rear-end.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So using that as your conclusions, what would be the effect of suspending the Red Light Camera Program? What would happen; what would you expect to happen?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

First of all, I think you have to go back to the line of thinking. Have we changed enough bad habits, at least in the short term, that if we suspended the program nothing would happen? Did the red lights have enough effect that people have started to learn to stop at the intersections? Maybe. Maybe behavior has changed and bad habits have started to improve. You would assume potentially over time that those bad habits would reoccur after the cameras disappeared. Maybe not one year, not maybe two years, maybe five to ten years down the road, wherever it may be. So I don't know immediately if you would see much of a change in the data because, remember, it's about bad habits, a quote called "*blowing the light*". Down the road you would assume that the T-bone accidents would go up again, presumptively.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Which are the more severe accidents.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Correct, which have the higher incidents of death and the more severe injuries.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I had another quick question. The comment that you made about Suffolk County having the largest number of automobile accidents in the State?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Fatalities.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Fatal automobile accidents. Does that take into account the different miles of roadway for different counties? Is that an adjusted figure or is that just a number?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

It doesn't have to say per, you know, miles of roadway. And remember, this is also pedestrian struck and everything else. It's not necessarily driver or occupant.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I'm just curious because, you know, it's a big County.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Probably larger than most.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Correct. And personally, out east I think has a multiplicity probably. You know, you have 55 miles an hour on single-lane roads with not necessarily the same traffic assessment. And then the other point which I made is the access to the trauma system is more limited out east.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. My only point was that when you throw out a number, you know, unless it's adjusted to equalize it amongst the comparative counties that you're using, you have to put it in that context, that it's not adjusted. That's what I'm saying. You know, based on population, based on miles of roadway. I mean, that could -- if you have one County that's, you know, a hundred square miles and one that's 500 square miles, I would expect more fatal accidents in the larger County.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Well, exactly. I mean, you could also go from the population perspective; the more population you should potentially have more point.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

The numbers -- I don't want to talk absolutes here. I want to talk that this has always been a continuing trend.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

All the trauma centers in this County are grouping together to really try to deal with this as well as the DOH and the State.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Which is great. And I'm not questioning your figures, I just wanted to know if that was an adjusted number.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Please, no, I don't really want to speak in absolutes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, this bill is asking us to suspend the Red Light Camera Program, Legislator Trotta's bill, and I'm just a little concerned because based on the statistics that you're citing, it seems to me that unless we've substantially changed behavior, we would expect to see more of the severe-type accidents that result in serious injury or fatality.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

With potential timing.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Fine, right, sure.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

You know, obviously with time it would potentially turn back up.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right, right. Okay, thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:

That's your opinion.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Correct; he's asking my opinion.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, I was asking his opinion.

LEG. TROTTA:

Let me ask you this. Overall accidents decreased by 3.1%, that came to 33 accidents.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Neither here or there, correct.

LEG. TROTTA:

My daughter was coming up to a yellow light and she slammed on the brakes and she was rear-ended. There was no camera there.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Okay.

LEG. TROTTA:

Clearly that happened more than 33 times in this County, you know, and there were injuries there. I mean, are you taking that into consideration?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

I'm quoting the data that was published, and this is -- they looked at specifically red light cameras. Do you want to comment more?

MS. LADOWSKI:

No, I'm just -- we're not --

LEG. TROTTA:

Have fatalities gone down since the cameras?

MS. LADOWSKI:

-- bringing in anything that we don't have data to backup and support, so we were just referencing.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Correct.

LEG. TROTTA:

Have fatalities gone down since the cameras came in?

MS. LADOWSKI:

Yes.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

From what to what? Over what period?

MS. LADOWSKI:

They've trended down, they started at -- I think around like the 150 and now they're down to, the latest data was 125.

LEG. TROTTA:

And that's from where; were there red light cameras at these locations?

MS. LADOWSKI:

No, that's something that I would recommend -- whoever has the data --

LEG. TROTTA:

Where are you getting this data from?

MS. LADOWSKI:

It's --

LEG. TROTTA:

From the report?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

SuffolkCounty.ny.gov portals; right here. Please, all the references are written.

LEG. TROTTA:

This?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Yes.

MS. LADOWSKI:

The last page.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

The last page, we quoted all our references.

MS. LADOWSKI:

Everything is accessible through the Suffolk County website, the New York State, the safer.gov -- *safefny.gov* website, and it's --

LEG. TROTTA:

What would you do in a case where the accidents actually increased with injury a hundred percent; do you think those cameras should be shut down?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Potentially, you'd have to look at that intersection and say yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

What if 20 intersections had accidents where they increased more than 50%?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Potentially that intersection -- you'd have to see -- that's where you have to redesign that intersection. If you look at states, Jersey comes to mind, with jughandles. Jughandles where you cannot make left turns have been shown to decrease accidents, period. We are not designed in Suffolk County, in New York State, with a lot of jughandles, that's why a lot of the other states have

those. So there are also roadway modifications that can be done to make intersections less --

LEG. TROTTA:

As a physician --

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Yes, sir.

LEG. TROTTA:

If someone told you there was a 100% increase in accidents once these cameras were put up, wouldn't that rise your concern of, *Hey, we've got to do something here?*

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Correct, but the data doesn't show that.

LEG. TROTTA:

Oh, it does show it. There's many intersections where we're up over 100%.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

I'm talking about the use of red light cameras in generality through the area, not at a specific intersection.

LEG. TROTTA:

Right. I'm talking about specific intersections. There's over 40 --

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Then that intersection needs to be re-evaluated.

LEG. TROTTA:

There's over 40 locations out of the 100 that went up.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Those intersections need to be evaluated.

LEG. TROTTA:

So you would say that those -- would you say that they should be shut off, those 40?

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Those -- I wouldn't just say the camera should be shut off, I should think you would need to redesign the intersection. I would go above that. Why is that intersection there? What is the causative reason? And you take it further. So the red light camera may be contributing, but maybe you better redesign the intersection. Do you need a left-turn lane?

LEG. TROTTA:

A lot of them have left-turn lanes. Okay, thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right.

DR. VOSSWINKEL:

Thank you very much.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Okay, Robert DeVito; then on deck, Allen Ferrari.

MR. DeVITO:

Bob DeVito, I'm the President of the Suffolk Bike Riders Association and Director of the Nassau-Suffolk Bicycle Coalition. I'm here speaking on behalf of cyclists in Suffolk and Nassau, but particularly from Suffolk. We do support the red light camera initiative. I understand what Legislator Trotta has said and he certainly brought up some very good points.

More importantly, it was discussed earlier about distracted drivers, and that's really the basis that I think that we need to address.

*(*Mr. DeVito held up his cell phone*)*

This is the most dangerous tool to have in your car. I cannot tell you how many times on the road personally, either in my car or on my bike, I've seen people not looking at the road, looking at their phone, texting, maybe on You Tube, I have no idea. All I know is we've had a number of incidences over the last eight years of our members and non-members being hit by cars and vehicles. The numbers of vehicle and cyclists accidents resulting in death in New York State is highest in Long Island, it's above the -- the average in New York State is 1.4 people per hundred thousand. So it's not a matter of geography or the amount of people in the state. The bottom line is people are distracted, they don't drive well, they don't pay attention. If the red lights help them become more aware of what they're doing and they put their phones down, then it's a good initiative. In itself, I don't know if it will really save that many lives, but it's certainly something that should be addressed. Thank you very much.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right, thank you. Allen Ferrari; an appropriate name for the subject, I guess. Dr. Dawn Marie Nappi is on deck.

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

MR. FERRARI:

Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Al Ferrari. I'm a retired New York City Highway Patrol Officer. Like Mr. Trotta over there, I served many years out on the road. When I retired in 2006 I was the Fatal Accident Investigator for the County of Queens, so when your family died in car accidents, I was the one who went there. I now work for the Town of Brookhaven. I'm their defensive driving instructor. I teach teenagers, older people everything and we constantly talk about the red light cameras, but most of the people that talk to me about those cameras are the people that get several of those tickets, and they're very angry. But I think, Mr. Trotta, you have to go back and you have to listen to them, because when somebody comes to complain to you about a red light camera, you have to ask them, what's their attitudes and motives.

A younger girl the other day was doing 140 miles an hour on the Long Island Expressway. She's 17-years old. She has no clue, Mr. Trotta, because there's nobody training us anymore. When we were younger our parents taught us how to drive. Our parents taught us when the light turned yellow, you took your foot off the gas and you put it on the brake. It's no longer done that way. The car companies are building cars with so many things inside of them, they're taking everybody's attention away. All of that stuff is contributing to deaths on the highway.

And, Mr. Trotta, you take one light away, just one, and somebody dies at that accident because you didn't like the camera because some of your constituents came and said, you know what, I don't want to pay this, I don't want to pay that, you're the one whose name is going to be on there. When you're done voting and you take these cameras away, it's going to be all over the newspaper, and then everybody is going to drive crazy. Everybody will, because now there's never a chance of being stopped by the camera. That's what you have to say to yourselves. Is it going to stop one person from taking the light? You know what, I'll take that one person. And if you have to pay a fine I'm not worried about you paying a fine. I'm worried about that one person.

Because you know, Mr. Trotta, at three o'clock in the morning when you put your kids to bed and you sit down and you plan your next day, you remember what that was like right, Mr. Trotta, when they called you to go to a house at two o'clock in the morning? And I'm driving around, or somebody like you, and we're looking through these towns in Brookhaven, in Suffolk County, and I've got to knock on the door at three o'clock in the morning. And then the wives wake up and they roll over and see their husbands are not there or they walk to the front door and see their daughter or son still isn't in the bedroom and they walk to the front door, Mr. Trotta, and me or you are standing there in uniform? Mr. and Mrs., quickly, get in my car. I've got to take to you see Dr. Voss because somebody just truly didn't give a damn and blew through that light, Mr. Trotta. Because if you take them away, increase in accidents -- and you keep calling them T-bones. They're side impact injuries. They're side impact collisions. They're fatalities. There's no way to get around it. Take the lights away and I promise you those accidents will skyrocket, and if you can stand there and tell me they won't, I don't know what data you're looking at. You've been working it your whole life. I don't understand it. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Mr. Ferrari. There are two questions. Legislator Lindsay and Legislator Trotta.

LEG. LINDSAY:

No, you can go.

LEG. TROTТА:

You're delusional.

MR. FERRARI:

You might say that, Mr. Trotta. First of all, I never called you delusional; I don't expect you to talk to me that way. Let's not start off that way.

P.O. GREGORY:

Let's tone it down, let's be civil.

LEG. TROTТА:

I've watched over 100 of these videos.

MR. FERRARI:

What videos are you speaking of?

LEG. TROTТА:

Of the people getting tickets.

MR. FERRARI:

I could give you 100 that would show you exactly the opposite.

LEG. TROTTA:

That person driving 114 -- listen, if a guy runs through a red light and it's anywhere remotely dangerous, God bless them, the camera should give them a ticket, but that's not what we're talking about here.

MR. FERRARI:

That's exactly what you're talking about.

LEG. TROTTA:

No, we're not.

MR. FERRARI:

So tell me what you're talking about.

P.O. GREGORY:

Hold on, hold on.

LEG. TROTTA:

I'm talking about the 85-year old man --

P.O. GREGORY:

Ask your question.

LEG. TROTTA:

-- who comes into my office, who comes in and plays the video for me, where he's never gotten a ticket in his life and he is doing everything perfectly safely. He pulls up next to the thing, the red light -- because by the way, about 95% are right on reds. So he looks the other way, there is clearly no one coming and he makes a right with just not stopping. Those are the ones I'm talking about, and the reality is that's 95% of them. And I resent the fact that you come out and think you're going to intimidate me by telling somebody about this is going to save someone's life. Because quite honestly, if you had the facts correctly and you would watch these, you would know that it's garbage.

P.O. GREGORY:

Question.

MR. FERRARI:

I disagree.

LEG. TROTTA:

It's nothing more than a money grab. Nothing more.

MR. FERRARI:

I disagree.

LEG. TROTTA:

If those cameras are up and they catch someone randomly, well, God bless them, they should get a ticket. I am for that 100%, but in reality, it's the guy who's drunk and who was drinking and you know it.

MR. FERRARI:

I disagree.

P.O. GREGORY:

You have a question?

LEG. TROTТА:

No.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Legislator Lindsay.

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

LEG. LINDSAY:

Good afternoon, sir. Thanks for coming in.

MR. FERRARI:

Thank you.

LEG. LINDSAY:

You know, as an Officer, and now as a Defensive Driving Instructor, can you explain, because we've had a lot of people come in and complain about their right on reds, that they don't have to stop, they can just run through it, or they stop for a half a second and go through it. Who is the most vulnerable in that type of situation when they're making that right on red?

MR. FERRARI:

You know what I tell the people that come to me? I tell them, "You don't have to make a right on red, you could just stay there, wait for the light to turn green and then make your right-hand turn on red." You don't have to make the turn on red. We're going back to the '70s when it was the gas crisis. I tell all of my elderly customers that come to me, and sit down there and they talk to me, and I tell them, "Don't make the right on red." I have the guy who comes in screaming at me, "I got 11 at this intersection." I have to look at him and go, "If you got 11, did you know the light was there?" And he goes, "Yes, I did." "So is it you or is it the light?"

LEG. LINDSAY:

I appreciate that information. You know, and I've looked at some of the videos myself, and what I have witnessed is people making a right on red, not even paying attention to the fact that there's a crosswalk when they make that right on red, and not even paying attention to a pedestrian that's in that crosswalk and hitting them, or nearly hitting them, because they're too busy looking to the left, because they're trying to come out into traffic that has the green light, too.

MR. FERRARI:

I agree.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

Well, thank you for coming, because you should have been here this morning.

*(*Laughter*)*

MR. FERRARI:

So.

LEG. BROWNING:

You know, I certainly appreciate your expertise. Obviously, having been a Highway Police Officer, you see all the mistakes and the things that people do. And I think you hit the nail on the head when you talked about bad habits. And I know Legislator McCaffrey and I both have CDLs, and one of the things that we have always learned was, you know, when you're coming up to a traffic light, you get your foot off the brake and you -- get your foot off the gas, cover your brake. Not to say you hit your brake, but you cover the brake as you're approaching the light.

So I do have constituents in my district who have come to me and said, you know, "I got a right on red." And I look at it. I can't say I've seen one video yet where I couldn't say to them, "You didn't stop." I've heard comments about, you know, "I" -- "Well, it was at this time of the night."

MR. FERRARI:

Legislator, would they --

LEG. BROWNING:

So my -- so my question for you is, is, you know, how do you respond? You're teaching young people to drive. I agree. And my husband is a city cop, so -- and he always tells me, you know, with the red light camera issues is people just need to slow down. Then stop, then don't break the law, and he's right.

So how do you respond to people when they say, "Well, you know, it was three o'clock in the morning, there's no traffic on the road"? You know, and you're trying to tell them, "But, that's not okay, you still have to obey the law."

MR. FERRARI:

Your -- people are coming to you with these videos of them stopping, but what about the rest of us out there? When we get these tickets, we just pay them, we don't come to you. There's millions of us that don't come to you that made the mistake and weren't the squeaky wheels. You need to think about those people, the people that aren't the squeaky wheels, because when you take those lights down, those are the people that the squeaky wheels are going to touch, and when they touch us, some of us won't walk away.

Listen, the process is not perfect, and nothing ever is, but to totally get rid of the system all together, you're asking for a catastrophe, you are. And even if it's just one of us, that's too many. I hope I answered your question.

LEG. BROWNING:

I think you did, you know. But, again, it's -- you know, hearing people's comments about making the right on red at three o'clock in the morning, there's no traffic, you know. And I keep saying, "But the law is the law. You have to" --

MR. FERRARI:

You're going to get home three seconds later? And that's what we talk about. I tell them, "Don't make the right on red, just sit there. It's an extra three seconds. You're going to get home. And you know what, maybe you don't get home, and then it goes from three seconds to forever." It's about attitudes and motives. We have to teach our drivers to be better drivers, like Legislator -- and that's what it -- that's what it is. We both came in the same area, but we need to teach them to be better.

Defensive driving courses should be mandatory. I get people that have never taken these classes, have no idea what to do at these intersections. There's enough postage. There's signs everywhere telling me where the signs are, it's on the internet. You know, GPS in your new cars tell you it's coming up, so there's plenty of information.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for being here, appreciate your perspective. We're all in too much of a hurry when we're on the roads, we see it all the time. How many times have you seen -- you're sitting at an intersection, all right, and traffic is coming in the other direction, in the right angle direction, and the light turns yellow and the light turns red. Inevitably, there are still cars in that intersection waiting to turn right, and maybe there's a couple that speed through that yellow light to try and beat the red, but don't quite make it, and the light's red. And then while those cars are in that intersection waiting to turn right or left, or whatever it may be, after that light has now turned red, the other light turns green, the right angle light turns green, and cars start to move, and then --

MR. FERRARI:

Everybody stops.

LEG. CILMI:

-- it creates kind of a traffic jam. Imagine if that light stayed red for maybe three seconds longer, that would make that intersection more safe, wouldn't it?

MR. FERRARI:

Of course it would.

LEG. CILMI:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

How did you get here today?

MR. FERRARI:

I drove.

LEG. TROTТА:

What road did you drive on?

MR. FERRARI:

Long Island Expressway, got off at Exit 71.

LEG. TROTТА:

Did you drive 55 miles an hour or less?

MR. FERRARI:

No, of course not.

LEG. TROTТА:

So you were speeding on the way here today?

MR. FERRARI:

Sure I was.

LEG. TROTТА:

Okay. So you were committing a crime?

MR. FERRARI:

Yes, I was.

LEG. TROTТА:

Okay. So you and I are in agreement. If a guy runs a red light and it's dangerous, God bless him, he should get a ticket.

MR. FERRARI:

No, no, no, no, no.

LEG. TROTТА:

I'm 100% for that.

MR. FERRARI:

No, I disagree. So I don't see it that way, Mr. Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

Oh, so --

MR. FERRARI:

I see fatality there, that's what I have to look at.

LEG. TROTТА:

Okay. So what --

MR. FERRARI:

I see death there.

LEG. TROTТА:

Okay. All right, you see death.

MR. FERRARI:

All right. So here we go with the apples and oranges.

LEG. TROTТА:

Let's say you got a ticket. Now, if a guy pulls up to a right on red and there's no one there, clearly, he looks and he just doesn't stop, how is that different from you doing 56 miles an hour today?

MR. FERRARI:

Mr. Trotta, here we go again.

LEG. TROTTA:

I didn't think you had an answer.

MR. FERRARI:

Your constituents --

LEG. TROTTA:

Thank you.

MR. FERRARI:

Your constituents, you should be telling them to wait at the red light. That's what you should be telling them as a government official.

LEG. TROTTA:

I should be telling you to go 55 miles an hour.

MR. FERRARI:

For everybody's safety, you should be telling them --

LEG. TROTTA:

How -- what is the difference between you doing 56 than a 75-year-old man, who's never gotten a ticket in his life, is getting -- getting taxed by the politicians for doing the same thing you did? Should we put in another stop sign? I am not talking about a dangerous situation. I'm talking about 95% of those tickets, 100% of the ones that I've seen, that are totally minor, minor infractions that you and I would have never ever written. It's about money. So if you -- you should -- let me -- you should say -- you, as a good driver, should pay, every time you do 56 miles an hour, pay \$80 to the County, because that's what you're saying. I'm not talking about the guy who's doing something dangerous. I'm talking about the someone who does -- the citizen of this County who are putting our hands in our pocket every which way we could possibly do and doing just what you did, breaking the law.

MR. FERRARI:

I disagree.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

MR. FERRARI:

I disagree, because not everybody's putting -- not everybody's getting those red light tickets.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Asked and answered. D'Amaro, Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes. Through the Chair, Legislator Trotta, how did you get here today?

*(*Laughter*)*

I'm just curious how fast he was driving. Look I --

LEG. TROTTA:

What?

LEG. SPENCER:

Oh, he's back.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No, I'm just joking. I agree that you should not be speeding, and nor should people not be stopping before they make the right on red. But I have a question for you. And you've made your testimony very clear, and you believe that the camera program is somewhat helping reduce fatalities or serious injury because of the reduction in that type of accident. But I wanted to get your reaction to the fact or the statistic that's been reported that the incidents of rear-end collisions have gone up.

Now, you have experience, obviously, as a Police Officer investigating accident scenes. We've been told statistically that the rear-end collisions are not as severe, generally speaking. Of course, there's always going to be more or less severe. But, generally speaking, the rear-end collision is less severe than the side swipe or the T-bone, if you will, and all of that. So since this program has gone into effect, we've seen statistics that say that the rear-end collision, the incidents of rear-end collision has gone up. What's your reaction to that in the context of whether or not we should do away with these cameras.

MR. FERRARI:

So my students come to me and they ask me those questions. They're in fear of the people behind them. One lady in particular goes, "I'm driving to the Smith Haven Mall and I see this young man in that little car with the loud muffler, and I see him keep coming to me, and he keeps coming up to me." And my answer to her is, "You had the option to prevent that rear-end accident because you observed the danger. You saw him coming and you did nothing to prevent it." She should have changed her lanes prior to the impact.

And it goes back to what I've said earlier. We don't have enough time in our daily lives to teach our younger children how to drive, we don't. When we were younger, the roads weren't as crowded, there weren't as many cars, and your parents had time to get out to -- get you out there and drive. I did a class just yesterday at the Shoreham-Wading River where some of these children drive one day a week, that's all the time they get. So I'm telling people to keep their eyes open, slow yourselves down. If the lights change in sequence, you know when the light's going to change. When traveling in an intersection, you know the light's about to change, you should be taking your foot off the gas, slowing yourself down --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MR. FERRARI:

-- preventing it.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So would you say -- is it fair to conclude that the cameras are having an impact on rear-end collisions, because it's compelling drivers to be more mindful of what the law requires, and that is to stop, or slow down, or not proceed through a red or a yellow light, all right? So is the answer to do away with the cameras, or is the answer to try and educate the driving public as to how to properly operate an automobile?

MR. FERRARI:

Education, not doing away with the cameras.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Thank you. Thank you for coming, sir.

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

All right. And you are --

DR. NAPPI:

I'm Dr. Nappi.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Thank you, Dr. Nappi, and then on deck, Reverend Ronald Stelzer.

DR. NAPPI:

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak. Mr. Trotta, you had said that you were concerned about the 75-year old man who never had a ticket in his life. Well, what about my 14-year-old daughter who never had a chance to experience her life because a man ran through his red light eight years ago. When my daughter got up that morning, it was winter break and she was so excited to be going out with her friends, and a man who had been in court that morning and was told not to drive got behind the wheel and ran his red light. He was a seven time repeat offender. And maybe if there were a red light camera there he wouldn't have gotten the mere six-month sentence that he got and he served four. My family sentence is indefinite, sir.

And let me just tell you a little bit about this T-bone accident that my daughter endured. Okay. When my husband and I were called to the hospital, first of all, I received that phone call that is every parent's worst nightmare that dropped me to my knees in the parking lot of Panera Bread, telling me to get to the hospital because my daughter was critical. When we got to Brookhaven Hospital the neurosurgeon came out and said that my daughter's brain was so severely swollen that they had to remove her skull, sir, because the swelling was so profuse. When I was able to see my daughter in the emergency room, I thought that her beautiful, long curly hair had been wrapped up in a turban on her head. Unbeknownst to me it was her brain, sir, that swelled this far out of her head. I saw white matter seeping out from underneath the gauze bandages because the impact of that accident was so horrific, sir. He was in a Jeep, she was in a Saturn. The T-bone practically killed her on impact. In fact, they did me the favor of keeping her on life support for three days.

I made a promise to my daughter before I took her off of life support that I would do anything to prevent any family from going through the trauma that my family endures on a daily basis. And if it means only one life, sir, then I did a job well done, because I now go and I speak to different people in various places in memory of my daughter, because no family should have to go through what we went through at all.

And as far as people saying this is about money, how do you place money on a human life? That is disgraceful. I can never get my daughter back. She was my honeymoon baby and my family until this day is traumatized. I had another daughter in the car that day who was 12. We celebrated her 13th birthday while her other sister was laying in the casket. They had switched seats, sir, 30 seconds before they took off in this car. Needless to say, the man had trace amounts of heroin in his system. It wasn't enough to convict him because of our wonderful New York State laws.

One thing I do recommend is that you do keep the red light cameras in place, because if it saves one life, and if it even prevents the number of T-bone accidents where the accidents and the injuries are totally not compared to a rear-end collision, then we're doing a good thing for the people on the roads. Because as far as I'm concerned, we are vehicular anarchy right now on our roads. People

are doing whatever the hell they want to do. They're texting, they're talking on the phone. There's no regard for laws, and it all goes back to being a law abiding citizen. When the light turns yellow, you slow down and you stop. And the reason why we have rear-end collisions is because people are on their stinking phones and they're not paying attention. That's why they slam on their breaks and that is why we have rear-end collisions.

P.O. GREGORY:

Dr. Nappi, thank you. I'm sorry for your loss. Dr. Nappi.

LEG. TROTТА:

Doctor, listen, you're not going to get an argument from me. If they showed that they were saving people's lives and it was more forgiving of the minor violations, I'm for them 1,000%. But accidents happen every day to everyone in this room. It's a horrible, horrible part of life. I sympathize with you more than you'll ever know, but if I thought for one minute that these cameras were about that, I'd be standing up screaming for them. But it's not.

DR. NAPPI:

Aren't the statistics enough to show you that there's been a decrease in the number of T-bones at intersections? That those collisions have gone down?

LEG. TROTТА:

I can bring people in here that said they've been killed because of the red light cameras, so that's going to go back and forth. We're never going to know that. That's something -- the person on heroin, the person who runs a light, the person who's texting, doesn't care if there's a camera there or not.

DR. NAPPI:

The bottom line is, sir, there needs to be repercussions for people's actions. And if people knew that there would be a possibility that they would get a ticket for running the red light, I would think that they would think twice.

LEG. TROTТА:

I'm not arguing that. I agree with you. I'm talking about the fact that the huge majority of those are totally minor violations, totally minor, minor violations. If it's something that's remotely dangerous, God bless them, give them the ticket. Make the ticket a thousand dollars. But that's not the reality of it.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. We have Legislator Cilmi has a question, question for you.

LEG. CILMI:

Hi, Doctor. I'm sorry for your loss.

DR. NAPPI:

Thank you.

LEG. CILMI:

How long ago was that?

DR. NAPPI:

Eight years.

LEG. CILMI:

Eight years ago. You explained the circumstances behind this person who was driving. You said he was on heroin when he was driving?

DR. NAPPI:

There were trace amounts in his system, but it was not enough to convict him.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. And you said something about he had lost his license or he had gotten --

DR. NAPPI:

Yes. He was a seven time repeat offender. His license was suspended and revoked that morning. He was told by the judge do not get behind the wheel of a car. So again, it all stems back to just being a law abiding citizen. Whether it's not driving, stopping at a yellow light, not going through a red light, it's all about following the laws. That's why we have laws.

LEG. CILMI:

Right, and I respect that. And in all deference to your loss and your situation, obviously you're very passionate about traffic safety, as well you should be. I applaud you for coming out and speaking about it. But you can't believe that having cameras at an intersection would have prevented a man who was told seven times that he shouldn't drive, and just that morning was told he shouldn't drive, but he got behind the wheel anyway with trace amounts of heroin in his system.

DR. NAPPI:

But maybe he would have gotten a lot longer than six months, sir.

LEG. CILMI:

But as you rightly pointed out, the failures of our Criminal Justice System, you know, he probably should have been in jail is what should have happened. If you don't mind, and if you do, I -- by all means, but the circumstances that precipitated the accident, what had happened, exactly. There was a right angle intersection.

DR. NAPPI:

Yes. It was the intersection of 101 and Woodside Avenue in Medford.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

DR. NAPPI:

And they were going through their light, they had the right-of-way.

LEG. CILMI:

Your daughter.

DR. NAPPI:

My daughter, who was in the car, yes, with several other passengers as well, and this man ran his red light. It was a four-car accident, very, very severe injuries. There were nine serious injuries. They were airlifted to the hospital. My daughter was the only fatality.

LEG. CILMI:

So -- it's horrible to hear about. I can't imagine you telling that story over again. So the traffic going through the intersection, was it -- I mean, do you -- you know what, I'm not going to ask the question. Never mind.

DR. NAPPI:

No, no, go ahead. I have no problem with it.

LEG. CILMI:

Was traffic free flowing through the intersection that your daughter's car was traveling through at that point, or had it just started moving through?

DR. NAPPI:

They never even stopped because their light had just turned green, so they were going through.

LEG. CILMI:

Their light had just turned green?

DR. NAPPI:

Uh-huh.

LEG. CILMI:

And I guess the other direction's light had either just turned red or was it red for a period of time?

DR. NAPPI:

That I don't know. All I know is that he went through his red light.

LEG. CILMI:

Well, our prayers are with you.

DR. NAPPI:

Thank you. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

Again, thank you for coming here. It's very brave of you to speak about your daughter and her accident. You know, my thought is if there was a red camera there, a red light camera, and the man did not stop, we would have never known who it was. So there's more to this picture of things. And, unfortunately, we have to prioritize what we're doing here at the Legislature. And we're finding out that the red light cameras, they're saving lives and that's why you're here and we appreciate it. Thank you.

DR. NAPPI:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Thank you. Reverend Ronald Stelzer and then Alec Slatky.

REVEREND STELZER:

Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm a Pastor of Our Savior Lutheran Church in Centereach, and I've been Headmaster of Our Savior New American School, and coached basketball teams, and we have a Safe Driver's Education Program as part of our school.

I'm here because I've paid a few of these and I don't -- I'm not even sure if I was even in the car when the infractions occurred sometimes. I don't really like the letter or the spirit of this law at all. Having experienced going to the court and listening to one person after the other state their case

and see their video, I'd have to say that I didn't -- I saw -- before I went up there was dozens of people, I think, that went up and nothing was unsafe. I didn't see anything that was alarming that was going on. It was very legalistic, well, you didn't come to an absolute stop, and so, therefore, here's your -- pay your \$80, good-bye. Or I don't want to hear about any circumstances, there's no traffic anywhere and you didn't come to an absolute stop, good-bye. Pay your money and good-bye. So I just didn't think it was something that was very humanitarian. Let's put it that way. I think it was very legalistic and seemed like just a way to collect as much as possible.

You know, we can all have a story, a terrible story about somebody dying, and nobody wants their children to die. I've got six children myself and they've experienced terrible accidents in my family, we've had that experience, but an argument like if it saves one person's life, then I think we should do it. Well, you know, if that's your thought, then I think you ought to just ban cars. We should all walk every place we go, take horses and, you know, because then there'll be absolutely zero accidents and absolutely no one will have died from an accident.

I wrote a letter called the Dehumanization of America, kind of like an anti big brother type thing, and I gave it -- I put it my church newsletter to see what kind of response I got. I had 100% support. And I said well, maybe we ought to put out a petition. If you really feel that this red light stuff ought to be done away with, sign your name and we'll send it to Legislators, at least a few people.

(Beeper Sounded)

My time is up? Then you'd have to ask me some questions I guess.

P.O. GREGORY:

Well, someone does have a question for you. Legislator Browning has a question for you.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. Thank you for coming. But, you know, we listened to the testimony of Dr. Nappi and what happened to her daughter, which is horrific for any parent to have to go through..and again, it's -- I think you know and you would agree that people's driving habits have gotten really bad. Yes or no?

REVEREND STELZER:

I think some people have some really bad driving habits. I just don't think that this is the solution to our driving habit problem.

LEG. BROWNING:

However, if the Red Light Camera Program was to change many people's driving habits, and I can tell you there are people I've talked to that said it has changed their habits, would you agree with it?

REVEREND STELZER:

It depends on how many people you've caused to get tickets and pay \$80 for doing nothing.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. Now you did mention about the court?

REVERENT STELZER:

Yeah.

LEG. BROWNING:

Again, you're not the first person to complain about our Traffic Court, and that is an ongoing issue, which is separate from this. And certainly I'd like to follow-up with you on that issue. But, again, do you think that to totally suspend the program or should there be modifications to the program, if it

was to work better, make people change their habits better? Do you think it should be more modified than suspended?

MR. STELZER:

I think it should be totally suspended. I think there are other ways to teach people to drive safely. I think that if you're going to take in \$30 million for these kinds of things, you better be taking in \$30 billion to get rid of text phones and get rid of alcohol in this society. This is way out of perspective. It's way -- it's just bizarre to me.

LEG. BROWNING:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you for coming out today to speak. My question to you is, so, you asked your congregation if they wanted to sign and?

LEG. TROTTA:

You didn't finish.

LEG. KENNEDY:

You didn't finish. You didn't get to finish.

REVEREND STELZER:

Oh, well, I just said -- it's out in the lobby if you would like. They saw what I wrote about it, which I'll give you copies to distribute. I got -- we're not a huge congregation. We got -- I'd say we got 120 signatures, please suspend the Red Light Program. And I said we'll send it to the Legislature if that's how you feel. So, you know, we sent it out there, got -- and 120 people said wow, that's the greatest the idea. I got zero people that said you know, I think you're doing the wrong thing, Pastor, you're getting involved in something you shouldn't get involved in or I don't agree with you, Pastor. I didn't get that. I'm not real intimidating, they will argue with me if they have a different idea, but in that case I'd say that the great majority of people, everybody that I've ever dealt with, think that this is just a scheme to get into people's pockets.

Now, other things, like you got tens of millions going out to Baltimore or something for some firm? That means you're taking money out of Suffolk County, so these people -- not only you might be getting some money from this, but you're taking money out of citizen's pockets that they can't spend on the economy. And you're sending it all to Maryland, you know, to do what? To get citizens to feel like they don't really respect their government anymore. That's my thought.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:

Just a quick question. If that camera caught someone doing something dangerous, running through that light, you agree they should get a ticket, correct?

REVEREND STELZER:

Well, if somebody's doing something dangerous, yeah, let's stop dangerous behavior. Yeah, absolutely.

LEG. TROTTA:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

REVEREND STELZER:

But in my appearance in the court, nothing dangerous happened. It was just very --

LEG. TROTTA:

Mine, too.

REVEREND STELZER:

Going on and on, on, \$80, \$80, \$80, \$80, \$80. And they said I don't have the money, can I wait until my next Social Security checks in? Okay, I'll tell you what, I'll be nice to you, you can pay \$30 today, \$30 next month, \$30 next -- come on. You've got to be kidding me.

P.O. GREGORY:

Pastor, I -- Legislator Lindsay has a question for you.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Hi, Pastor. Thanks for coming in today. I just have one quick question as well. When you come up to intersections now, do you take a different approach since you've gotten this ticket?

REVEREND STELZER:

Yeah. Yeah, I do. I'm always looking like this, I'm always worried if there's a red light ticket. I sometimes slam on my breaks to make sure that I'm okay, but it hasn't kept me from getting -- it hasn't saved any lives. It hasn't made me --

LEG. LINDSAY:

Has it taken any lives by you driving that way? Because I'd be a little concerned that you're looking all over the place and you're not looking at the road.

REVEREND STELZER:

Yeah, I know.

LEG. LINDSAY:

So why not just stop at the intersection and stop at the light?

*(*Laughter*)*

REVEREND STELZER:

Well, when you think big brother's out there, and like, you know, what's going to happen next? Are we going to have these cameras over the Long Island Expressway and 56 miles an hour? Just keep the -- I mean, this is just too -- way, way out of there.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Thanks, Pastor.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you very much.

MR. STELZER:

Am I done?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. STELZER:

God bless you. Thank you for your public service.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Alex Slatky and then Ashley Hunt-Martorano.

MR. SLATKY:

Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Alex Slatky. I'm here representing AAA Northeast, which is the local chapter of AAA. We serve over 290,000 Suffolk County residents. And thanks for having this hearing, thanks for having me here. And I just want to say at the outset we do have the concerns about the implementation of Suffolk County's Red Light Camera Program, but we definitely do not support suspending the program. There are ways to improve it without suspending the program entirely.

So I just want to give a little background on red light running in general, and in Suffolk County. You know, according to the AAA Traffic Safety Culture Index, 94% of New York drivers believe that red light running is unacceptable behavior, and yet 42% report doing so recently when they could have stopped safely. So there is a bit of a do as I say, not as I do attitude in traffic safety. And it's not just people that are impaired, or people that are texting or distracted. It's not just those people that are running the red light. Absolutely there are many of those that are doing this behavior, but there are people that are going through the intersections deliberately to beat, you know, the next cycle of the light, and they just want to be there a couple of minutes faster or a minute faster, and there are people that do that that aren't impaired, that aren't texting. And this is a big problem in Suffolk County.

Over a three-year period we have 4,000 crashes that listed failure to obey a traffic control device as a contributing factor. And academic research, like what was presented initially from {Mitza}, shows that cameras do have the potential to save lives, reduce T-bone crashes and reduce crashes overall, and that's why we support it. We do have some concerns, but I just want to get to the overall layout of what the data is for Suffolk County in particular.

If you go to the bottom of the second page of what I've provided, the data is actually a little bit more favorable to the County than their own numbers, because I took a look at just the intersections that have cameras that were in place since 2010 and 2011, and their rear-end crashes have gone up 34%, side impact crashes down 37%. And so there's reason to believe that the cameras are having a positive effect. Are they working in every single intersection? No, probably not, because there are some locations, as was pointed out earlier, where rear-end crashes have dramatically increased, we haven't had a corresponding decline in T-bone crashes, and those should be looked at, absolutely. But we should keep the cameras, we should improve the program. Thank you for my time.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Legislator Anker as a question for you.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay. You mentioned that there -- there's a way to make this better for those right turns. Can you give a few examples?

MR. SLATKY:

Well, the right turns, it's a tough one, because I am sympathetic when, you know, I've gotten similar calls as Legislator Trotta or Legislator Browning or others have mentioned, and I look at that and I say I don't know about that, that was really, really borderline. I have sympathy for someone who gets one of the right on red tickets. I don't have sympathy for someone who gets five or six right on red tickets because while it's not the most important violation to police, it's probably the easiest to avoid as a driver.

LEG. ANKER:

Do some of the other states or counties allow for maybe one or two right-hand turns and no fine?

MR. SLATKY:

We've seen kind of a get out of jail free card I think in one or two other municipalities around the country. It's not super common. That's not -- it's some -- you know, we would have to take a look at and it's a possibility. But, really, I think a lot of people have already gotten those tickets and so it wouldn't have a ton of impact at this point in the program.

I mean, one way that we'd like to see the program improved in terms of transparency, you have all this great data in terms of every violation for every intersection. Xerox is collecting this data and I know they're supposed to keep it for at least two years after the violation date. If there were some sort of open data platform where you could look at every violation, and we could certainly redact the personal information, but you have the date, the time, the intersection approach, the amber time, the time that's already elapsed in the red phase, the lane, the direction of movement and whether or not a crash occurred, that's a really, really robust data set to have. And that might help color our evaluation of those locations where it hasn't worked quite as well, because there are some locations, even going back to the very beginning of the program, where we haven't seen a drop in right angle crashes, which is kind of surprising. You'd think we would. It's not -- you can't look at every single intersection and if it's increased by one you say get rid of it, you can't do that, but there are some locations where it's not performing as well as we might think.

I agree with the Stony Brook Injury Prevention people that maybe that means let's take a look at redesigning the intersection. But that data I think would be a real, really robust data set.

LEG. ANKER:

So who do you recommend could analyze that data?

MR. SLATKY:

I mean certainly I'd love to get my hands on it, but I'm not a traffic engineer. I think the injury prevention community and the academic traffic engineering community would love to have that data.

LEG. ANKER:

That's a great idea. Another quick question as far as, you know, your understanding of ways to make the situation better, because that's why we're all here. What about the -- was it rumble strips or notification that there's a camera there and, you know -- and I know we have that, we should have that sign showing that there's a camera, that they're entering into an intersection. But are there other ideas that other counties are doing that provide additional notification of the camera?

MR. SLATKY:

Yeah. I mean, I think the signage is the most important thing, and there are some locations where maybe the signage is not as visible, or maybe even just taking a look at the traffic lights, maybe we can have larger signal heads or if there's a warning that a light is coming. I mean, obviously if you're on say Jericho Turnpike, you know that there's going to be a light there, so that wouldn't

really have that much effect. But I think making sure the signage is visible.

In terms of rumble strips in the middle of the road, I probably wouldn't support that, just because we want -- you know, we want to tell people where the cameras are to reduce the information disparity so we don't have as many read-end crashes. Because if someone stops super short at the light and the other person wants to go through, that's the when the rear-end crashes happen as was said. But in terms of a rumble strip, I don't want to totally reinvent the wheel just to prevent people from getting a ticket.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Calarco.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Thank you and I'll be brief. You had mentioned data that you would like to get a hold of and I actually authored the Open Data Law for Suffolk County, so we are in the process of developing a whole website. DPW has been very helpful in identifying data sets. But if want to touch base afterwards --

MR. SLATKY:

Absolutely.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

I'd love to know what data sets you're looking for and we'll work with them to get them published.

MR. SLATKY:

Sounds great.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yeah, I think one of the ways to improve the Red Light Program is to take a look at those intersections where you have a situation -- installation of the cameras where the violations are very low, but the incidents of accidents has gone up. That could well be an intersection where you have to take a long, hard look as to whether or not the red light camera is appropriate in that particular area. For example, I have a hamlet where there are six cameras, and when you take a look at the analysis in terms of the violations and the number of accidents, in five of the six the violations are high, the number of accidents are down, but there's one area where the violations are very low but the accidents are very high. To me, that's an area that the Department of Public Works, and I made the request for them to take a long, hard look. It may be appropriate to eliminate that red light camera at that particular location.

MR. SLATKY:

Yeah, I mean, I agree with you. I think -- it is confusing. I've dug into this data so deep. I've typed everything in because some of the coding was a little off. I've looked at this really, really thoroughly, and one of the main conclusions I have is this is -- it's a confusing subject. It's an art and a science. And it doesn't make sense that you'd have a place where, you know, if we take a look at one of the ones that was deactivated, if you have -- it's the LIE Service Road, the North Service Road and Motor Parkway. In 2010, there were 31 violations a day, by 2013 there were four violations a day, and yet crashes actually went up and right angle crashes also went up. And that's

a confusing result to me. Like, honestly, part of that is small sample size, but that's where I think that open data can help. And if we see what's really causing the crashes, what do we need to crack down on, is there a way that we could re-engineer our intersections, I think you're right, that if something isn't working, then it's time to make a re-evaluation.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:

I brought this up before, I'm just going to bring it up quickly again. These aren't measuring accidents that occur at intersections where there's no camera where someone slams on their brake. So the fact that there was only -- have you heard anything about this like, you know, because oh I thought there was a camera, I slammed on my brake, I got in an accident.

MR. SLATKY:

Well, actually that's a good point. I think the main concern for me in that perspective is looking at control data, right, and that's something that the report doesn't have. You want to take a look at similarly situated intersections that don't have cameras, compare them to the ones that do, and maybe if the ones that don't have cameras there are a lot more crashes, then you'd say oh, the cameras are working. If it's the opposite, you say the cameras aren't working. We haven't seen that control data, so that -- I mean, that point I think is well taken and we'd like to see that from DPW as well.

LEG. TROTTA:

I've read a lot of the studies. There's basically like a wash. It doesn't prevent anything. My concern is in Commack there's intersections where it's increased over 100%, 100% increase. Now, I would think there's some liability on the County that we would have to take it down. I mean, will the AAA back the fact that hey, if it went up 100%, there was 20 now there's 40 accidents?

MR. SLATKY:

Yeah, I mean, I think if you do an engineering analysis and you look at the data, you look at a robust data set sample size before and after, and you see basically no decline in T-bone collisions but a big increase in rear-end collisions, that's one you might want to take out. But I think you have to do the engineering analysis of that intersection.

LEG. TROTTA:

There's over 40 where that happened.

MR. SLATKY:

Over 100%? Because I know there -- I have all the data here, and I think it's easy to say, I think everyone would agree with this, if the the data shows that the crashes are up, the engineers should take another look at it. That doesn't necessarily mean that cameras have to go, but that means there's a problem there. That's plain and simple. That's evident in the data. And if it showed -- if we can determine the cameras are the reason why they're up, then maybe it's time for that camera to go, but I don't think that means every single camera needs to go right now.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. You know, there was a doctor here from Stony Brook earlier and he was talking about changing the behavior, and I do have a lot of -- way more driving than I ever did before with this job, and I see a lot of bad behavior. But, you know, I am, you know, aware of the Red Light Camera

Program, and I've seen the signs, and sometimes if you stop at the intersection you'll see the little flashing lights, you know, and it's -- to me it's pretty obvious that when I come up to an intersection, even if I didn't see -- because when you drive, and I have a problem as a driver. I think there's too many signs. It's like oh, we'll put another sign up. Well, you're actually driving so it's hard to read the signs if you're driving, you know? You should be paying attention to driving. To me the signs are nice but they're not -- I don't know. Sometimes they're distracting. So when the light turns yellow it gives you a warning. I think that's the intent that it's going to turn red, right?

MR. SLATKY:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So do you find that it is enough time to change -- actually, the doctor talked about changing behavior. So when I come up to an intersection I always think, oh, it's -- I should stop because the light turned yellow. It's going to turn red next. Do people -- do people -- do you think that there's been enough time with this program to change that behavior, or do you think people need more time to change it, people who, you know, who drive a lot?

MR. SLATKY:

I think it's changed behavior already. I mean, certainly anecdotally, you know, we've heard a lot and I think the data shows that there is a change in behavior. In my analysis, I separated out the ones that were installed in 2013 and '14 because you want to treat those differently. There's not a big sample size. But with the ones that have four years of data, it seems like behavior is changing. Like I said, control, comparison would be very helpful. But I think anecdotally I would say that it seems to be changing behavior, although, you know, it does take a few years to really set in, especially where those new locations are.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Muratore.

LEG. MURATORE:

Thank you. Thank you, Alex, for coming. My question is do you -- have you studied other programs like this in other municipalities?

MR. SLATKY:

Yes. I mean, I do the work for the State, so I've looked at all the programs around.

LEG. MURATORE:

So how does our program stack up against theirs?

MR. SLATKY:

It's not -- I'll just use Nassau as a comparison. I think New York City is a little bit of a different animal and their program has been in place for 20 years, so that's not a great comparison. Yonkers has been very bad. So suffice it to say, there's one lower on the totem pole in the red light camera rankings. But Nassau's program has been better. And it's -- it is difficult to say why. I'll take a look at my notes here. But, yeah, Nassau, we've actually seen rear-end crashes go down as well, and here we've seen them go up. And I think part of the reason for that is that in Suffolk the roads are just a little bit wider, it's higher speed. In Nassau County it's more congested perhaps at a slower speed, and I think that's part of it. It's really hard for me to say exactly why. There's been such a big difference in performance.

LEG. MURATORE:

How would you fix the program here in Suffolk County? What would you do differently?

MR. SLATKY:

I mean, like I said, I think the open data will help. One thing, you know, from a Traffic Court perspective if you were looking at trying to enhance that process. Maybe allow people to, you know, submit a plea of not guilty by mail just as they receive these by mail. In almost all those cases they're going to be found guilty anyway, but that's one way to do it. I think having a control analysis would really help.

I mean, from my perspective, I'm a data guy. I just want to look at the data, I want better data, and I think the open data with the violations, I think more controlled intersections will help. And then, you know, it makes sense to take a look at some of the locations where it's not performing as well as we hoped it would and maybe think about taking it down or doing some sort of engineering change. But in terms of radical engineering changes, you can't reinvent the wheel. There is limited space here. I mean, what was said before was right jughandles do, you know, reduce collisions. There's not so many places in Suffolk County where we have the room to do something like that. I wish you'd explore it, but I think really getting a better evaluation is important to me because I don't think we have a phenomenal one at this point.

LEG. MURATORE:

I think Legislator Krupski was going up the right road when he said, you know, it's going to take time. It's kind of like the seatbelts. You know, when seatbelts first came in to play you had to wear them, nobody wore them. And now if you have a youngster, a two-year-old in the car and you get in the car and don't put the seatbelt on it's grandma, grandpa, daddy, mommy, put the seatbelt on. So, I mean, I think it's going to happen, I think it needs time.

And I applaud my colleagues for standing up and taking it from these people that are coming here and act in despicable ways and yell and scream at us for us trying to do the right thing for the citizens of Suffolk County. Some of us are trying to, you know, grab hold and say well, you know, it's a money grab, and maybe it is a money grab and maybe we have to look at this and reevaluate. Maybe we have to do a couple of things in TVB and make it so people have an easier time there. And maybe we make them lessen the fine or do away with the fine and just, you know, come up with some -- not do away with the fine totally, but maybe the first time, like Legislator Anker said, give them a one-shot, you know, get out of jail free.

I really think it's a topic of discussion, it's taking a lot of good time away from other important issues we have in this County to take care of. And, you know, it's putting us through a lot that I think we need to come to a fork in the road here and make the right decision and say listen, we need to reevaluate this. Maybe let's suspend it, you know, give it a sunset of suspending and say, well, for three months. Some people move quickly, typically what happens in government we take forever to do things, and come up with some new ideas. Keep the program in place, come up with some new ideas.

I mean, you know, the gentleman from Brookhaven was here, he was a City cop and he taught defensive driving. I taught cops how to drive. I was a Suffolk cop for 35 years, and if you consider the amount of time -- the amount of miles cops put on the road and the amount of accidents they have, they do a pretty good job of driving. And they drive at high speed. I mean, Trotta can you tell you. I taught him to go through an intersection at 100 miles an hour and not have a problem and get through safely.

But the reason -- people don't want to slow down here. The first thing you're supposed to do when you approach an intersection is slow down. The foot is supposed to come off the gas and go to the brake. And like Legislator Trotta said, you know, a lot of this stuff is grab you right turn on red. We've got to educate people. I think that's the worst thing they ever did was the right turn on red. It's created a monster now. I really think we need to think seriously about -- it might cost us a few bucks, we might have to put off some spending for a while, but I think we need to revisit this immediately and maybe work over it. Again, thank you for your time.

MR. SLATKY:

Thanks. And if I could just make one point in response to that. I mean, I don't think it's surprising that people think it's a money grab. We've seen that throughout the country when it comes to automated enforcement. Obviously we saw that in the adjacent County when it came to the speed cameras, and this was put in under, you know, the State budget. The headline or the heading of that section was Provide Additional Targeted Revenue Flexibility for Municipalities Outside New York City. So it's not surprising that people think that way.

At the same time, you know, if you get a ticket, you did something dangerous, then that's a fine. The way to remove that suspicion, and it's a tough -- it's a tough one for you guys, I certainly understand that, but the way to remove that suspicion is to take all the money, all the profit from the cameras and put it back into a dedicated traffic safety fund. And I think, you know, you talk about there are other issues that the County has to deal with, absolutely true. And one of those issues is traffic safety. We've raised texting and driving, we've raised impaired driving. There's a pot of money that's coming in that can be used for those issues or other traffic safety issues. I'd love to see that because, you know, obviously budgetarily that's a very difficult one, but I think that would help, and it would remove the appearance of impropriety and help traffic safety at the same time. I think that's a win/win.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Thank you.

LEG. MURATORE:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Next we have Ashley Hunt-Martorano and then Charles Clampet.

MS. HUNT-MARTORANO:

Good afternoon and thank you for the chance to speak before the Legislature today. My name is Ashley Hunt-Martorano and I live in Medford. And I'm here today to express my displeasure with the Local Law 1395 regarding removing or banning the red light cameras.

In 2015, my husband was T-boned by somebody that was running a red light on Horseblock Road just east of 112. There was not a red light camera there, but thankfully his injuries were not life-threatening, unlike the doctor who spoke before me. He suffered a minor concussion and a rotator cuff tear that required surgery, but he has returned to normal functioning. I've been hit by distracted drivers on two occasions, and that resulted in me having to undergo shoulder surgery and neck surgery. As a result of my neck surgery I have complication and so I'm going to deal with a chronic medical condition for the rest of my life.

Clearly Suffolk County and Long Island suffers from too many traffic violations of all sorts. We've heard about drunk driving, we've heard about speeding on the Long Island Expressway, so it's just not running red lights or turning right on red. But that's what the issue is that we're talking about here today, so I would like to stay focused on that particular issue.

So I also am a member of the Suffolk Bike Riders Association. We heard Bob DeVito, our President, speak before. I'm a bicyclist and bicyclists and pedestrians are disproportionately represented in right turn on red crashes. Twenty percent of the right turn on red crashes are hitting pedestrians or cyclists according to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. And they say that a majority of these right turn on red crashes involved a driver looking left for a gap in traffic so they could turn right on red, and then striking a pedestrian or bicyclist from that driver's right.

Several studies have demonstrated when types of crashes are averaged out, there is no difference between crashes before or after installations of red light cameras. In fact, after removing red light cameras, in many studies crashes increased by 64%. Right turn on red crashes, which are typically the most deadly, were three times as frequent when those cameras were removed. In Houston they saw a dramatic increase in collisions after banning red light cameras. Major crashes went up by 84.62%. The commercial vehicle crashes went up over 200%. In 2011, the institute -- the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety compared cities with red light cameras versus cities without red light cameras, and the cameras reduced fatal red light running collisions by 24%. Behavior changes don't happen overnight. We could see reductions in citations and any rear-ending non-fatal accidents as people become more familiar with this and the placements of these cameras, and we will decrease most deadly collisions commonly attributed to red light running. And again, it will protect pedestrians, which is not accounted for in any of the data that has been submitted thus far.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. You're done? Anyone have questions? No? Okay. All right, thank you very much. Mr. Clampet, and then on deck, Chris Scalone.

MR. CLAMPET:

County Legislator Krupski and Ms. Fleming, you don't have any red light cameras out by you, right?

LEG. FLEMING:

I'm sorry. Do we do back and forth?

MR. CLAMPET:

You don't have any red light cameras out there, out on the East End.

LEG. FLEMING:

I'm sorry. I don't think we do back and forth.

MR. CLAMPET:

And that's fine, that's fine. I just want to bring that to your attention. The doctor that sat here and showed that red area of Suffolk County being in red, does that include the five East End towns? Because there's no red light cameras out there. And how can that doctor sit here, this is not a court of law. Somebody said before asked and answered, it's not a court of law. I really think this should be taken on a Federal level. I don't think this should be taken on a County level. I think that's where this should go. I don't think this is -- it's benefitting by anybody.

Somebody said something before -- oh, Tom Muratore said it before, that there's other pressing issues that should be dealt with, and I agree with him. Sarah Anker said it, too. She said something about give one ticket, give them a free out of jail card. I say raise the yellow light for six seconds, the two red lights on the corner ought to be six seconds, and then when that light changes, then you can go. Try to do the six seconds. If you're going to table this, you're going to put this on the side, try to do the six seconds and I'm sure you'll still make revenue. I'm sure you'll still make money. Make it six seconds, that's all I'm asking. I'm not for the red light camera, so, all right? And I thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

DuWayne?

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Charles, how are you?

MR. CLAMPET:

Good, good.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

I just want to -- you asked a question before. Let me ask you a question. Do you know if there are any of these red light cameras, besides the five East End towns, whether or not any of these cameras are in any of the incorporated villages?

MR. CLAMPET:

That I'm not too sure of, but I know that they're not in affluent areas. They're on Middle Country Road going through Centereach to Selden to the mall.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

It has nothing to do with affluent areas. There are none in any incorporated villages of Suffolk County. The reason for that is that any of the red light camera revenue would have to be split with those municipalities. So it is not as if we don't have those situations in those areas, in those incorporated villages. I'm sure we have T-bone accidents in the Incorporated Village of Lindenhurst and the Incorporated Village of Babylon who are in my district. But in the unincorporated area in West Babylon there are six red light cameras in a 1.5 mile stretch of road. That's what that woman was talking about. So I just wanted to know if you knew that they weren't in the incorporated village and the reason why. That's all.

MR. CLAMPET:

The incorporated village, I agree with you, just like the five East End towns, if the cameras were out in the five eastern towns, then the County would have to split the money with them, so the PBA would get bupkis.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Well, I don't know about the PBA.

MR. CLAMPET:

The PBA -- I want somebody to tell me exactly where all the money is going to, where exactly the money is going to, that's what I want to know.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Well, it's going into --

MR. CLAMPET:

It hasn't gone to the General Fund.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Well --

MR. CLAMPET:

Where's the money going to? And I don't know if you guys know, but I'm sure you do know, the FBI has been here for ten years, so just watch out for your hot seats, okay? Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Chris Scalone.

MR. SCALONE:

Hello. Can you guys hear me?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

MR. SCALONE:

Hi. My name is Christopher Scalone. I'm 19 years old and I'm from Central Suffolk County in Farmingville, New York. I'm here today to advocate for the use of red light cameras in and around my home County because of the security that they give to me and my fellow drivers on the road. See, I am a fatal accident survivor, having survived an almost fatal motor vehicle crash involving my mother and me two years ago. Had it not been for the seatbelts we would not be here today.

It was September 11th, 2013. My mother and I were on County Road 97, more commonly known as Nicolls Road, traveling northbound towards Stony Brook at around 10:00 p.m. at night. We were in Holtsville almost under the Long Island Expressway Service Road bridge and a ramp for Exit 62, when there was a blockage in the lane that we were traveling. There was a car parked in between the ramp lane and right line with the lights off. My mother slowed to go around this car, signalled and cautiously proceeded with the knowledge that there was absolutely no oncoming traffic.

Little to our knowledge, someone coming down the ramp was not paying attention to their surroundings, the road or the speed, and crashed into the back of our car. This in turn caused a five car pile-up and the dislocation my mother's neck and spine cord, leaving her a quadriplegic.

Although this accident was two years ago, still to this day we live the nightmare that that was that night. My mother now requires 24/7 home health aide care. More often than not her aides do not show up for work, they call out five minutes before their shifts and they give my mother lies and excuses. Because my father's deceased and there's no one else to stay with my mother, the responsibility is mine.

The past month just filling in for her aides that don't show up, I have stayed with my mom 45-55 hours per week, along with being a full-time student at St. Joseph's College. I stay with my mother -- she has to miss doctor's appointments on certain days because she can't get out of bed and there are things that I can't do for her that her aides do. This is the exact reason I couldn't take my scholarship to Penn State, because if I would have left my mother would be alone.

There are a myriad of reasons why my mother cries each day. She cries for the fact that she can no longer feel my hugs, she'll never taste her own cooking again, and she feels that she can not provide for me because of her disability. Every day is a struggle.

Finally, two weeks later -- I'm sorry. Finally, two years later our case is being processed and we almost think back and remember our account of that terrible night. Fingers pointing everywhere from all parties involved, the mystery of why there was a car parked blocking lanes on a major

shore-to-shore County road. It's sad and stressful and the wound is only rehashed every time we must think back. Had there been a camera the night of the accident, I wouldn't have to think about -- I wouldn't have to think back and describe in full detail all the things that have happened. A night of such haze truly to be brought to light.

It's crazy to think that an extra set of eyes on the the road would be viewed in a negative spectrum. That's why those cameras are there, for our safety and for our protection and for the extra set of eyes, that extra set of eyes that not only will oversee the safety of the roads, but the safety of us and our neighbors. See, there's no traffic lights on Nicolls Road where my accident happened, but there are red light cameras at much more dangerous intersections where an extra set of eyes is needed even more. Why a safeguard of societal safety is being questioned I don't understand. There wasn't an extra set of eyes to make sure we were okay, but it is my hope that these cameras continue to stay and protect our County.

One thing everyone needs to understand is that protecting our roads and the people who drive them isn't a one person effort. We must work together with our law enforcement, with our town and our County of Suffolk to keep our people safe and lives healthy.

And then one thing I just -- one thing I just -- if I -- I speak at Traffic Court every Thursday night and I tell my story we the EAC Network, a non-profit organization. And when I took my permit test and when I took my road test, the DMV gives out little books and they're free, like to educate young drivers. If the right on red -- if that's -- obviously it's a big issue, and it's the three seconds and the three seconds, shouldn't someone look in the book? I mean, I haven't, shouldn't someone look in the book and see exactly if you have to wait the three seconds? You know what I'm saying? Like me personally, I agree with the red light cameras, a red light camera wouldn't have prevented my accident, but they're there for our protection. They're there for our safety. I understand what Legislator Trotta is saying and I try and always see every point of view, and that's why I can never be a politician.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. All right. Anybody? Legislator Kennedy has a question for you.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I just want to thank you for coming out and speaking. And thank you for taking care of your mom.

MR. SCALONE:

No problem.

LEG. KENNEDY:

That takes real guts. It's difficult.

*(*Applause*)*

MR. SCALONE:

No problem. And I know Dr. Nappi. We've spoken at high schools before together. And, you know, I know you're all trying to do the greater good in your own ways and it's really important and I thank all of you for all that you do, and I need a stop sign near my house. Thanks, everyone.

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you for saying that. It's a little difficult hearing how corrupt I am every meeting because of red light cameras. But anyway.

General Meeting - May 10, 2016

That is all the cards I have. Is there anyone else that would like to speak? Please come forward. Okay. What say you, Mr. Trotta?

LEG. TROTTA:

Motion to close.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to close by Legislator Trotta, second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. I'd like to make a motion to set the date for the following public hearings on June 1st, 2016, at 2:30 P.M. at the Rose Caracappa Auditorium, Hauppauge, New York: The 2016-2017 Suffolk County Community College budget; I.R. 1007, I.R. 1462, I.R. 1466, I.R. 1471.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

And I.R. 1207, a Local Law prohibiting the distribution of plastic carry out bags in Suffolk County. Did I get a second?

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MS. ELLIS:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Also, I'd like to make a motion setting the date for the following public hearing on June 21st, 2016, at 6:30 p.m. at the Maxine Postal Auditorium in Riverhead New York: The 2016-2017 Suffolk County Community College budget. Second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Actually, I'm going to make a motion to approve the Consent Calendar before we get back to where we were in the agenda.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MS. ELLIS:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. We were on page six. *I.R. 1392, (Amending the Suffolk County Classification and Salary Plan in connection with new titles for use in the Department of Economic Development and Planning (Senior, Principal and Chief Community Development and Planning Specialist)*, and Legislator Muratore had a question. He was on my list.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes. What I wanted to know is the number of employees in IT from four years ago til now. So that's my question. I think I got that answer, but I want it for the record, Doc. Okay?

MR. LIPP:

Okay. So the question is how many employees are in IT. Four years ago, I guess we're talking May 1913, was -- I'm sorry. May 2013, there were 98 employees, and May of this year 107. There have been a few employees that were moved over from other departments.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yeah, I see that you sent me -- and if we look back to 2011 we had 79.

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. MURATORE:

And then in 2012 we had 73, and then we jacked up to 98 and then now we have 107.

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. MURATORE:

Correct? Okay. And how many more are we asking for?

MR. LIPP:

These are just -- these are upgrades.

LEG. MURATORE:

Oh, these are upgrades. Okay.

MS. KEYES:

I just want to clarify, too, in 2011 and 2012 you were -- 2012 reflected the consolidation of that department, so that might have something to do with why the number of positions seems to jump.

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

MS. KEYES:

Assuming you're talking about Economic Development and not I.T.

MR. LIPP:

Actually, the -- I wasn't sure what your question was. We were talking about I.T., the Department of Information and Technology.

MS. KEYES:

Then I don't have anything.

LEG. CILMI:

But this is Planning.

MR. LIPP:

Right.

LEG. CILMI:

Just to make sure that we're on the same page.

MR. LIPP:

I'm afraid that the question was out of context. I was just asked for how many I.T. people there are, so I just assumed you meant the Department of Information Technology.

LEG. MURATORE:

I asked the wrong question. I'm out of order, I'm sorry.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. I have a question for Dr. Lipp. Do you have an analysis on how this will affect our budget?

MR. LIPP:

Okay. The answer is the fiscal impact that was stated by the County Executive assumed that they would work within the confines of their existing budget, and that's a partial answer and one way to approach it. There is sufficient -- as we said in our review of the 2016 Operating Budget, there were more than sufficient funds to hire additional staff either for vacancies or for new positions in Economic Development of over 500,000. The cost of the three positions that are being asked for the upgrades, that could occur in terms of an expense in various different ways. If we assume the full year cost at entry level step S, that would be like 240 something thousand dollars. That's not necessarily, A, the way it would work and, B, that it's a full year's cost as opposed to a partial year which, you know, they wouldn't be able to do a full year 2016 here in May obviously. So if you're looking at what the costs are down the road, you would say the 240 something thousand dollars for the three positions potentially could be annualized costs.

There are two ways to look at those costs. One is on a myopic level for the line item or for the department. They do have sufficient funds. If you look at it more broadly over the course of the entire General Fund, yes, we do have a significant deficit we're trying to deal with. So any expense would, in theory at least, add to that. And then of course we're talking about service provision, too, that is a separate issue from the finances.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So if you say -- you said, you know, we have sufficient funds for this, but there's a projected \$2.8 million deficit.

MR. LIPP:

One-hundred and -- I believe it was like 186 -- \$186 million deficit, I think was the presentation we did to Budget and Finance the other day.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I'm sorry, for 2016, two point -- 20.5, and then at 2017, 82.5.

MR. LIPP:

Right. So we broke down the shortfall into three years, but basically that, you know, one way to look at it is it doesn't matter which year it's in, that's the overall deficit for the three years combined. Because what we're looking at is trying to mock put together a 2017 budget. We're coming out of 2015 with a shortfall compared to what we budgeted of over \$16 million in the General Fund, another 2.2 or so in the Police District and then you add on top of that the shortfall that we're projecting for this year and then what we would need for next year. So I would look at it just as combined the three years sum of 186 million.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Then how can you say that we would have enough money in the budget?

MR. LIPP:

Because on a line item basis the appropriations that were given to Economic Development gave them sufficient funding to pay for all their employees, and to have a little over half a million additional for either new hires or to fill vacancies or these new positions.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. So we have a motion to table. We were in the process of calling that vote. Okay? We have a motion and a second. Roll call.

(Roll Called by Ms. Ellis, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes to table, yes. I forgot what we were doing.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. TROTТА:

Yes to table.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes to table.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes to table.

LEG. HAHN:

No.

LEG. ANKER:

No.

LEG. LINDSAY:

No.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

No.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

No.

LEG. SPENCER:

I'm sorry. I was not paying attention. No to table.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

No.

P.O. GREGORY:

No.

LEG. BROWNING:

No to table.

MS. ELLIS:

Seven.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Motion to approve. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Opposed.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

Keep your hands raised.

P.O. GREGORY:

Keep your hands raised. Any abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:

Twelve. (*Opposed: Legislators Krupski, Muratore, Cilmi, Kennedy, Trotta and McCaffrey*).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. Also, I'm going to make a motion to take -- we have a CN. **IR 1480**, out of order, **Amending the 2016 Operating Budget and appropriating funds in connection with payment of a salary deferral to Deputy Sheriffs**. Do I have a second?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Well, we're taking it out of order.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MS. ELLIS:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. I make a motion to approve I.R. 1480.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator D'Amaro. Legislator Kennedy offers a motion to table.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Second on the motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:

Seconded by Legislator McCaffrey to table. On the motion?

LEG. BROWNING:

I'd like to make a motion to send to committee.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. Motion by Legislator Browning to recommit.

LEG. BROWNING:

And on the motion? The reason why --

P.O. GREGORY:

Do we have a second? Hold on, we need a second. Anyone second that motion?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Kennedy to recommit. I feel like a car dealer, I got like -- you know, what goes first?

LEG. BROWNING:

On the motion?

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Browning on the motion to recommit.

LEG. BROWNING:

I mean, I do see the President of the Deputy Sheriffs union is here. You know, he called me last night, I think it was probably 9:30 last night, and was not aware that the CN was coming forth. I -- basically the reason why I'm asking that we send it to committee is it's only a matter of a couple of weeks, and I think he's -- unless he's changed his mind, but I think that to allow them to look at it, to review to make sure that that number is correct for them, I don't think that's such a hard lift to delay it for a couple of weeks. I don't know if you want to let Mr. Becker come up to speak, if he would like to see us pass it tonight or not.

P.O. GREGORY:

Sure. Come on up, John.

LEG. BROWNING:

So, John, I know that you -- again, I asked the question if you guys had been notified, I guess you weren't notified, about the CN and had the opportunity to look at it. Because I know we're always talking it's \$4 million, it's like 3.1, 3.2, and I just wanted to know what your take is.

MR. BECKER:

Right. So we haven't, at least I have not seen what the Certificate of Necessity actually is. The number that's on it, 3.2 million, is from my understanding; again, I haven't seen it in person. You know, I represent the Deputy Sheriffs at this effect, so certainly we want to verify that this number is correct. If the County's going to be paying it out, we want to verify that that number is, in fact, the number. Additionally, it was also brought to my attention that this amount of money was going to be bonded, which is for us very striking that the County would have to borrow this amount of money. We should be able to have that available. Is that not correct?

P.O. GREGORY:

It's not being bonded.

MR. BECKER:

It's not being bonded. Okay, so we have the funds available.

P.O. GREGORY:

We take it from Legislator Trotta's personal account.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. BROWNING:

So in the event that if there's a discrepancy in the number, are we just going to write another check or what do we do if there is a discrepancy?

P.O. GREGORY:

Well, I would imagine. I mean, you know, the Deputy Sheriffs have been asking for this money. I would imagine that they would have some idea what that number is, right?

LEG. BROWNING:

Well, he's standing right here.

LEG. LINDSAY:

If I could -- Mr. Presiding Officer, if I can ask a question to Counsel. In the language of the bill it says the 3.2 million and, "*WHEREAS sufficient funds to satisfy a deferral payment are available in the 2006 Operating Budget.*" So does that leave that number to be open if it's in dispute?

LEG. BROWNING:

Someone from County Exec's office maybe would be able to answer that better since they wrote it?

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Come up, Connie.

MS. CORSO:

The number -- it was originally half of the deferral, which was about \$3.9 million. Five-hundred -- at least 500,000 has been paid out already to people who have already separated service. This is the balance. Now, this is -- I wrote this resolution myself, with Stephanie in my department. It says approximately, because I don't know what the total number is going to be about. I won't know until it runs through payroll. So the Comptroller will verify the amount plus or minus 3.2, we'll move the rest of the money in. Part of this I really didn't have to do by resolution. I only had to do the contingent by the resolution. So I have the ability to make a budget transfer for the balance. The amount will be what they're owed. It will not be less than what they're owed. We are not bonding it.

P.O. GREGORY:

So your intention is to state that this isn't, you know, an exact amount, it's an approximate, and you have the flexibility within the resolution to correct any pluses or minuses?

MS. CORSO:

Right.

P.O. GREGORY:

Right. Okay. Anybody else?

LEG. KENNEDY:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

On the motion, Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

We're taking this money out of energy, oil, gas funds?

MS. CORSO:

There was money in the --

LEG. KENNEDY:

The utilities.

MS. CORSO:

-- contingent account for salaries and then the balance will come out of the gas.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So later on down the line if we run short, will we be bonding to recoup the money?

MS. CORSO:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No. Okay. Thank you.

MS. CORSO:

You're welcome.

LEG. BROWNING:

So I -- all right.

LEG. HAHN:

We're good. We're good.

LEG. BROWNING:

I would assume it's good to go? Okay. I'll withdraw my motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I withdraw the tabling.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. Peace, I love it.

*(*Laughter*)*

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

MS. ELLIS:

Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Congratulations. All right, back to the agenda.

LEG. BROWNING:

Now let's get a contract.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Mr. Presiding Officer, could we take 1381 out of order?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes. Remind me what page that's on again?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Six.

P.O. GREGORY:

Page six. ***I.R. 1381 - Amending the Adopted 2016 Operating Budget to transfer funds from Fund 477 Water Quality Protection, amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds in connection with the H. F. Corwin and Son's Agricultural Waste Storage Facility System (CP 8240.337).*** Motion by Legislator Krupski, second by Legislator Fleming, to take out of order. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:

Seventeen. *(Not Present: Legislator Lindsay)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Krupski, second by Legislator Fleming, to approve. The motion is before us. Anyone on the motion? Legislator Krupski.

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah, on the motion.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I make a motion to approve.

P.O. GREGORY:

I did. I did it for you already.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. I'm sorry.

LEG. CILMI:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

On the motion, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

I'm not sure if the owner of the duck farm is still here?

P.O. GREGORY:

He walked in. There he is. There you are.

LEG. CILMI:

May I, through the Chair, just ask him a couple of questions?

P.O. GREGORY:

Only if he makes you smell the plant with all the feces like I had to go through --

LEG. CILMI:

Why would you -- why wouldn't you say only if he makes you have some of the duck that -- because I did a couple of weeks ago. It was delicious.

(*Laughter*)

I love duck. Anyway, I don't like spending a lot of money, though, so there's that.

LEG. HAHN:

But it's 477.

LEG. CILMI:

Well, listen, I know it's 477.

LEG. HAHN:

It's restricted.

LEG. CILMI:

I know it's restricted, but here's the problem. So this is a quarter of a million dollars, right, \$250,000, and we are contributing to -- hi, Sarah.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Hi.

LEG. CILMI:

We are contributing to the construction of this agricultural waste storage facility system; correct?

MR. CORWIN:

Correct.

LEG. CILMI:

What is the total cost of this system?

MR. CORWIN:

Minimum of 600,000, probably more --

LEG. CILMI:

Microphone, please. You said 750,000 or something?

MR. CORWIN:

Minimum of 600, probably more like 700,000 by the time we get done with it.

LEG. CILMI:

Now once -- if we pay for a portion of this, do we have partial ownership in it? Or is it yours?

MR. CORWIN:

Not that I'm aware of.

LEG. CILMI:

So we would just be basically giving you --

MR. CORWIN:

A grant.

LEG. CILMI:

A grant for \$250,000 to construct this which would, granted, help our environment, but also help your business.

MR. CORWIN:

That is true.

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah. Where is the rest of the money coming from, your own personal -- your business?

MR. CORWIN:

My own savings.

LEG. CILMI:

Your own savings. Is there any potential here for other revenue for your -- for your farm?

MR. CORWIN:

We --

LEG. CILMI:

You know, could you take waste from other facilities, for example?

MR. CORWIN:

I tend to doubt it given the amount of waste that we generate on a daily basis that Sharon documented earlier. I don't think that I'm going to have room in this facility to generate anything more than -- thank you. I don't think there's going to be any room in this facility to take any more waste on. I mean, I don't know if we're going to realize that until we --

LEG. CILMI:

So it's not your intention to do that.

MR. CORWIN:

It's not our intention.

LEG. CILMI:

But theoretically that -- God bless you -- theoretically you could.

Is there anything -- would there be anything in a contract -- I'm not sure if this is a question for you or for Ms. Lansdale. I assume that this would be done contractually. Let the record show that Sarah Lansdale is nodding yes. *(Laughter)*.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

May I answer that question more directly?

LEG. CILMI:

Sure, please.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

So if you look at the 9th Resolved Clause in this resolution, it directs that -- it resolves that the funding is specifically going to the Suffolk County Soil and Water Conservation District, who then is in turn providing funding to this private individual, similar to what we've done in the past with 477 programming, just to clarify that in other instances. And I can provide those examples if you need that.

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

LEG. CILMI:

So do we -- does the County have any jurisdiction over the contract between the Soil & Water Conservation District and Mr. Corwin?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes, two of the Legislators sit on the board.

LEG. CILMI:

Well, but that doesn't mean the Legislature has any jurisdiction over it, right? I mean, you're part of the board --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

-- and somebody else is part of the board. How many members are on the board?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Five members. So we have oversight over all these projects that go through.

LEG. CILMI:

You as Legislators do, but only you as Legislators do and not the full Legislature.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

So is it possible to -- and I'm not sure that this, you know, sways my opinion one way or the other, but is it possible to require that any contract between the Soil and Water Conservation District and Mr. Corwin includes a clause that precludes the use of the facility to make money in other ways such as, you know, selling the services to other farmers or anyone else who would produce waste?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I could ask Sharon Frost if there's any precedent for that. It seems unlikely in that someone would transport their waste over the roads to this facility to use it; for some reason, it's just kind of an awkward --

LEG. CILMI:

Not practical?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No, no. You've got to process it. You know, New York State has laws, CAFO laws, concentrated feed operation laws that govern animal waste over a certain number of animals. And transporting that waste over distances is really cost prohibited. It's really not -- you know, because animals produce waste every day, so it's not like they made it one day and you've got a pile and you can move it and you're done for a while. You need to really process your waste on a continuous basis.

LEG. CILMI:

Right. So we have -- that brings me to another question, actually, Legislator Krupski. So we have other farms in Suffolk County that raise wildlife of different sorts.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Not wildlife, domestic animals.

LEG. CILMI:

All right, domestic animals; sorry.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Leave the deer out of this.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. CILMI:

All right, I'll leave the deer out. Life of different sorts, be it wild or otherwise. What do they do with their waste?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

If they produce large enough amounts, they'd have to be regulated. Mr. Corwin's operation is the only one that I'm aware of that produces waste in this sort of generous amounts.

MR. CORWIN:

Yeah, I'm not aware of any animal agriculture left on the Island that comes anywhere near the scope of what we do.

LEG. CILMI:

After I had your duck, I was out in a -- drove past the bison place; not enough waste?

MR. CORWIN:

No, no.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

They're on pasture, so that waste is distributed throughout the --

LEG. CILMI:

Oh, waste stays in the field and it doesn't contaminate the drinking water as duck waste would?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No. If the pasture is managed properly, there's also -- Russ McCall has steers in Cutchogue and 8 Hands Farm has pigs on pasture and about -- oh gosh, they have to have at least a hundred sheep there, maybe more. But it's all on pasture and they move them throughout the pasture, so they graze it to a certain amount. And the idea of that is the waste is distributed, you don't have to mechanically clean the barn, move the waste out or store it and then move the waste out. The waste is distributed by the animals as they graze, then you move them. Well, usually it's an electric fence, you move the electric fence over and that area regenerates itself. You don't have to actually -- you know, pasture management is like -- it's a science.

LEG. CILMI:

The things you never thought you would learn as a County Legislator. So thank you for that explanation. How does that differ, Mr. Corwin, from the way you manage currently your waste?

MR. CORWIN:

Given the parameters of the Clean Water Act and nitrogen in this County, we -- other than this one instance of storing our excess solid waste, we keep everything over on concreted floors, through septic systems through a waste treatment plant. What we're doing here is taking the one last

contaminant that we have with soil and putting it on an impervious surface to help protect this Peconic Bay Estuary System.

LEG. CILMI:

I'm sorry, I'm not sure if it's that I can't hear you or if I didn't understand. So what do you -- I mean, you've been in existence for how many years, a hundred?

MR. CORWIN:

1908.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay, so 1908; a hundred plus years. What have you been doing with your waste all these many years?

MR. CORWIN:

Well, up until the 60s this was just a traditional duck farm that had them on pasture lands with --

LEG. CILMI:

So you didn't really pay attention.

MR. CORWIN:

We had lagoons and we had manure separations, but starting then we realized we couldn't meet the parameters of the Clean Water Act, we started learning how to grow ducks inside on concreted floors, on raised, vinyl plastic floors where the excrement goes down below onto a concrete surface, it's flushed out daily or so into a septic system that we built. But then we still have the situation of dealing with the solid waste that the ducks make, and we make an awful lot of it. Right now we store it on land until we can put it off on farmlands out in the distance, which --

LEG. CILMI:

All right, so you're storing it now, the solid waste you're storing now --

MR. CORWIN:

Correct.

LEG. CILMI:

-- until you develop enough of it. And then what are you doing with it?

MR. CORWIN:

Well, we send it off to vegetable farms or to nurseries --

LEG. CILMI:

Who are using it for fertilizer.

MR. CORWIN:

Correct.

LEG. CILMI:

And is there a cost associated with that?

MR. CORWIN:

There is a cost associated with that.

LEG. CILMI:

What kind of numbers are we talking about?

MR. CORWIN:

I -- I make approximately 40 yards of waste a day. So to truck that off, 500 to a thousand dollars a week to truck that away.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

MR. CORWIN:

Sometimes we can get some revenue back from some farmers for our trucking, but that's about it.

LEG. CILMI:

Five hundred to a thousand a week, so between 25 and \$50,000 or so a year.

MR. CORWIN:

To truck the solid waste off to local North Fork farmers, yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Right. And are they paying you for that?

MR. CORWIN:

Some that are a far distance away will pay us our trucking, but it's nominal.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

MR. RICHBERG:

Come closer.

MR. CORWIN:

Come closer?

LEG. CILMI:

And with this system, if it's constructed, then what happens?

MR. CORWIN:

With this system we can store manure, we can take it properly at the right times of the year to farmers. We will not have any contact with rain water which is going to start -- presently right now leaching stuff into the ground, which is the main key is to not have that nitrogen infusion that we get from storing solid waste outside right now. That's the major difference. This is going to be an 8-inch floor, a 10-inch wall, a totally covered, totally enclosed; kind of like a salt storage that's totally enclosed, like a big hoop building.

LEG. CILMI:

(Laughter).

MR. CORWIN:

Well, it is. It's a big, circular building.

LEG. CILMI:

Right, right.

MR. CORWIN:

And we can manage this stuff inside until its proper time to put it outside without having to worry about rain water collecting on it, which is a problem of nitrogen leaching in our area.

LEG. CILMI:

Right. So currently you're storing it all outdoors.

MR. CORWIN:

Correct.

LEG. CILMI:

It's subject to the elements.

MR. CORWIN:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

And this will allow you to protect it from the elements and then distribute it, as you said, when it's appropriate.

MR. CORWIN:

Correct.

LEG. CILMI:

And I suspect that if we weren't kicking in a quarter of a million dollars here, you'd be an unable to do this?

MR. CORWIN:

I would not -- I would try to do the best I can, but I wouldn't be able to put up this type of structure.

LEG. CILMI:

Is anyone forcing you to do this at this point, or is this something that you just are doing out of your concern for the environment and your business?

MR. CORWIN:

It has been recommended that I do it.

LEG. CILMI:

By whom?

MR. CORWIN:

Well, our DEC planners recommended it. I talked with the waste water people at Stony Brook and they highly recommended it.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

MR. CORWIN:

We're trying to be ahead of the curve instead of all of a sudden having an order of consent forcing us basically towards the end of our business.

LEG. CILMI:

And believe me, I really do appreciate that. It's -- the red flag for me is that we're spending a quarter of a million dollars on somebody's private business, and that presents a problem for me that I have to somehow try and overcome in my questioning here, and I'm not sure that I'll get there but I'm making an effort. So maybe Sarah and -- I'm sorry.

MS. FROST:

Sharon Frost.

LEG. CILMI:

Sharon could elaborate a little bit on this project and the need to do this. Not so much the need from an environmental stewardship point of view because I get that, but if Mr. Corwin is being, you know, forced to do this in some way by, you know, some regulatory agency or something.

MS. FROST:

Well -- my name is Sharon Frost, I work for the Suffolk County Soil & Water Conservation District. I developed the Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan for the Corwin Duck Farm, and it was given to the New York State DEC last April. It's a current conservation plan.

In the plan, this was one of the recommendations. My office administers -- writes grants and administers millions of dollars in grants for conservation projects for farmers all over Suffolk County. In the last 15 years, we're talking maybe six or \$7 million in grant money through the State and Federal funded -- funding. It is a common practice throughout New York State to do this type of thing. We -- we use USDA/NRCS standards and specifications. This project is highly recommended by the State, the New York State DEC. It will -- it will keep 50% of the nitrogen that is generated from the duck farm from leaching into the drinking water and the Peconic Estuary. This is something that is commonly done throughout the State. So --

LEG. CILMI:

Well, that may be, but our State is not in the best of fiscal situations, nor is the County for that matter, so.

MS. FROST:

Yeah, but --

LEG. CILMI:

What's commonly done may not be in our best interest.

MS. FROST:

And neither is our drinking water, and protecting it is one of the reasons why --

LEG. CILMI:

Agreed.

MS. FROST:

-- this fund was set up.

LEG. CILMI:

So you mentioned that this would reduce by 50%.

MS. FROST:

Okay, so the duck farm produces one million ducks a year. The ducks produce approximately half a pound of manure a day. In that manure, there is .03 pounds of nitrogen. So we're talking 50,000 pounds of manure daily, and that's -- that comes out to 3,750 pounds of nitrogen a day. You split

that in half, because Mr. Corwin has a treatment facility for the liquid fertilizer, and this -- this facility will only handle the dry manure. That dry manure will be handled by this ag storage facility. Right now that dry manure is being stored on bare ground, either by being trucked off-site or on Mr. Corwin's --

LEG. CILMI:

What proportion of the overall nitrogen problem in Peconic Estuary does the duck farm represent? In other words, you said we would reduce it by 50% of the waste that's generated on the duck farm. What does that represent in terms of the overall problem in the Peconic?

MS. FROST:

It's been documented in the Peconic Estuary Program documentation, it's been documented in all kinds of reports. I don't -- I'm not sure. Do you know that information?

LEG. CILMI:

I mean, would we reduce the nitrogen by 2%, 3%, 10%, 20%? What's your best guess?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

So overall, nitrogen from agriculture into the Peconic Estuary on a whole using a blended rate throughout the Peconic Estuary, is approximately 16% of agriculture contributes to the total nitrogen load. The balance then is cesspools and septic systems, as well as atmospheric deposition. But --

LEG. CILMI:

So agriculture contributes 16% of the overall nitrogen load in that area.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

And of that 16%, what portion comes from Corwin's?

MS. FROST:

I would say probably most of it. I don't know the exact number, but I would say probably most of it.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So one last question, maybe this would be for Sarah. Differentiate this for me, if you can, between between X, Y, Z electronics manufacturing that assembles components and circuit boards and uses some sort of a cleaner to clean the resin from the circuit boards and the County saying, *You know what? We don't want the resin to be -- you know, to end up in our wastewater system, so we're going to give you a quarter of a million dollars to install some sort of a new-fangled, you know, system that would prevent that from happening.* How does this differ from that?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

This differs in a couple of ways. One is that the private farmer did not apply specifically for this funding. This funding application came through the Soil & Water Conservation District which, again, has members of the Legislature on its Board of Advisors, so that's one difference.

This is also consistent with a number of County initiatives in terms of the 2015 Suffolk County Comprehensive Water Resources Management Plan where there's a specific strategy that states that the County should encourage farmers from adopting agricultural and environmental management best practices.

Third, we've already set a precedent within the County providing funding for individuals and using non-profit entities that we work with as that vehicle. For instance, we provide funding through Cornell Cooperative Extension, and then in turn they provide funding for farmers through the Agricultural Stewardship Program, for instance, where the County provides 235,000 annually so that farmers can upgrade their on-farm practices.

We also provide -- again, to Cornell -- 118,000 for alternative strategies for nursery growers, and 289,000 to Cornell for their Bay Scallops Program which seeds bay scallops which clean the water and then that goes into private hands. And historically, we provided funding through The Nature Conservancy to seed the Great South Bay, the clams for 500,000. So there are a couple of examples of the County providing funding to non-profits who then in turn, through their work, you know, with plans in place, provide financial support to private individuals.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. I'm not sure that I really see the distinction. I understand procedurally the distinction. We don't have a manufacturing conservation district, maybe we should. Some would argue maybe the IDA is a manufacturing conservation district, in effect, but it's a little bit different. And I know a lot of my colleagues here, I hear them saying all this is 477 money, but my understanding is that our 477 money is a stressed source at this point. I mean, we -- we're not -- we're spending a lot of that money on debt service at this point. You know, we all would like to preserve more land with that fund, we'd all like to protect our drinking water more with that fund. We're making some payroll -- we're paying for some payroll functions out of that fund.

So anyway, you've answered all of my questions. I'm not sure if I'm satisfied, but I appreciate the answers.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I guess the concern that I have, this is a private business and we're about to give him \$250,000, regardless of the intermediaries being used. Let me ask you a question. You talked about the State of New York and the Federal government, they have a history of grants and promotions; has anybody made a grant to the State of New York or to the Federal government for grant monies for his particular situation?

MS. FROST:

Yes, we have. In -- what year was that where it was upgraded?

MR. CORWIN:

In 2003.

MS. FROST:

In 2003 Mr. Corwin received a New York State grant for -- \$250,000, was it?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Well, I'm talking about now.

MS. FROST:

No, not for this particular project.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No attempt has been made by Mr. Corwin or someone else in your agency to fill out applications for

grant money for his particular situation, before coming into us and asking us for 250,000?

MS. FROST:

No, we have not.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Why haven't you?

MS. FROST:

Because this opportunity came up and we felt that it was a good fit for Mr. Corwin to reduce the nitrogen.

LEG. BARRAGA:

When you say opportunity, it's \$700,000. Obviously, Mr. Corwin --

MS. FROST:

No, it's \$250,000. The project is 700.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I know, but the project, I'm told, in total is about 700,000. Mr. Corwin's able to raise 450, he's short 250, that's why you're here. Okay.

MS. FROST:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I'm also going to ask him. I'm sure being in business for almost -- better than a century, he has lines of credits with banks. Has he approached any of the banks for the 250,000 that he needs to complete this facility?

MR. CORWIN:

At this point in time, no. But the major reason for that is I have another huge project that I'm working on with the DEC for my wastewater plant with --

LEG. BARRAGA:

See, I guess the point I'm making is that I think before you come in here and ask for \$250,000, you should exhaust all other sources of possible income; in your case, banks. In your case, maybe the State of New York and the Federal Government. If there's applications and possible grant money, proceed to do that. We should be the last resort, not the first resort. You haven't approached the banks and you haven't approached the State, you haven't approached the Federal government, but you're in here for 250,000. Is that pretty much it?

MR. CORWIN:

I --

LEG. BARRAGA:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Hi, Mr. Corwin. I was looking on Google Maps and there is a water body to the -- I don't know how to explain it. To the right of --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

South.

LEG. KENNEDY:

To the south? Okay. To the south of your facility?

MR. CORWIN:

Correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:

What is that?

MR. CORWIN:

Meeting House Creek.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Are there any other swamp lands within your property or any other --

MR. CORWIN:

Meeting House Creek, the headland splits through our property. We constructed six acres of artificial wetlands that we use for waste treatment in a program with the Peconic Estuary plan that actually are on the property, which you can see very clearly from Google Maps if you look overhead.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Let me ask a question of Sarah. Do we actually have this 250 in 477 money, or will we be bonding out for it?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

We have this money in 477. This would not be the enhanced money, this would be money that we have in hand.

LEG. KENNEDY:

The money that you have on hand; is that what you said?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes.

MR. NOLAN:

It's cash.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

It's cash.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Maybe Mr. Lipp could confirm that.

MR. LIPP:

Yes, that's accurate. That Water Quality monies are basically all cash, they're not borrowed monies.

LEG. KENNEDY:

You are the last duck farm on all of Long Island. We do have to preserve our businesses and our farms as best as we can. I will tell you what the difficulty with the people that are speaking right now is, if we do for you we're going to have to do for everybody else that comes down the line.

I don't know why the County of Suffolk got rid of all their grant writers, but there are grants that are out there. I don't know if this year they can be written to get that kind of money and that kind of funding. But you are entitled to 477 because of the amount of reduction that you do, so that's why it's such a tough decision.

But thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. So first of all, when it comes to -- and I understand my colleagues are concerned that this would be money that would be spent on a private endeavor, but this is certainly not without precedent. And I was kind of surprised when I started here at the amount of County taxpayer money that subsidizes all this housing throughout the County. I mean, there's a great deal of housing that's subsidized, there's a lot of projects that go on, and it's pretty steady that comes through here. But if you look at the seal behind our Presiding Officer there, it's not a bulldozer and it's not a sewer pipe, right, it's a plow. And this money is a dedicated fund, 477 Fund, what little that's left, it has been poached for salaries.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Right.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

It's a dedicated source to improve water quality. And this is a project that went through the Water Quality Review Committee and that passed muster there. I don't sit on that, right; it passed muster there, I attended the meetings. And this is a project that's being coordinated with not only Suffolk County Soil & Water, but New York State DEC. So this isn't some slipshod operation. The money is going to be dedicated, it's going to be used properly. So I would say that there's great precedent for using public money for private projects; I mean, this isn't -- this isn't new at all. And I would like to ask Director Lansdale about the RCPP, please.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Sure.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

If you could clarify that.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yep. Just today we submitted, as a County, a grant application to the USDA through -- which is called the Regional Conservation Partnership Program, and that's specifically to attract more funding and do more projects like this and others in partnership with the Soil & Water Conservation District, Cornell Cooperative Extension and the Farm Bureau and many others. What was allocated for New York State, you know, several billion were allocated -- was allocated, it's a Federal program, and New York State was allocated 1.3 million out of the billions allocated Federally. So we submitted last night, around 1 AM this morning, a grant application to request \$1.3 million in funding to do just

this, and other projects like this.

P.O. GREGORY:

I just want to chime in. I agree with Legislator Krupski. I had the pleasure of going out to Doug's farm I guess, what, a week ago, two weeks ago? And very much enjoyed the visit, it was very much an informative visit and he's been around serving Suffolk County -- not even Suffolk County, I mean, you have clients in other countries and across the country. You are the last remaining duck farm in Suffolk County and it's very much a family-run business. This is a gentleman who works 80+ hours a week. I met his two sons, Frank and Beau?

MR. CORWIN:

Close enough.

P.O. GREGORY:

They're part-timers, they work 60 hours a week. You know, I mean, this is what, you know, Long Island is about and our rural community and our farm community is about. And they're very heavily regulated, Federal, State, County, and many of those regulations, from my conversations with Doug, have, you know, I won't say forced, but have made people decide not to be in this business any longer, and he's trying to do the right thing. He's trying to do the right thing. This is a grant program, we have the monies available for this specific purpose. If you go here he had -- I don't know what you call them, but probably about just as wide as this room, big -- I keep calling it a drum, but it's much larger than a drum. Two of them that, you know, how they handle the nitrogen. I mean, it's a very, very, very sophisticated operation. You employ, I want to say, what is it, 80 something employees?

MR. CORWIN:

Eighty-four, yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Eighty-four employees. I mean, this is -- you know, this won't certainly pay for all the work that has to be done, but it certainly will help contribute and make sure that it gets done and it does the right thing -- it won't cause -- it won't add to the nitrogen problem and there will actually be a solution to the problem that we're trying to address as a County initiative.

So I fully support it and I think it's, you know -- they're trying to do the responsible thing and they have done the responsible thing and want to continue to do so. So Legislator Spencer, I have a long list still, and then Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. SPENCER:

I fully support the concept, and I think that I'm trying to balance between understanding maybe the distinction between this situation where we have a business, which, really, God bless you for your family and what you've done. And I feel that we should try to find as many resources for you as possible. Help me distinguish, though, for instance, like when the gas stations, they came under additional regulations. So a guy that's a gas station owner and he's told that he's got to take the tanks out of the ground and spend a certain amount of money to do that, and by doing that it protects the water. What's the distinction that that private gas station owner or person that owns a hotel that's trying to put in a septic treatment -- and I may not be directing it for you, maybe towards just even, Legislator Krupski even -- as far as distinguishing like one small business from another small business that's doing a water quality project. Because I'm looking for every way possible to support this. Why isn't there a precedent that's being set for any person that's in business that needs to make an improvement for water quality?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Sure, sure. I mean --

LEG. SPENCER:

They're just as deserving and we couldn't do this for everybody.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Sure. So you're comparing the Corwin Duck Farm with Exxon Mobile, though. I mean, that's a big distinction. I mean, here's a family operation that employs 82 people.

LEG. SPENCER:

I'm talking about --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

You're talking about gas stations, you know, BP.

LEG. SPENCER:

No, I'm talking about someone like a gasoline retailer, a person that owns a gas station. They get the New State regulations that say, *You've got to get those tanks out of the ground. You've got to comply with these new standards.* And I've probably seen maybe 80 gas stations close down because of those new standards.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

You just made the point; all the independent gas stations went out of business.

LEG. SPENCER:

Sure, sure. So if they got in line and came here to Suffolk County, would we be just as obligated to give them that percentage or to support them?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

It's like I said, we subsidize a lot of private businesses here. So, you know, we subsidize all that affordable housing. Those are all subsidies to companies making a lot of money.

LEG. SPENCER:

I agree with you. I agree with you and I don't want --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Nobody bats an eye.

LEG. SPENCER:

No, no. We do. I think for me, when you give the housing example where we talk about families and trying to give them affordable housing, which is kind of our justification for being able to do that because of just the high cost of living and people that wouldn't have a place to stay. I just need precedent, and I'm getting there. I'm not saying -- I'm not debating against you, I'm actually trying to work towards you. So without -- and you can just decline to answer this question and I would understand. In your business, how profitable -- what's your profit margin in what you do? That may help. I mean, is it --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Ask Dr. Lipp.

MR. CORWIN:

That's going to tell me, based on how well I can hash out ducks and how well I can make them live and what the corn price is going to be on a given year and what I can get to market; we've survived. We've done okay. But to ask me what it is in a given year; you could lose money two or three years in a row in this business and then make it back two or three years. It's farming; farming, there's no guaranteed profit or profit margin. I compete against big farmers out in the mid-west, unfortunately they've out-competed everybody else that's on Long Island or else there would be a duck industry still here. Would I -- I guess my boys came into it, but I don't know if I'd really recommend people to go into the duck business to make money.

LEG. SPENCER:

I feel that this is really -- what you said is inspiring with the plow that's there trying to preserve this business and what we're doing, I'm doing everything possible to work towards it. I just want a standard of fairness where we talk about our economic difficulty, our limited 477 Fund. And although this is a legitimate case, that if there was a line around the block of businesses that were making water quality arguments for this type of support, who would we say no to or who would we say yes, or is it just going to be kind of first-come-first-serve? And as long as I have a consistent, fair way of -- to myself being able to vote for these things, then I'm fine. But if it's not, I just need to -- is it somewhat because of the financial distress? Is it because of the farming? Is it -- because there's a lot of water quality issues and small businesses that need money to do these types of things.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

It's actually -- and thank you for that concern, because it is both; it is the water quality thing, but it is also agriculture. And it's not just a heritage of agriculture, it's actually, you know, meaningful employment for a lot of people, but it's also food production. And if you look how our food production is being outsourced now nationally, you go to the store now, look where your food is coming from. This is serious. We have the best land here and a great climate, and someday it's going to be very important to produce food on Long Island for these millions of people that live here. So we really do need to take it serious and keep -- because agriculture is a business and once you lose it, it's really hard to go back into that because you need that base of experience.

LEG. SPENCER:

I think you may have tossed me a lifeline. Thank you. *(Laughter)*.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Fleming.

LEG. FLEMING:

Thank you. Yes, just -- I can't really say it better than Al, but I just --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Wait, I thought I was next.

LEG. FLEMING:

-- in response to Legislator Kennedy and Legislator Spencer, this concern that there are other businesses that could also compete. And we have to bear in mind, this is the very last of a once-thriving part of the Suffolk County agricultural industry that, as Al said, provided food. I mean, this farm has held on despite the fact that water quality contamination was one of the things that killed off a lot of the duck farms on Eastern Long Island. So this is a perfect solution to the very problem that caused the demise of this extremely important part of our agriculture. The Corwin Farm produces, what did you say, 4% of ducks --

MR. CORWIN:

That's correct.

LEG. FLEMING:

-- nationwide. Four percent, right here in Suffolk County from one farm, when we used to, you know, produce so much more. So I don't think we have the opportunity to have people lining up around the block or to have to respond to everybody who comes because he's the only game in town, and I think we have an obligation to keep that part of our ag industry alive. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I appreciate the sense of nostalgia going around the horseshoe here. I yearn for the Mom and Pop hardware store, too --

LEG. FLEMING:

It's food, Lou.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- but they're never coming back. So I have a couple of questions about this. My first question is to Director Lansdale. Can you give me an example of where the County has provided substantial funding to a private business to bail it out of DEC compliance with a potential consent order?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

No.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No, okay. My question to Counsel; is this a gift of public funds, in your opinion?

MR. NOLAN:

You know, if John Kennedy was here, he would have asked me that about an hour ago.

*(*Laughter*)*

I would say just two things. First, that this type of project, if you look at the Drinking Water Protection Program and the water quality component, this type of project is pretty expressly contemplated. Beyond that, you have to do a gift analysis, and to me it really comes down to is there -- you weigh the public benefit. And there can be a private benefit in an expenditure of public monies that's incidental to that, so that's the analysis the Legislature has to make. Do they think that the public benefit is such that it's so great that they want to make the investment? Mr. Corwin may benefit incidentally from that, but if it's a substantial and significant public benefit to the investment, then I think it withstands that analysis.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So the only test for whether or not use of public funds constitutes a gift is if there's a public benefit?

MR. NOLAN:

That's generally --

LEG. D'AMARO:

I mean, I think you could make an argument there is always a public benefit, always.

MR. NOLAN:

Well --

LEG. D'AMARO:

So it has to be something a little more than that.

MR. NOLAN:

Well, I think the key is that, you know, the private benefit is incidental to the public benefit. So I think it has to be a very substantial public benefit. That's generally the test, from my recollection of when you do a gift analysis.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It would appear that the public benefit is incidental and the private benefit is going to keep this gentleman in business, according to his own testimony. Well, but that's for us to decide.

MR. NOLAN:

That's for you to decide, yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay, fair enough. I'm troubled by this, because -- and again, to Director Lansdale, who else was given the opportunity to apply for this grant? I heard the word grant used. And what were the criteria for it? Who was notified that it was available?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Sure.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You know, how did that come about?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

So this is the 477 Water Quality Grant Program the County administers using 477 funding. All municipalities, towns, villages, as well as non-profits, were sent electronically the call for funding availability.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right, but did you get any applicants that were also for-profit businesses? When you send that notification out to the towns and villages, what's the expectation? What type of response are we looking for?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

We received grant applications to improve water quality in specific bays, we received grant applications from non-profits like -- non-profit organizations like the Soil & Water Conservation District and others.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. So if we're going to provide some of the funding, are we going to share in the profits here?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I don't believe so.

LEG. D'AMARO:

We're not. See, the non-profits are serving -- their charter and their mission statement is very different than a for-profit business, and I don't know that the County should take on the habit of --

and Sarah, this is nothing against you, we're just talking on a government level -- of subsidizing a for-profit business. I mean, the DEC has laws, this gentleman has to comply with those laws, as does every other business. There are literally thousands of other businesses every single year that receive orders from the DEC for compliance for groundwater protection. We don't subsidize them. What we do subsidize are not-for-profit organizations that have a very different mission. It's not -- profit is not the reason they're in business. If this gentleman wasn't making a profit he wouldn't be here, he could care less about duck farming. If he's not making a profit, he wouldn't do it; at least I know I wouldn't.

These not-for-profits exist because they're not making a profit, what they're doing is they're fulfilling their mission statement, whether it's groundwater protection or protecting battered women. So we're now changing gears. We're now saying we're going to single out -- we're going to have the ability to pick and choose which business that makes a profit, we're going to subsidize you, we're going to make an investment in your company, because there's a valid public purpose, right? But we're not sharing in that profit. I'm making an investment here. I mean, whether or not I make this subsidy or not, this person has to comply with the State law, right? Either way.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. So, you know how many business owners every year face the decision, do I go out of business or do I comply? I mean, I'm sure it happens all time. I mean, I certainly know, I represent clients that have to deal with that decision, and usually they comply because they're making a profit. And this gentleman probably knew this day was a long time coming, he has to make a business decision. And I just don't see how we, because some water quality board decided that, *yeah, let's single this guy out because it's the last duck farm on Long Island*, I don't really see that as a distinction. Tell that to the 50 other businesses that are going to go out of business in the next three months because they didn't get \$250,000 from the County. How is this fair?

You know, I want business to thrive, I want to keep the jobs, I want to do all of that, but I would expect that when the State enacted this legislation requiring this type of upgrade, that they were very cognizant of the fact that there's going to be a cost of compliance. That's all factored into the cost of doing business in New York. And we can debate whether that's too high or all of that, but that's not the purpose of today. The purpose of today is that we are singling out one particular business to give them a quarter of a million dollars for-profit company so they can comply with their State DEC regulations. I think that is patently unfair to every other business owner in this County. And I don't see how we come up with this stuff, frankly.

You know, I don't have a valid public purpose of keeping this particular farm in business, I don't, I really don't. It just doesn't seem fair to me that we are now creating a grant program for private business out of our 477 Fund; that was never the intention of this money, ever. This money was supposed to go either to not-for-profits or direct County programs or even personnel in order to fund water quality improvement that benefits everybody. This is creating a tremendous benefit to a business owner that no other business owner is going to get that benefit, and I don't think that's fair.

So, you know, I understand the concern from my colleagues about preserving the duck farm like we preserve the farmers, we subsidize them hundreds of millions of dollars, hundreds of millions of dollars for an industry that can't support itself. I mean, it's just a bottomless pit of money. Now we're going to go for the for-profits, now we're going to pivot and we're going to provide this funding for for-profit business. You know what? I have ten more for-profit businesses that want a quarter of a million dollars and I'm giving them your phone number. You explain to them why one business

gets it and another one does not. I just don't think that's appropriate. You know, let's stick to a government function here. It is not our job to subsidize a private business that comes along and needs help with State DEC compliance, it's not what we do. It's just not what we do.

And I can't think of any instance where we have, frankly. I just can't. There's not -- this is setting a very dangerous precedent, in my opinion. And I wish you, sir, the best of luck in business and I want you to succeed in business, and maybe the laws need to be changed. But, you know, what we're doing is we're doing an end-run around a law. The State enacted very tough legislation that probably requires you to do very costly upgrades and I sympathize with that, but that's the public purpose. And then it's up to business to figure out how to pay for that or if they even have a viable business in this County anymore. So that's all I have to say. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:
Thank you. Is the grant a payment or is it a reimbursement? And what is the timing on that? If this was approved, when is that appropriation made and what is the process for that?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:
It's a grant. It's specifically to a not-for-profit, the Soil & Water Conservation District, who will then provide that funding to Mr. Corwin, if approved by the Legislature. The grant -- the terms of the grant would be for three years, and there would be a negotiation on what the terms of that -- would it be a reimbursement or a direct grant, and those terms would have to be negotiated if this -- if the Legislature approves this.

LEG. STERN:
What would be the incentive on Mr. Corwin's part to take it as a reimbursement rather than a grant? I don't see where the negotiation is on that and what the consideration would be for that element of it. He either makes the investment and gets reimbursement or he does not.

MS. FROST:
We did begin working out the contract, we've done this many times. The Ag storage facility would have to be completed and then reimbursement would be made. And I believe that we agreed on two years, on a two-year completion, so it would have to be completely built and then Mr. Corwin would be reimbursed. And it would have to be built to the standards, you know, an engineer would come down and approve the --

LEG. STERN:
What is the relationship between the two-year period that you just mentioned and the three years that he has the ability to do the project?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:
The three years is specifically mentioned in the resolution. So obviously there needs to be an update to the resolution.

LEG. STERN:
What is the result of that? It is a two-year, then, not a three-year?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:
That's right.

LEG. STERN:

How many employees did you say are there?

MR. CORWIN:

Eighty-four.

LEG. STERN:

Are they full-time, year-round?

MR. CORWIN:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

For me, I mean, a big part of the conversation here is public versus private, it is profit versus for-profit; those are all important elements. But with any water quality protection project, like open space and like farmland preservation, it comes down to priority. And so I would be interested to know, forgetting the fact that there's a heritage issue and there's a particular industry issue, there's a farmland issue; explain to me, then, given the amount of pounds -- however you measure that in terms of time, whether that is per day, per week, per year -- of nitrogen that this project will keep out of our waterways and protect the quality of the water that we drink. Give me an idea as to what the scale or the impact of this grant and this project would be. Where does it rate, where does it rank based on the other expenditures, the other appropriations that this Legislature makes to protect the quality of our water?

MS. FROST:

I'm sorry, I don't know exactly what you asked.

LEG. STERN:

Out of our 477 Fund we are making investments all the time. Where would you say this project ranks in terms of the 477 funding projects that we make? Is it big? Is it monster? Is it not ultimately, after all of this discussion, is it going to have that kind of an impact? Going forward, if we're going to make this investment, what kind of a benefit are we and our taxpayers going to receive back?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

So we received close to two dozen applications through -- that was considered at the October 477 Water Quality meeting and we recommended advancing a little more than half of them for the Legislature's review, and had a lot of discussion around many of the applications, if not -- actually, we've had discussion about all of the applications, and I would say that this is the significant -- one of the most significant investments that we can make. Meeting House Creek is one of the most impaired sub-watersheds in the Peconic Estuary and we know that agriculture contributes more than 50% of the nitrogen load specifically in that sub-watershed. So this will make, in the committee's decision, a significant impact.

LEG. STERN:

And knowing the history of the 477 and the projects that we fund and the dollar amounts that are allocated towards those projects, you are saying that this would be considered a substantial project with a substantial benefit.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

That's right. That's right. And we have provided funding for Cornell Cooperative Extension in the amount of -- for instance, their bay scallop program for 289,000, and that also benefits private individuals in the future.

LEG. STERN:

Are there -- in the 477 Fund and going through this process now, are there similar projects that are being considered for similar appropriation amounts?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

There are, I'd have to just look at my notes and see. Give me a minute and I'll go back and look it up.

LEG. STERN:

I'd be interested to get a comparison.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Sure.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Trotta.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No, I'm not Trotta.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. TROTТА:

What happens if, you know, we do this and two years from now they sell the duck farm?

MR. CORWIN:

I have no idea why I would want to even do this if I had any interest in selling a duck farm. I mean, this is my life. We've had this land since the 1600s. We've grown ducks since --

LEG. TROTТА:

Listen, I would give you all the money, you know, in a perfect world, but I understand the philosophy here. I mean, if we're investing money in a private business, I have hundreds in my own Legislative District, you know, in the Hauppauge Industrial Park or in that area where they have to meet DEC stuff and they've got to put filters on and cesspools in and catch ponds in and I'm not giving them \$250,000.

MR. CORWIN:

I think you asked a question that was very valid. And yes, if I sold the business, is that a -- would I even be here right now if I had any intentions of selling?

LEG. TROTТА:

No, but people don't know what happens in life. I mean, is there any --

MR. CORWIN:

When we built our waste treatment plant, Presiding Officer, sir, we poured 160 loads of concrete, two tractor trailer loads of rebar. We poured 160 loads of concrete and two tractor trailer loads of rebar, we -- this isn't something that --

LEG. TROTТА:

You're not going anywhere.

MR. CORWIN:

We're not going anywhere.

LEG. TROTTA:

To Sarah; is there any criteria for this money? Is there any kind of like, you know, I don't want to say contract or something like, *Hey, you have to do this for a couple of years or you've got to pay it back*; is there anything like that in there? Because I've got to tell you, it would be easier to swallow if there were something in there where they've got to farm ducks for ten years or something.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

He's indicated that, you know, we could add that into the draft contract.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Anker.

LEG. STERN:

Can she first answer the question?

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, okay. I thought you finished.

LEG. STERN:

We still have an open question to the Director. You were giving some information.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes, I was. So before you tonight there are some other projects. For instance, we are looking to amend a resolution that was approved by the Legislature back in 2010 where we provided \$500,000 in grant funding to the Town of Southampton for the Reeves Bay Watershed Water Quality Improvement Project, for instance. And then we have another resolution for your consideration today that was also recommended for the Legislature's consideration for 88 -- for 82,000 for the Town of Brookhaven. So those are two examples. My staff is working on the rest of the list for you.

LEG. STERN:

And lastly, the work that's going to be done, I recall that you used the term best practice, that this is a recommended best practice. I guess my question to Mr. Corwin is in your experience, how often are these best practices coming along? I'm assuming that this is now going to be a two-year, as you said on the record, not a three-year endeavor to get the work done. Can we presume, then, that within the two years when this work has to be completed in order to qualify for the reimbursement, that this is going to be the very latest in best practice? How often are best practices changing in this area and is this going to be out of date soon after it's implemented?

MR. CORWIN:

I'm having this building designed by a group called Team Ag which is an agricultural design group from Lancaster, Pennsylvania; they have New York offices, and they specifically do the best practices. And does technology change? Sure, technology changes, but I think that -- I think that we're doing the best that we know how to do a proper job so that we can protect this watershed.

MS. FROST:

The best practices don't change that often, maybe once every ten years or so. This building is being designed to handle the manure for a million, a million ducks, so it's not -- I don't think that they can do anything better than that.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay, I have a couple of questions regarding -- okay, so what is the priority for 477 committee? It is a priority, it's been voted for, it's been vetted through the committee?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

That's right, it was voted on October 8th, 2015.

LEG. ANKER:

And as far as the local benefit and the community benefit, I was wondering, Mr. Corwin, is it possible -- you know, because we discussed attaching a commitment that you're going to be here for some time with the agreement. Is there a way to create additional community benefits, you know, like providing the farmers, the local farmers with maybe some of the manure, like you see on our emblem here? Because I think that's a concern with some of the Legislators, is that we're investing in a private business, but it's actually affecting the community to a great extent. And what I mean with that, two components; number one, you know, of course the water quality, and that's the main reason why we're doing this. But the second, if not more important reason, is keeping the farm legacy in Suffolk, and to me those are so important. So, you know, again, additional maybe local benefits that you can provide to the community. Could you maybe come up with a few?

MR. CORWIN:

Well, as far as the farming community, we have a limited farming community, and as we lose more and more of our base, it becomes harder and harder for the rest of us. I've lost all the rest of my industry, so I've had to learn how to do everything ourselves, by having our own feed milling business and breeding, hatching, growing, processing all the way through. But also, I buy approximately 50 tractor trailer loads of straw a year from local farmers; I supply manure to local farmers; the equipment I buy goes to dealers locally that local farmers utilize which keep local dealers in business. We all have a network together that if I lost my -- if I lost all the agriculture on Long Island other than myself, I guess there's no way that I could survive, but thank God the County had the foresight to put the preservation in so that we have a solid base that's going to stay there for a long time. So we do have our own community out there.

If the dirt agriculture lost us, as I say, they wouldn't be having the straw to purchase. I purchase roughly 60 tons a week of local corn that you can see growing tall six, seven foot high in Sagaponack up on the North Fork and whatnot that all goes to my feed mill. If I wasn't there, you'd have approximately maybe a thousand, 2,000 acres of corn that's no longer going to have a market for itself. We all kind of have a symbiotic relationship together to keep this going, and it's in my best interest to see that the rest of that culture is going to survive.

LEG. ANKER:

And again, that's always good to hear. I proudly sit on the Soil & Water Conservation District Board and I know, you know, Sharon Frost here today has worked very hard, Rob Carpenter, I don't know if he's in the audience. But, you know, that -- the farming community is really what makes Suffolk County -- you know, it gives us -- it's our identity. You know, we have a bull and then we have this --

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Plow.

LEG. ANKER:

Plow (*laughter*), it's a plow. And, you know, we have to make sure that we keep that. You know, I work with a lot of historical communities and they're just -- they're trying to save just the structures, these historical homes. Right now we have an economy based on our agriculture and I sincerely feel we need to continue to support that. And I appreciate your commitment to farming and I hope there will be additional generations to fulfill your business. So again, thank you. And I will be supporting this resolution.

MR. CORWIN:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right, Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Just a couple of more questions. Did you sell the County of Suffolk your development rights?

MR. CORWIN:

No, ma'am.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So you have the ball, all right. Are you aware that because of the type of business that you own you could also get funding from the IDA?

MR. CORWIN:

We've had past endeavors with the Riverhead IDA that usually have not worked out very well.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Sarah, just his -- the periphery of his property, the percolation rate to groundwater is two years, less?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Probably less than two years, but within the zero to two year contributor range.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Within the zero to two years, okay. I realize that although you are far away from my district, your 13% nitrogen per whatever it is -- it's all our aquifer. So if we don't do this, even though I feel the same way about giving a gift in there, it's not the same thing, because what we are getting is a cleaner aquifer, our drinking water. All right, thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Just quickly, two more questions, points. First of all, is there any mechanism, through Fund 477 or otherwise, to require the payback of this funding over time? Could we, in effect, loan through 477 Mr. Corwin the \$250,000 here and over the course of X number of years recover that funding?

MR. NOLAN:

I'm looking at the program right now and it doesn't really talk about using these monies in that manner to make loans, but that doesn't mean that we could not do that. It's not expressly included in the statute, but we probably could turn it into more of a loan, I suppose.

LEG. CILMI:

Sort of like an offline contract saying, you know, it might be paid back.

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah, like with the -- you know, when we did the sewer infrastructure money, I know that there was a possibility, they built into that program the possibility of doing it as loans to people. I don't know if we ended up doing that with anybody, but they certainly contemplated making the money we gave to villages and so forth in the form of a loan. So I guess we could do it, even though it's really not set forth in the program.

LEG. CILMI:

So that's something maybe to consider.

The other point I would just make is -- and Mr. Corwin, understand, you know, I don't know that there's a Legislator here that doesn't appreciate the business that you're in and the challenges that you face and, you know, the environmental considerations here. But again, it's sort of a unique situation. And I just -- I can't help but think if yours was a different type of business that maybe wasn't held in such high esteem, that the discourse here would be somewhat different. I mean, if we -- you know, if we were confronted by, you know, the CEO of a manufacturing company that, you know, admitted to contaminating an aquifer or an estuary with 4% or 25% or whatever the number was, based on that person's business, we'd be screaming bloody heck. You know? We'd be calling for DEC investigations, we'd be saying they've got to pay for it, you know, and in this case we're saying we understand and we want to pay you to help you fix it. And without saying that to all those other businesses, I'm not sure how we can do it with you. So that's, again, the struggle that I face here.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Just call the vote.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right, we have a motion to approve and a second. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. CILMI:

Opposed.

*(*Legislators D'Amaro, McCaffrey, Trotta
& Barraga raised their hand in opposition*)*

MS. ELLIS:

Thirteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right.

LEG. CILMI:

I hope it was worth the 250 grand.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Mr. Corwin.

MS. ELLIS:

Sorry, eleven (*Opposed: Legislators Cilmi, Barraga, Trotta, McCaffrey & D'Amaro - Not Present: Legislators Hahn & Lindsay*).

P.O. GREGORY:
Eleven. Okay, all right.

Introductory Resolutions for May 10, 2016

Okay, page five, *Budget & Finance*:

1323-16 - Amending the 2016 Operating Budget to provide funding for Girls Incorporated Of Long Island (Martinez). Motion by Legislator Martinez. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:
Sixteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn & Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:
1373-16 - Amending the 2016 Operating Budget and transferring funds to provide funding for LIGALY (Long Island Gay and Lesbian Youth) (Presiding Officer Gregory). I make a motion to approve.

LEG. STERN:
Second.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
What happened to Resolutions Tabled to May 10th?

MR. NOLAN:
Yeah, we've got to do Tabled Resolutions. You missed a page.

P.O. GREGORY:
Oh. Motion to approve.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Second.

LEG. CILMI:
What are we on?

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Calarco. Page five.

LEG. CILMI:
On the LIGALY bill?

P.O. GREGORY:
Yep.

LEG. CILMI:
1373?

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

I have questions on that one.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right.

LEG. CILMI:

Sorry. Here we go again. So this is -- Presiding Officer, this is your bill?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

We're transferring \$71,000 or so to Long Island Gay and Lesbian Youth from \$28,000, fees-for-services, non-contract agency; \$20,000 or so, light, power and water, non-contract agency; and \$23,000, or almost, from the Comsewogue Youth Club. Can you or can somebody else speak to those offsets?

P.O. GREGORY:

Well, some of them we had chosen ourselves. We actually worked with the Administration on filing some of the offsets. One was Comsewogue which was I believe a defunct agency now, so the funding wasn't going to them. I've spoken to Legislator Hahn, whose district the funding for the original organization was in, she's okay with it. The light, power, water is another offset that the Administration had chosen because gas prices were low, there was an expected savings, projected savings, estimated savings throughout the year, and we've chosen that as an offset.

LEG. CILMI:

That's light, power and water. What about fees-for-services, \$28,000?

P.O. GREGORY:

Fees-for-services, that was the County Executive's contract services line. I guess they had, you know -- they had some excess monies there that they put towards the overall amendment.

LEG. CILMI:

Right. And the \$71,000 going to LIGALY, what are they doing with the money?

P.O. GREGORY:

Well, this is a program that they started two years ago, it's a bullying program out in Sag Harbor. What happened was during the budget process they had received monies at the beginning of 2015, so during the budget process the decision was made to look at the funding, adopted funding levels for 2014, so they were negatively impacted. Because they started off at a lower number and then there was a 10% or a 5% cut, I forget which, so they were, I think, disproportionately impacted because of that. And because of the unique services that they provide and they're the only service provider to do that, we're making an effort to restore some of that funding.

LEG. CILMI:

So through the Chair, to Budget Review, if I could. Dr. Lipp, disproportionately impacted; were they disproportionately impacted, or were they proportionately impacted?

MR. LIPP:

I'm having trouble with my computer so I wasn't really listening; could you give me the fuller explanation?

LEG. CILMI:

I was asking Presiding Officer Gregory about the funding that's being transferred from three different sources to Long Island Gay and Lesbian Youth, it's IR 1373, \$71,000, roughly. And the Presiding Officer was saying that, you know, during the budget process we had cut some funding from a number of contract agencies and he mentioned that LIGALY was disproportionately impacted -- God bless you -- by that. Can you either confirm or expound on that?

MR. LIPP:

Well, they did lose more than certain other organizations, but it was decided by the Working Group that that's what they were going to do.

LEG. CILMI:

Did they lose more proportionately or did they lose more in dollars because they got more dollars from us?

MR. LIPP:

I believe both.

LEG. CILMI:

Both. How much did they lose in that process?

MR. LIPP:

I would have to check, hold on a minute.

P.O. GREGORY:

I believe it was in the neighborhood of 150,000.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So this would be effectively restoring about half of what they lost in that budget adoption process.

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. CILMI:

Are they -- are they engaged in that anti-bullying program now?

P.O. GREGORY:

They are. They're at the point where, you know, they're concerned that they're going to have to shut the program down.

LEG. CILMI:

I'm sure you appreciate many other not-for-profits are sort of at the same crossroads with their programs.

P.O. GREGORY:

Absolutely.

LEG. CILMI:

And I appreciate your support for this organization. I don't know. I mean, first of all, Comsewogue Youth Club, we obviously decided at some point that \$20,000 or twenty-two thousand eight -- \$900 was to be used for Comsewogue Youth Club for the provision of some sort of service that -- and you said that they're no longer in existence, that organization? Is there no other organization in that

area that could pick up the pieces of this particular club that this money could be used for?

P.O. GREGORY:

From conversations with Legislator Hahn, no, not at this time.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. We talk about having extra money in the budget for fees-for-services for light, power and water, but yet we still have a structural deficit in excess of \$100 million or so. So while the money may be on paper in the budget, it's not really in the budget. All right. Listen, I appreciate the explanation. I can't support it, though.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Fleming.

LEG. FLEMING:

Thank you. I just -- I am a cosponsor on this bill and I just wanted to note that this is not only about an anti-bullying program. This is the only center of its kind on the East End. It actually was founded after a tragic suicide by an LGBT youth in our community and is the only center, the only service provider that can offer services to someone that's in that young man's situation. It offers support, health and social programs for people of all ages, including family and friends of LGBT community members and does testing for HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases. I can say it's around the corner from my district office. It is extremely well traveled, it's not like any other service provider in, you know, mental health services that I know of. It's really a very wide-ranging service provider for LGBT community on the East End and there's nothing like it for miles.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, I'm sorry. Legislator Calarco, did you want to say something?

D.P.O. CALARCO:

No, I'm good.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right, we have a motion and a second. Anyone have any questions? All in favor?
Opposed?

LEG. CILMI:

Opposed.

P.O. GREGORY:

Abstention?

MS. ELLIS:

Fifteen (Opposed: Legislator Cilmi - Not Present: Legislators Hahn & Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

And I apologize, I had skipped -- I had forgotten the Tabled Resolutions, so we have to go back to **Tabled Resolutions:**

IR 1101-16 - Authorizing -- actually, IR 1101 was withdrawn.

IR 1242-16 - Authorizing the reconveyance of County-owned real estate pursuant to Section 215, New York State County Law to Andreas Dambakakis and Giovanna Dambakakis (SCTM No. 0800-115.00- 01.00-039.000) (Kennedy).

LEG. KENNEDY:

Motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to table by Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MS. ELLIS:

Sixteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn & Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1257-16 - Appropriating funds in connection with the new Enhanced Suffolk County Water Quality Protection Program – 2014 Referendum – Sewer Improvement Projects (CP 8734.310)(County Executive). I'll make a motion to table.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MS. ELLIS:

Sixteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn & Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1258-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with the new Enhanced Suffolk County Water Quality Protection Program – 2014 Referendum – Water Quality Projects (CP 8733.310)(County Executive). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:

Sixteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn & Lindsay).

Okay, IR 1323 we did.

Economic Development

IR 1329-16 - Reappointing member to the Suffolk County Landbank Corporation Board of Directors (McCaffrey).

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion to table.

(*Laughter*)

P.O. GREGORY:

I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. CILMI:

Can I vote on this?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Why would you?

LEG. TROTTA:

Tabling motion goes first.

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:

Sixteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn & Lindsay).

LEG. CILMI:

Thank you, everybody.

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1361-16 - Reappoint Naomi Hogarty to the Suffolk County Motion Picture/Television Film Commission (County Executive).

LEG. FLEMING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Fleming. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:

Sixteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn & Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1362-16 - Reappoint Steven Taub to the Suffolk County Motion Picture/Television Film Commission (County Executive).

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MS. ELLIS:

Sixteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn & Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1403-16 - Reappointing member to the Suffolk County Landbank Corporation Board of Directors (Hahn).

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion.

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

This is wrong.

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah, it's not --

MR. NOLAN:

She's the sponsor.

P.O. GREGORY:

But the name should be --

D.P.O. CALARCO:

No, that's right.

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah, that's right.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

LEG. CILMI:

It's written right, it's just --

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Your name would be in *(inaudible)*.

P.O. GREGORY:

Right, gotcha.

LEG. CILMI:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Cilmi. Second by Legislator Spencer. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:

Sixteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn & Lindsay).

Education & Human Services

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1325-16 - To appoint member to the Teen Pregnancy Advisory Board (Charlene Rogers) (Spencer).

LEG. SPENCER:

Motion.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MS. ELLIS:

Sixteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn & Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1368-16 - To appoint member to the Suffolk County Child Care Commission (Kathy Liguori) (Martinez).

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Martinez. Second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:

Sixteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn & Lindsay).

Environment, Planning & Agriculture

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1339-16 - Making a SEQRA determination in connection with the Proposed Replacement In-Kind of Portions of Yaphank County Center Sewers' Conveyance System, (CP 8158), Town of Brookhaven (Presiding Officer Gregory).

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. SPENCER:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MS. ELLIS:

Sixteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn & Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1340-16 - Making a SEORA determination in connection with the proposed Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 Southwest Rehabilitation - Awixa Creek and Pilgrim Psychiatric Center Pumping Stations (CP 8170), Town of Islip (Presiding Officer Gregory).

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Martinez. Second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:

Sixteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn & Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1365-16 - Amending Resolution No. 1019-2015, extending authorization for the Town of Southampton Stormwater Abatement Project in the Reeves Bay Watershed and authorizing Water Quality Review Committee approved changes (CP 8240.325) (County Executive).

LEG. FLEMING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Fleming.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MS. ELLIS:

Sixteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn & Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1380-16 - Amending the Adopted 2016 Operating Budget to transfer funds from Fund 477 Water Quality Protection, amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds in connection with the Town of Brookhaven's Shellfish Population Enhancement Project (CP 8710.332) (County Executive).

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. D'AMARO:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

On the motion, Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, I just want to slow it down here for a second and just understand exactly what program are we funding here? It's part of a Capital Project? Is this a for-profit business that we're funding?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

It's the Town of Brookhaven's Shellfish Program.

LEG. D'AMARO:

The Town of Brookhaven has a shellfish program.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

They do.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And what do they do in that program?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

They are -- they are working to restore shellfish restoration and note that shellfish can reduce nitrogen impacts to local waters.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. So the town has an existing shellfish restoration program.

And is there anyone here to tell us about the successes of the program? And have we contributed in the past, Sarah, do you know, to this?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I don't believe that we've specifically funded this program within the Town of Brookhaven. I mean, it's specifically for clams and oysters.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. So do you know anything more about the program that the town is running and that we're partially funding, like how long it's been in existence, whether or not there's been a success, a level of success achieved? You know, things like that.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I don't have any other information. All I have is that it's -- this particular funding is to improve funding to their center which manages this program. And I'd be happy to come back and provide greater detail.

LEG. D'AMARO:

How much are we providing through the Capital Program?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

So specifically this is \$82,623.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And we're bonding through a Capital Program so that would be bonded?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

This is not bonded money.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It's 477?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes. This is cash in-hand.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. I just -- you know, I really don't -- was this -- who's the Chair of the Environment Committee? Was it Environment?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Kara Hahn.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Oh, Kara; she's not here. Anyone on the committee, through the Chair, that maybe asked any questions about the program itself? Sara?

LEG. ANKER:

Okay. So this is in Mount Sinai Harbor, and I think they've been doing this -- Sarah, how long have they been doing this type of program? For a while, I'd say at least five years. And so this will go towards basically cleaning it up.

What is happening in Mt. Sinai Harbor, it has been shut down, the whole harbor. It used to be really a great place to get clams and muscles and some of the other types of shellfish. And because it's storm water runoff pollution, they've had to close it down. So, you know, again, I'm hoping the town is -- I'm assuming the town is focusing on this, but this is one of the reasons why they're trying to clean it up and use this money.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I have some more information.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You do?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I do.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thanks, Legislator Anker. I appreciate it.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

So this project involves the restoration of two species of shellfish, hard clams and oysters, to the waters of the Town of Brookhaven, both on the north and south shores. All of the shellfish species being grown have had their numbers reduced. Production of shellfish will be increased to three million oysters and one million hard clams.

In order to grow this shellfish, it will be necessary -- and this is where the funding request comes in -- to increase the holding capacity of the current mariculture system. Specifically, this increase will be achieved by purchasing a floating up-weller system, four new tanks for 24 on-shore up-wellers, 30 new 2 x 5 wire cages and 300 mesh bags, as well as the shellfish seed.

In addition, the funding will be used specifically to purchase a 100 -- to upgrade electricity at the shellfish center, to upgrade it to 100 amp service.

LEG. D'AMARO:

All right. Well, if -- thank you, I appreciate that information. So there's real infrastructure being built and purchased and put in place --

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

That's correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- to help these shellfish thrive, which is a benefit to the waterway, obviously. But my question really is more about if we need to enhance the shellfish population, obviously there must be a cause as to why it's diminished in the first place. And the concern I have is spending funds to do this type of project where they just die-off anyway, because we've seen that happen. We've had unsuccessful programs such as this. And, you know, unless you get to the causes of why the shellfish population is diminishing, we're just kind of literally throwing money into the water. So I don't know -- I wish somebody was here to tell me a little bit more about the project and about how long this has been going on and how we're seeing some success, because -- and what's causing the depletion of the population to begin with, because if we're not addressing those problems, why are we receding. It's just very difficult, with limited information, to make a funding decision like this.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

If I may --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, sure.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

-- attempt to address some of your questions that you just raised, which are all great ones. It's noted in the letter from the Town Supervisor when he applied, or when the Town applied, that the possible causes of the diminished shellfish industry is as a result of the harmful algal blooms and over fishing as well as loss of habitat.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right, and those problems are not being addressed through this particular program. I just -- I don't feel convinced that just approaching the depletion this way is really effective if we're not going to solve or try to solve the other problems that are causing it in the first place. But you said that this money was for actual seed? Seeding?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes, it's for shellfish seed as well as infrastructure improvements at their facility.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I mean, is it for water quality only or is for the industry to harvest?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Um --

LEG. D'AMARO:

You know, are we going to just seed every year so an industry can harvest them? I don't understand. I don't know. It just seems to me that we keep talking about water quality, but I don't see how this is going to really help. You know?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Studies have -- may I answer that question?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes, of course.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Studies show that these species can actually filter --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

-- the water --

LEG. D'AMARO:

If they don't die.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

That's right.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right, from an algal bloom.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Right.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You know, I really think the Town should be here, if they're administering the program, to answer questions. I'm not on this committee and, you know, they're asking for County funding but they're not here to defend -- or not defend, but to explain their program and justify the request. Okay. All right, but thank you for answering my questions.

LEG. ANKER:

I also want to mention that the Town is matching the funding; I'll just throw that in there.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay, this is also the Bellport Bay and this is a project that's been going for a couple of years now with the Friends of Bellport Bay, the Town of Brookhaven. And actually, Cornell is a partner in this and it's actually working very well. And obviously, the Bellport Bay, because of the breach after Sandy, the water quality has improved, but the Friends of Bellport Bay, I get reports from them

every so often, I'd be happy to send it to you, but they see that it is successful and what's happening right now is working. So I understand you want the Town of Brookhaven here, but it is something that we have been working with Cornell on also.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Legislator, can I ask you a question, through the Chair?

LEG. BROWNING:

Sure.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Do you know how long the County's been subsidizing this program or working with the town; do you know off-hand?

LEG. BROWNING:

I'm not sure, because last year was the first time. I think it's only been a couple of years that they've been doing it, maybe two. I could be wrong, but I would be happy to get you an answer.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Well, I don't know -- I don't -- so you're saying that we've seeded in the past and that it's been successful.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah. I mean, the Friends of Bellport Bay, they went out, you know, the volunteers go out to do the seeding.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So they --

LEG. BROWNING:

And actually, recently a report came back that things are going very well.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. So it's farming, it's duck farms and shellfishing.

LEG. BROWNING:

(Nodded head yes). It's not about shellfishing, it's about the water quality, too.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It's about the water quality?

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah, right now it's about the water quality.

LEG. D'AMARO:

They don't harvest in Bellport Bay anymore? They're closed, right?

LEG. BROWNING:

They're not harvesting, I don't believe, at this time.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Do you know that, Sarah?

LEG. BROWNING:

I could be wrong.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I'd have to look at the DEC maps.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I know when I was a kid I used to go in the water and pick clams all the time, but --

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah. We used to go to the Forge River, too, and it's really bad.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, yeah.

LEG. BROWNING:

It's getting better.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But you see, my point is it's not that I don't want it to improve, but are we just throwing this money into the water?

LEG. BROWNING:

No, but I --

LEG. D'AMARO:

You know, people are going to have algal bloom.

LEG. BROWNING:

Right. No, I understand what you're saying.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And it's going to cool everything off.

LEG. BROWNING:

I understand what you're saying. But the other thing is that since Sandy with the breach, it has certainly made a big difference, too. So the water -- believe me, the Bellport Bay these days compared to what it used to be --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

-- is dramatically improved. You know, this is also another part of it.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I wonder why we need to seed if the water quality is improving. The ecosystem is not coming back on its own?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I think I would know; I know that.

LEG. BROWNING:

I think Al would be a good one to answer that one.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Years ago, Suffolk County -- through the Chair, thank you. Suffolk County invested a great deal of money in the Scallop Reseeding Program. Scallops are a major part of the local economy in Peconic Bay, and when the brown tide started killing them in 1985, the population pretty much crashed to almost nothing. So Suffolk County invested a lot of money and it probably took ten years of Cornell doing the reseeded down at Schmelke in Southold. That plus -- and Legislator D'Amaro, you're absolutely right, if you just put seed in the water and the algal blooms kill it, then you're just going to keep -- you can do that every year, you're not going to get anything.

And from my standpoint, it is about the shellfish. Because if you improve the water quality, you experience of going out in the bay and getting clams, that should be repeated in the future. So if we improve the water quality and keep seeding, once you establish like a max -- what would I say? Like a breeding population, they can then reseed themselves. But Cornell in this case, funded by the County, provided that stable population of scallops so that they could reseed themselves and now we have a nice harvest; an economically viable harvest and also a nice recreational harvest.

So Suffolk County DPW -- and this is a plug for Gil Anderson and his people -- have done an excellent job reducing road runoff. You know, so you have to look towards Brookhaven as a town because, you know, all the town roads are designed to drain into the waterways and have them do the same thing. Because the road runoff does carry a lot of impairments, all the pathogens that close the shellfish beds, carries the nutrients from upland sources, carries anything that was applied to land, VOCs, anything leaking out of the cars. So you're absolutely right, you need to do both. But shellfish seeding is a component.

And if you have -- like Kate said, you've got that water quality improvement by Bellport Bay. And I've heard there is a big, natural set of clams right on the inside of that bay and that will continue, but if you enhance it with a hatchery, it should help, but it's economic -- it really is economic development then.

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

LEG. D'AMARO:

I appreciate that. I don't -- I don't have the expertise. But just from my layman's knowledge of what I've read, these programs are not successful, they're not. Our water quality, the bays are experiencing more and more of these blooms. They're devastating. We're trying to get to the root cause through the nitrogen reduction, and the septic, and all those other debates. But these programs, I don't -- I mean, I sat on the Environment Committee for six years and we just kept funding and funding and funding, and everything just kept dying, and nothing was successful. And I don't -- that's why I'd be curious to know -- you know, I know Legislator Browning, and you say, "Yeah, this can work," or it should work, or it could work, or it has worked, but there's no one really here to say, "Well, you know, here's" -- "Let's quantify it, this is how we know." I suspect that it doesn't work.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No. There actually -- they actually last year published a scientific paper proving that the efforts of Suffolk County funding Cornell, seeding the scallop was part of the scallop population coming back to an economic population. So they actually proved that scientifically.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. I'll give it the benefit of the doubt. I appreciate it. Okay. Thank you.

LEG. ANKER:

I'm looking it up on the web, and, you know, as part of this program, there's a Coastal Stewardship Program, which is pretty intense. It's an educational program. And I know my school district, Mount Sinai, participates 7th through 12th grade, and they focus on marine science and environmental stewardship. So there's a lot into this, and they're part of the seeding. They actually take care of the oyster seeds. So it's more than just cleaning up the harbor and creating a sustainable -- you know, farming, aqua-farming type of situation with the clams, it's also part of a pretty extensive educational program.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I have additional information.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You do?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I do. I just wanted to let you know that this is the first time the County is funding this specific facility. And parts of Bellport Bay are available to commercially harvest. And the water quality in Bellport Bay has been improving since the breach was opened after Sandy to allow for additional flushing of that area.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Go scallops.

(*Laughter*)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. So we have a motion and a second on ***I.R. 1380***. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fourteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

LEG. CILMI:

Am I included in this?

MR. RICHBERG:

You're included.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, PERSONNEL, INFORMATION TECH & HOUSING

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1341 --

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen, sorry. (Not Present: Legislator Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

-- Authorizing the sale of County-owned real property pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law to the Incorporated Village of Mastic Beach for affordable housing

***purpose (SCTM Nos. 0209-011.00-02.00-012.000 f/k/a 0200-974.80-02.00-012.000)
(Co. Exec.).***

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Fleming. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislator Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

***I.R. 1352 - Appropriating funds in connection with Fiber Cabling Network and WAN
Technology Upgrades (CP 1726) (Co. Exec.).***

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Calarco, I'll second. On the motion, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

On the motion. So this is 720 grand. Do we have anybody here from I.T.? Commissioner. Commissioner. Is this the first -- is this the last time we're going to get to hear from the Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER MEZZANOTTE:

Possibly.

LEG. CILMI:

Possibly. Hello, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MEZZANOTTE:

How are we doing?

LEG. CILMI:

So I guess one of your parting responsibilities is to get this thing passed, huh.

COMMISSIONER MEZZANOTTE:

Yeah. Well, this goes -- it's consistent with what we've asked for previously as part of a life cycle replacement addressing end-of-life equipment that's critical. There's actually three projects that are being proposed today. They are all interrelated, and they all focus on replacing equipment that has reached the end of its life in terms of reliability, overall resiliency, and, most importantly, the security of our network infrastructure. I think it's critical that we fund these projects.

LEG. CILMI:

And why is it so expensive?

COMMISSIONER MEZZANOTTE:

You know, it's the cost of doing business in the I.T. environment. I mean, it's just the hardware costs are at the level -- there's a significant amount of equipment here. We're talking about, for this year alone, on the Wide Area Network, 65 network switches and nine routers. And the total

population of equipment in this network is almost about 400 network devices. So when you look at that over a six or seven-year life span --

LEG. CILMI:

Right.

COMMISSIONER MEZZANOTTE:

-- it's what it costs, you know, and, unfortunately, it is -- it is expensive, but it's critical.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So you fully support this project?

COMMISSIONER MEZZANOTTE:

Absolutely. I think that when you look at what we invest in I.T., the most important thing is to keep the infrastructure solid.

LEG. CILMI:

And at some point soon, I guess, we will be absent your leadership of the Department?

COMMISSIONER MEZZANOTTE:

Yes, that's true.

LEG. CILMI:

It's been good while it lasted.

COMMISSIONER MEZZANOTTE:

Yeah. No, it's been an enjoyable --

LEG. CILMI:

For us, anyway.

COMMISSIONER MEZZANOTTE:

Yeah. I feel the same way.

LEG. CILMI:

Are you confident that the -- that the department that you're leaving behind has the leadership in place to be able to implement -- you know, to install and implement these purchases seamlessly?

COMMISSIONER MEZZANOTTE:

Absolutely.

LEG. CILMI:

Or oversee that?

COMMISSIONER MEZZANOTTE:

They did it before I arrived and they'll continue to do it.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Thanks. And thanks for your -- thanks for the work that you did with the County.

COMMISSIONER MEZZANOTTE:

Thank you.

General Meeting - May 10, 2016

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

I.R. 1352A, bond resolution, same motion, same second, roll call.

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

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present)

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Not Present)

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present)

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay, Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1353 - Amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the Suffolk County Disaster Recovery (CP 1729) (Co. Exec.).

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Calarco, second by Legislator Browning.

LEG. TROTTA:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

On the motion, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:

What is this about?

P.O. GREGORY:

I don't know, but it has nothing to do with Burke, that's all I can say.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. TROTTA:

I'll work it in there somehow.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right.

LEG. TROTTA:

It's disaster recovery. Maybe it is.

(*Laughter*)

P.O. GREGORY:

Ah, see, you did it. He did it, he did it. Very good, very good. Touche.

LEG. TROTTA:

Can someone from the Administration tell us what this is, and how it's connected to former Chief Burke?

COMMISSIONER MEZZANOTTE:

Very similar to what I just described on the network infrastructure. These are our two data centers between Hauppauge and Riverhead. It provides us with the overall communications and hardware servers and storage that we require for supporting all of the applications. We have approximately 300 applications that are currently --

LEG. TROTTA:

I thought it was like for storing cots or something. Never mind.

COMMISSIONER MEZZANOTTE:

No, it's data.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1353A, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present)

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Not Present)

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present)

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***I.R. 1393 - Approving the appointment of a relative of a Supreme Court Judge in the Suffolk County Parks Department (Noah Ford) (Co. Exec.).***

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer).

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1399 - Authorizing a two-year extension for the development of six parcels of land transferred pursuant to the 72-h Affordable Housing Program to the Town of Islip (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Martinez.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor?

LEG. D'AMARO:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, I'm sorry, Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I'm just how long this is -- this program has been -- this project has been waiting.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Hi. So these six parcels in particular are some of the oldest transfers. The Islip CD -- the short answer is they were first transferred in 1986, so they're -- it's very old. It's vacant land in North Bay Shore. It's six noncontiguous parcels. Three of them are contiguous. They're all within the same block-and-a-half. They were first transferred in 1986 via resolution. We issued a correction deed in 2005. Islip CDA approached the Department a couple of months ago saying that they had resolved some outstanding title issues. It was several -- several leadership changes, obviously, occurred in that 30-year period and they've asked -- they asked us to give them two more years. They've committed in writing to get the houses built and occupied within this last two-year extension, so that's why we've brought this before you.

Obviously, we recognize it's very old. This is -- it came to our attention, specifically my attention, a couple of months ago, and this seemed like the most prudent course of action.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So let's do some -- oh, do I go? Do I have the mic?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yeah.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah. So let's do some oversight here, okay, of your Department. So in 1986, the County transferred these parcels for development of affordable housing to the Town of Islip.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Yup.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Ninety-six, '06, that was 30 years ago. And so after 30 years, someone in the Town of Islip contacts your Department and says, "Well, we need another two years," and you guys go, "Okay"?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

So that -- I mean, yeah, that's exactly right. And I --

LEG. D'AMARO:

That's exactly right?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

That's exactly right.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So did you ask the question why --

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Did it happen? Absolutely.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- did you not develop the parcels for the last 30 years?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Absolutely. We were --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Were you satisfied as to those answers?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I was, yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You were?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Yeah. I think that they had outstanding --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thirty-year delay and they had a valid answer for that?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Well, the person who -- the current Director --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thirty years.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

-- of the Islip CDA was not there in 1986.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I don't care.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Well, here --

LEG. D'AMARO:

What do I care about that?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I understand your issues completely. The -- from our perspective, from the Department's perspective, the end goal is to get these parcels developed as affordable housing. So that --

LEG. D'AMARO:

But that could happen 100 years from now. The end goal was to get them developed in 1986.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I just want to explain. I completely -- I completely understand your concern.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No, no. What I'm questioning is your Department, your Department has an obligation to see that when we authorize a transfer of property, that it either gets developed or it reverts to the County; isn't that correct?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Or we grant an extension, right.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But we never granted an extension.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

That's correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

That's correct. And I can't -- I really can't argue and wouldn't -- wouldn't presume to start to argue with you on this. I -- we brought this forward because it is very old, because it is unique in all --

LEG. D'AMARO:

So who takes the blame? Who takes the blame? Where's the accountability for a 30-year delay?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I don't know. There has been a lot of -- there's been a lot of responsible parties during that time period. The Town, the Islip CDA, the Islip CDA who was developing these parcels, in conjunction with Habitat for Humanity, asked us to seek one additional extension. They were very -- they understood the position that it put us in. In total, we -- when this came to our attention, it drove us to do an overall inventory of the 72-h Program. This is a division that I personally was assigned to in September of last year. All in all, there are 72 out of the 560 parcels that have been transferred since the program was initiated. Of the 560 parcels that were transferred for affordable housing, there are 72 that are currently outside the seven-year wait -- outside the seven-year construction period. And it has been --

LEG. D'AMARO:

And that's a good thing?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

No, no. That's why I want --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Oh. You were presenting it like you were proud of it.

*(*Laughter*)*

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

No, no, no. What I'm trying to do -- the reason I'm saying that is there are 70 -- our -- from our perspective, the goal, end goal is to get these developed as affordable housing. So rather than have the County take the parcels back into our inventory, have them taken off, forget -- they're not going to be -- the potential for them to be tax-positive is even further diminished, and the County becomes responsible for the maintenance of the property. So rather than go that route --

LEG. D'AMARO:

So you're making a case for the Town of Islip's delay?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Yeah.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I mean, really. You know, this is the problem people have with government, that we pass a bill 30 years ago, and you can stand up here 30 years later and not tell me, "You know what we said to the Town of Islip, 'No, we're taking that property back. We're taking it back. You didn't fulfill your obligation. There's parameters, there's rules that applies to everybody. This program had rules. We're taking it back.'" Instead, "You know what, yeah, whatever. No problem. We'll just go to the Legislature, we'll tell them give you another two years." I mean, it's just how --

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

You know, that's --

LEG. D'AMARO:

How is that --

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

-- a policy decision that you -- that the -- all I did was --

LEG. D'AMARO:

I know it's a policy decision. I'm not questioning that I have a policy decision. What I'm questioning is why your Department, after learning after 30 years that this property was not -- we just debated workforce housing today, about rolling back connection fees, I mean, but the Town of Islip did nothing, nothing for 30 years. How your -- there's no ramification, there's no consequence. You didn't hold their feet to the fire, and you told them you'd get -- you'd put in for an extension.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

From my perspective, if it's well --

LEG. D'AMARO:

I mean, how is that administering a program?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

If it's well --

LEG. D'AMARO:

How are we protecting Suffolk County taxpayers and people who are being driven off Long Island for lack of affordable housing?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Because I'm trying to get the affordable housing actually built.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You're not.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I can only answer for the time --

LEG. D'AMARO:

You had 30 years to do it.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I was two years old 30 years ago, so I haven't had 30 years to do this. I have had less than a year to do it. So, from my perspective, in terms --

LEG. D'AMARO:

I didn't mean you personally.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Okay. I'm just saying, from my perspective --

LEG. D'AMARO:

How old was I 30 -- I was 20 -- I was older.

*(*Laughter*)*

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

From my perspective, the goal is to get the -- I understand your frustration and your anger, I really do.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I think we should tell Islip, "No, way, no how," and we find another way.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

That -- I am completely comfortable going back to the Islip CDA and saying, "Unfortunately, the Legislature said no." They made of request of me. I felt that it was -- I couldn't find any record that any previous extensions had been brought forward for this parcels.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I felt that, at the very least, I --

LEG. D'AMARO:

But my point is you didn't have to put the bill in in the first place.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I felt that that was the most prudent action to take, given the -- given the unique circumstances of these parcels, I felt that that was the most -- it was either come to you with this --

LEG. D'AMARO:

What's so unique? It's just -- what's so unique?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

There's nothing else, there's no other parcels in our inventory that are outstanding this old.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, that's not making it unique, that just means you're deficient in administering.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

It's unique in that there's nothing else like it. That's what -- that's what characterizes it as unique. I am not -- I am not personally here -- I'm not here to argue that Islip CDA, you know, give them a break. I put it forward so that it gave you a chance to discuss it and become aware of it.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No, you put it forward hoping that we'd pass it.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I mean, from the perspective --

LEG. D'AMARO:

You just told me you thought it was the best way to go.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I thought it was the most prudent action.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I don't agree with that. I mean, if there's going to be absolutely no enforcement and no ramifications to bills that we pass and programs that we have, then we're just wasting our time, just wasting our time.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

All I can say is --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Why don't you send a message to the Islip CDA and all the other Community Development Agencies out there that, "You know what, if you wait 30 years, you're going to lose the property." What about that, no, maybe it has to be 50 years? I don't know.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

This resolution and the next resolution, which also deals with some parcels that are quite -- were transferred a number of years ago, represent the Department --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Oh, but the next one is Babylon, that's okay.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Represent the --

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. D'AMARO:

You guys, you know, people are watching. People are watching, okay? And people are fed up with all the double-talk and all the -- you know, well, here's -- "This is unique, and this is a special reason." This Legislature is completely impotent if we can't pass a bill and 30 years later see that it came to fruition or something was done.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I'm not -- I'm not double-talking. I have -- I've worked in government for almost ten years. I chose to be in government because I want to get things done, and I brought these resolutions, but I've --

LEG. D'AMARO:

I'm not questioning you personally.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Let me just finish. I brought these resolutions forward, because, from my perspective, having inherited this issue, obviously, realizing that the Legislature was not aware of this issue, the most prudent thing was to basically say, "This is the last chance." I received in writing, which is something that -- I received in writing confirmation that they would be built and occupied within two years. From my perspective, should they have been built 30 years ago? Absolutely. But I can't go back and do anything about that. The best thing I can do is make sure that they do get built in the next two years.

LEG. D'AMARO:

That's not an answer.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Well, I mean, it is an answer.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It's not an answer, it's not.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I don't see how it's not an answer.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You could have said to the Town of Islip, "No." No, that's it.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

And the County becomes responsible for the maintenance of the property.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So what? So what? How many -- so what? So what?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Well, we're responsible for 2,000 --

LEG. D'AMARO:

So isn't it more important to show all of these organization and other levels that we stand behind our rules and mean it when we say it? I mean, you know, people have moved off Long Island because they don't have the workforce housing. I blame the Islip Community Development Agency, because we're not holding their feet to the fire either. Anyway, thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Ms. Keyes, thank you. Thank you for your response. Just explain to me, because maybe I didn't hear it, I know you said that you think it's a unique opportunity.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

So it's -- the reason I said that they're unique is these six parcels specifically are vacant land, they're extremely old, and they're -- it's vacant. It's six contiguous parcels. They're going to develop six single-family homes. So, from my perspective, it's an opportunity for these six parcels to become tax-positive within two years. I understand that that should have happened a long time ago. I can't do anything about that.

P.O. GREGORY:

Why do you think -- because you had also mentioned that you don't think it would be -- at least what I heard you say, or interpreted it as what you were saying, was that it wouldn't be prudent for us, the County, to auction these properties off, that it would be -- it would be best suited to be developed.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

You can -- if you tell me to take the properties back, if what this Legislator wants -- if this Legislature wants to do is deny this extension and enforce the reverter clause and take the properties back, they will -- they will go to auction. I'm -- these parcels were previously identified, basically before my lifetime, for affordable housing. So, from my perspective, that's the -- that was the appropriate action for the parcels. But I recognize they're very old. I understand the points that are being made. That is what will happen, they will go to auction, so, you know --

P.O. GREGORY:

So you're not opposed. I thought I heard you say that you didn't think that was the best course.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

No.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

From my perspective, you want to -- they were meant to be developed as affordable housing.

P.O. GREGORY:

Because they're contiguous.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

If we can do that, do what they were told --

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

-- you know, what they were designated for, that's the most prudent action. But, certainly, I don't -- I am not -- I don't want to engage in a debate of auction versus affordable housing, that's for you guys to decide.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Now do you have a reason why they haven't developed these? I mean, it is a long time.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I was told there were serious title issues in the beginning, and beyond that, no, I don't have -- I don't have any airtight reasoning.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I don't.

P.O. GREGORY:

I have Legislator --

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

And I would be happy to table both this and the next resolution. I brought Islip CDA, Habitat for Humanity, Wyandanch CDC, who's developing their properties on the next resolution. They came to committee. There were no questions asked at committee. I would be happy to have these tabled. All organizations would be more than happy to come. I told them not to come tonight, because there were no questions at committee. So I -- just in the interest of expediency, if that's something that the Legislature wants, I'm happy to do that.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yeah, no. I don't -- I mean, it's -- you know, maybe I'm speaking for Legislator D'Amaro a little bit. I don't think he's attacking you personally. This is -- you were obviously two years old. I mean, we get it, you said so. You're younger than most of us, we get it.

*(*Laughter*)*

So this burden doesn't fall on your shoulders. But I think, you know, 30 years is a long time, and there should be some type of reasonable rationale as to why they haven't developed these properties. I mean, it is a unique opportunity, because it is six contiguous properties. You know, I'm not in the title business, but I think, you know, you can clear a title within 30 years.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

You'd be surprised. We have parcels that the County has held and unable to auction that go back to the 1960s because of title issues.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, really? Oh, okay.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

So there are unresolvable title issues.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

And for -- the leadership in place at the Islip CDA now has been able to resolve the title issues, so --

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. And I've got a property in my district with a title issue that we're trying to resolve. But, Amy, I'm going to support this and I'm going support the next one. And, again, this is about creating affordable housing. And I think out of fairness to you, you and Jason have done -- they have done a great job, between the two of them, in identifying properties. In the short time they've been there, I'm extremely impressed with what she's done. And I think we need to cut her some slack. It's not her fault --

LEG. D'AMARO:

I don't, you know --

LEG. BROWNING:

I know. I know you're not blaming her. However --

LEG. D'AMARO:

She's doing a great job. I'm not attacking her personally.

LEG. BROWNING:

But she's -- but then again -- but they have picked up on these problems and they're trying to resolve the issues, and this is not going to be lost.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But you're rehabilitating her. I'm not, I'm not attacking her in any way, shape or form.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. BROWNING:

No, no. Okay, fine. Fine.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I'm not.

LEG. BROWNING:

However --

LEG. D'AMARO:

She does a great job.

LEG. BROWNING:

However, in the short time she's been here and been in this department, I have to give her a lot of credit for what she's done. And I'm sure there's going to be a lot more coming behind these ones that need to be fixed. So I'm willing to give you the opportunity to work with these properties. You have Habitat for this particular one. We all support creating affordable housing. And rather than put it up for auction and somebody build a McMansion, I would rather see that we create more affordable homes for working class families who are struggling and need to stay here on Long Island. So I'm going to support this, and I'm going to support the next one. And, again, thank you to you and Jason, because you definitely have stepped up and you've done a lot of good work.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Thank you.

LEG. BROWNING:

And I appreciate it.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Could I just say, just in no way, shape or form am I attacking you personally, okay? I just -- you know, it's just the merits of the case.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I understand. I understand.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But what's wrong with you? How could you let this sit here for 30 years?

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

How big are these lots, approximately, you know, acre, a half acre, six houses? I mean, it seems to me we're flat busted broke, we need money, let's auction them off. I mean, 30 years is 30 years, it's ridiculous. We should send a message to them. How big is it?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I have, in total, all six parcels are a little bit over three acres.

LEG. TROTТА:

Three acres. Okay. So it's money. We could make money on that. So I will never support it, and I will vote to take it back and sell it and prove a point. Look, if you can't get it done in 30 years, you're out.

P.O. GREGORY:

And it was Burke's fault somehow.

*(*Laughter*)*

All right. Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Title issues can go on for years. This was discussed in committee. Nobody had any questions, because it was clearly explained. Yes, someone messed up at the Town and at the County, and nobody picked it up from the Leg. either. It's a lesson that we can all learn. But this is for affordable housing. The groups that are coming in are excellent groups, they are devoted. We got to go for this. We made a commitment 30 years ago. We messed up, obviously. Go for homeless housing. That's it.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Martinez.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Hi, Amy.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Hi.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Just quickly. I know some questions have been asked already, but just for clarification, you said there were title issues and they've been resolved, from the letter that you received. Do you know what was there prior? I mean, was this just empty land? Was there -- my concern is we've seen a couple of --

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

It was vacant as of 1986. I don't know prior to that. I can try and find out, but I don't -- I know it was vacant.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

So my only issue at this point would be -- obviously, I support affordable housing, but, depending on what was there prior, and knowing what we've encountered in the Town of Islip in terms of prior landfills, and environmental, you know, disasters that we've seen, I would actually like to know if the parcel in any way will need to be looked at by the DEC or any type of environmental organization just to make sure that it is a clean lot, you know, to move forward in terms of placing homes there.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

So Islip CDA would have needed to conduct a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment to get the title insurance. So any brownfield or environmental contamination would have shown up on that ESA. I don't -- I don't have the ESA in front of me. I don't have -- I can't say with absolute certainty that it's not a potential -- the properties aren't potential brownfields. I can reach out to Islip CDA, get the ESA that they would have done, but I don't -- I don't know that off the top of my head.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

I would like to know that, only because if we do move forward, we don't want to encounter later on and then we have to extend it another two years.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Sure.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So it's -- putting aside the 30-year, small 30-year issue, it's your testimony that if we were just considering this today, this would be a good give to the Town of Islip for workforce housing?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You feel that way. You looked at the --

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Definitely.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- location and all of that, and you're confident that the Town is going to fulfill its commitment in the next two years?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You are?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And what do you base that on?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I have it in writing from Alison Karppi. I've had extensive conversations with both Alison and Kathryn at Habitat for Humanity about these parcels before I brought this forward. They understand how serious it is to get another two years when it's already 30 years old, and they've committed to me, absolutely, that this will get done. And I have confidence, particular -- Islip CDA has a good track record, Habitat has a good track record, prior to this, obviously, this notwithstanding. It's new leadership at Islip CDA, so --

LEG. D'AMARO:

How about if we get -- how about if we grant this, but get a deed back to the County to be held in escrow that's dated two years from now, that we immediately file if they don't fulfill their commitment?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

We can pursue that.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Just a suggestion.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Yeah.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I was very convinced by Legislator Browning and Kennedy on this, so I'm going to support it.

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Yeah. Other than the assurances from Islip CDA that this is something that they're going to pursue, and they have organizations involved with them that are going to make it happen, are there any other procedural steps that the Town or the CDA need to take that they have not? Is this really ready to go, or are there opportunities, is there potential for it to continue to get dragged out once again?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

They need to pursue building permits; they're waiting for this extension to do that. They can't finalize the title insurance, because the deed contains in it that reverter clause. So they can't finalize their title insurance without this extension. Once they have title, they can get their building permits.

LEG. STERN:

Do they have an -- have they given an indication as to, when this is approved, how much more time they're going to need to be able to finalize all that?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

She -- Alison has committed to starting construction by the Fall.

LEG. STERN:

Is that a reasonable time, in your opinion?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Yeah, absolutely. I know that the Town expedites building permits for their CDA, so that shouldn't be an issue.

LEG. STERN:

Very good. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

LEG. TROTТА:

Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fourteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. *I.R. 1400 - Authorizing a two-year extension for the development of four parcels of land transferred pursuant to the 72-h Affordable Housing Program to the Town of Babylon (Co. Exec.)*. I make a motion to approve.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

LEG. TROTТА:

Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fourteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1401 - Amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Globally Managed Network Protection and Security (CP 1807) (Co. Exec.). I make the motion to approve.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1401A, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present)

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Not Present)

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present)

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

HEALTH

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1266 - Approving the appointment of Meesha Johnson to the Suffolk County Disabilities Advisory Board - Group D (Co. Exec.).

LEG. FLEMING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Fleming.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1326 - Declaring the month of May as "Neurofibromatosis Awareness Month" in Suffolk County (Stern).

LEG. STERN:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Stern, second by Legislator Kennedy. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1328 - To appoint member to the Food Policy Council of Suffolk County (Ann S. Fangmann) (Hahn). I'll make the motion.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1364 - Requesting legislative approval of a contract award for Administration and Management Services for Point of Distribution Clinics for the Department of Health

Services, Division of Public Health (Co. Exec.).

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Calarco, second. And on the motion, Legislator --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, just on the motion. I want to just get from Counsel a brief explanation. George, I want to make sure I don't need to recuse on this particular bill.

MR. NOLAN:

Well, it's --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Is this concerning the health centers?

MR. NOLAN:

No.

LEG. FLEMING:

No. Brookhaven Hospital was the only responder.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Oh, was the only responder to the --

MR. NOLAN:

I think it's emergency services. They're going to provide services on an emergency basis at Brookhaven Hospital. The reason it's before us --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MR. NOLAN:

-- is because it's the only --

LEG. D'AMARO:

The sole response.

MR. NOLAN:

-- response to an RFP.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay.

MR. NOLAN:

So that's the company.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. That's fine.

MR. NOLAN:

And a two-thirds vote is required.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. They're not affiliated with Hudson River Healthcare, Brookhaven Hospital, at all?

LEG. FLEMING:

No.

LEG. BROWNING:

Wish they were.

LEG. D'AMARO:

All right. I just want to make sure. Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Page 7. ***I.R. 1394 - To appoint member to the Food Policy Council of Suffolk County (Diane Shulman Rabin) (Hahn).***

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So moved.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

PARKS & RECREATION

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1324 - Naming Suffolk County handicapped accessible playground in West Sayville as the "Betty Whitehouse Playground" (Lindsay).

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So moved.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Krupski.

LEG. ANKER:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1346 - Authorizing the use of Manorville Hills County Park by the Long Island Greenbelt Trail Conference for its 15K Trail Race Fundraiser (Co. Exec.).

LEG. KENNEDY:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1347 - Authorizing use of Indian Island and Meschutt Beach County Parks by the Suffolk Bicycle Riders Association for its Bike-Boat-Bike Fundraiser (Co. Exec.).

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Krupski.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1348 - Authorizing the use of Cathedral Pines County Park by Long Island ABATE for its Annual Campout Fundraiser (Co. Exec.).

LEG. MURATORE:

Motion.

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Muratore, second by Legislator Browning. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1349 - Authorizing use of Indian Island County Park by Event Power for its Riverhead Rocks Run Fundraiser (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Krupski, second by Legislator Fleming. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1350 - Approving a license agreement for Justin S. Dzakonski -- Dzakonski -- excuse me -- to reside in Huntington (Co. Exec.). I'll make the motion.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1351 - Authorizing a custodial license agreement with Bayport Heritage Association for Meadow Croft, Sayville (Co. Exec.).

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1372 - Amending Resolution No. 970-2014, in connection with construction of a handicapped accessible playground in West Sayville (CP 7157) (Lindsay).

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer).

PUBLIC SAFETY

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1343 - Appropriating funds for the Forensic Sciences Medical and Legal Investigative Consolidated Laboratory (CP 1109) (Co. Exec.).

LEG. FLEMING:

Motion.

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Browning. Who was the other one?

LEG. FLEMING:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Opposed, opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fourteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1343A, bond resolution. Same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

No.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present)

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Not Present)

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

No.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present)

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion to table.

LEG. BROWNING:

The bond? Which one is this?

LEG. ANKER:

The bond.

LEG. BROWNING:

This was the bond.

LEG. FLEMING:

This is just the bond.

P.O. GREGORY:

It's the bond.

MR. NOLAN:

It needs 12.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yeah, I know, but it needs 12 and we don't have 12.

LEG. BROWNING:

Do we need to table?

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Motion to table by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. ANKER:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Anker.

LEG. BROWNING:

They can bring back the bond.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Might as well table it and do it later. Motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. So the tabling motion. Roll call.

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

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

No.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present)

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Not Present)

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Sure, yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present)

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Thirteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. 1343 is tabled. I.R. -- the bond is 1343A. ***I.R. 1344 - Appropriating funds for the purchase of equipment for the Medical, Legal Investigations and Forensic Sciences (CP 1132) (Co. Exec.)***. I make a motion to approve.

LEG. FLEMING:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second, Legislator Fleming.

LEG. FLEMING:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

I didn't realize, but we have the Medical Examiner here. You're hiding right behind Mr. Richberg's head, so I couldn't see you. So I think it would helpful for us if you can --

MR. RICHBERG:

Are you trying to say I have a big head?

P.O. GREGORY:

I'm sorry.

MR. RICHBERG:

On the record?

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

It's late. From my perspective, it wasn't moving.

MR. RICHBERG:

Mr. Richberg's big head.

P.O. GREGORY:

There you go. Still not enough.

*(*Laughter*)*

Dr. Caplan, so please, I guess, explain what the purpose is, and so people can have a better idea of what you're looking to do, so that we could try to get support for it.

DR. CAPLAN:

Sure. Thank you very much. So, basically, in this bill, there are several items and the first two are the two Gas Chromatographs, and they are basically instruments that allow you to -- this is the -- the first one is for -- the first two are for our Crime Laboratory, and these are instruments which are in different parts of our Crime Lab. One is in Trace Evidence and one is in the Chemistry Section.

And, specifically, the one in Trace Evidence is for fire debris analysis. So chromatography, and, again, I'm not an expert at this, but, basically, what I can say is that chromatography is a way that you can separate substances over a column, and so it allows you to identify those substances. So, for example, in a case of fire debris or arson analysis, you're looking for particular chemicals or substances which may be related to a particular accelerant. As it turns out, that this is a -- this is a replacement item we're asking, because it's obsolete, and the support is no longer there for the software.

The other gas chromatograph is for controlled substances analysis, and here, this is specifically done in the Drug Chemistry Section. So, again, looking for -- this is more looking for drugs, elicit substances. But, again, the principle is the same, that you're separating compounds on the basis of a column, and that these compounds last a different length through this column, and that allows them to be separated. That's the -- that's the Crime Lab.

The Toxicology Lab, what we're requesting here is a Liquid Chromatograph/Mass Spectrometer. Now the difference between this and the gas chromatograph is that it has to do with sensitivity. With a gas chromatograph, there are certain levels of sensitivity. Liquid chromatography is even more sensitive. The reason that this is an issue with our Toxicology Lab now is we're facing smaller and smaller concentrations of drugs in people's systems. And so it's not unusual to have a so-called, a negative screen, or to be missing drugs from a more conventional gas chromatograph, because it's below the limit of detectability and sensitivity, and especially in days now where we're -- you know, part of forensic science, right, is try to keep, you know, one step ahead of the criminals, right? So one of the things that we're trying to do is to keep our science, you know, at a level where we have a sufficient sensitivity to detect that. And so this liquid -- we've had one, this Liquid Chromatograph/Mass Spectrometer, we've had one in place for the last ten years. But now, again, because of the software and the service contract, we need another one, you know, to keep up with our, you know, scientific development.

In terms of the Turbo-Vap, that's a small item, and that's just simply -- that's basically a drying agent that's used by the Toxicologists to dry organic solvent extractions, okay? And so, basically, what this does is allows chemicals to be made extracted, so that the medium that they're in allows

them to be separated to be analyzed.

The one -- the next item, which is the Security System or the cameras, okay, this I'd like to explain in a little detail, if I could. So the rationale behind the video surveillance system for the Medical Examiner's Office is, is that, you know, we're essentially a 24-hour operation. So, while we have most of our business, most of the people in our office are there, you know, during the daytime hours, we definitely have several activities that go on during the evening and into the night, and that includes funeral homes coming in to -- we release bodies to funeral homes. We may have families coming in off hours to identify their loved ones. There's a fair amount of activity that goes on after hours. There's also the issue, not only of people, but of properties. So when decedents come into our office, especially depending on the case, there's personal property, there may be physical evidence that's important to secure.

So, basically, what all of this comes down to is we need to have a strong security system that's going to protect, you know, the decedent's property, personal items and evidence, and also the people who are in the Medical Examiner's Office.

So just to give you an example, Legislator Gregory, where you're sitting right now, if you can imagine, that's the -- that's the front desk in the Medical Examiner's Office. After -- after about 4 or 5 o'clock at night, okay, then the only thing that's -- where I'm standing here is about where the door is that opens to the Medical Examiner's Office. Right now, we have basically a stand-alone -- we had a stand-alone recording unit where you can barely see that person from the camera that we have. What we tried to do is when we had the stand-alone recording unit that didn't work, we were able to kind of scrap together an old security system, some cameras from Building 50, Information Technology, but that was put out of service. So, basically, we now have about half of the cameras that are working. They've been replaced by old equipment, but we're really looking to get a system that's more vigorous.

So what we're proposing is, and this thing, this is a system that is through the -- I'm sorry. It's the Macro Digital Corporation, and we actually have a -- also have a County contract with them. And what this involves is a total of 16 cameras, each of which has licenses, and these 16 cameras are going to be -- the idea is that they'll be put in places both outside and inside. The interior cameras would be, obviously, one at the front desk, okay, where you can see the person coming in through the front door, at the loading docks, where the funeral homes or any person making delivery comes in, all fire exits, and all entrances. And then there's also the parking lot cameras where, you know, families or any other people coming into the office would be. There's a side parking lot, which is next to the Crime Laboratory, there's the front parking lot, and then there's also the rear morgue ramp parking area, okay? So that's the cameras and the licenses.

The other part of this is the training that would be required, okay? So, basically, there's a certain contract, you know, a price, and then there's approximately 80 hours of training with this that would be required. So it's a combination, really, of the cameras, the licenses, and the training, you know, that accounts for all of this. And, really, what we're looking for is to make -- is to optimize the safety, you know, in an operation that's essentially, first of all, a 24-hour operation, and also one where, you know, given the situation, there can be times where, you know, you have volatile situations. And as a Chief Medical Examiner, I think it's at least my responsibility to advocate for people who are working for me in off hours to feel that they're in a safe environment.

P.O. GREGORY:

Great. Well, thank you. Thank you for that explanation. So the security cameras are obviously a big part of what you want to incorporate in your security protocol, but the other upgrades are because the technology is just not being maintained, or can't be serviced anymore, and you want to upgrade that technology for detecting drugs and other things, obviously, that are important to your

investigations. So this is not a matter of just simply upgrading your technology, it's being -- you know, it's a matter of also just -- there's outdated technology that you have and you need to come up with the latest technology to meet the, you know --

DR. CAPLAN:

Right.

P.O. GREGORY:

You know, the demands of finding the -- you know, particularly, I guess, you had alluded to there are some trace amounts of drugs that you can't find, because the technology is just outdated.

DR. CAPLAN:

Right, that's correct. And that's one of the constant challenges of forensic science, is that, you know, the technology does change, but in addition, because we're dealing with a computer world now, you've got that technology that is, you know, linked with software and support systems. So it's not just the technology that may get outdated, but the software that supports that.

P.O. GREGORY:

Right.

DR. CAPLAN:

So it's really a combination of both of those things.

P.O. GREGORY:

Right. Thank you. Legislator Krupski had a question for you.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. So, you know, you described what you're testing and how you're testing, and you said something about the limit of your detectability. So what is that limit?

DR. CAPLAN:

Well, what that refers to, Legislator Krupski, is that for certain drugs, okay -- and, again, I have to, you know, give numbers here. So like, for example, I'll give an arbitrary number. When we use -- when we talk about limits of detectability, we're talking about, you know, what concentration of drug would be able to be detected through a -- you know, through an instrument, okay? So, for example, some drugs you can detect at what we call, again, arbitrary, because I'll give comparisons in a minute. Some you can detect at the milligram per liter level, okay? Some drugs you can only detect at the microgram per liter level, so that's a thousandth magnitude, less than that. Some are nanogram quantity. So, you know, without -- basically, what I'm saying is we're talking about orders of magnitude, and so limits of detectability would be that some drugs, while they couldn't be detected at the microgram level, others you would -- you would come up with a, quote, negative or false negative, because it's beyond those limits.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And so -- and what drugs do you test? I mean, just this year, Legislator Stern introduced us all to Kratom, and something we've never experienced before. So how do you know what to test for when you get into a situation where there's something new that's on the market that could be -- you know, that could be of interest and it could be important in some sort of incident?

DR. CAPLAN:

And, again, that's -- so part of our -- to answer that question, part of our job or our challenge is to be aware, okay, of all the different drugs, you know, that -- you know, that are being used. And so a lot of times we rely on a network, meaning that for -- just to give you an example, we had a case

-- we had a case recently where there was an unusual drug that was found that we had never seen before, but we were able to find out that it was a drug that had been seen by a couple of toxicology labs Upstate, okay? So what I'm saying here is that the way that we decide what we're going to look for has to do with, number one, what's potentially out there, what we hear about, and that in particular cases -- and I'll use the synthetic cannabinoids, because that's the best example. So the synthetic cannabinoids, of which only five are controlled substances, there are thousands out there that we don't really have the ability yet to detect or to identify, okay?

So the point is, is that that's an example, where through technologies, and through finding out -- getting standards for these drugs and finding out exactly what they're made of, then we can -- we have these standards and then we can calibrate our instruments to be able to detect those, even at small levels.

So you're right, there's no way -- one of the biggest misconceptions about toxicology is that, you know, you put the sample in a -- you know, in a tube -- in a box and out comes the answer, okay? No, we know that's not true. So what we try to do, though, is use as sensitive equipment, and we create basically a library of these identified drugs, so that we increase and enhance our capability to try to find those things.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Fleming.

LEG. FLEMING:

Doctor, I understand that -- the two resolutions you're speaking to now are also of a piece of another -- with another resolution, which was just defeated, when I think some of our colleagues didn't realize you were in the room to answer questions. Could you just talk a little bit about your space needs, particularly with regard to the preparation of samples and the storage of deceased individuals?

DR. CAPLAN:

Sure, absolutely. Yeah. I'm sorry, I should have spoken up. I was back there.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes, you should have.

DR. CAPLAN:

Yeah. So for this bill, basically, what we're looking for is -- I'll start with our morgue cooler, okay? So, basically, we have an issue with, depending on, you know, what our volume is, okay, and it's sporadic, because you know you may have some days where, you know, luckily, nobody passes away or is referred to our office and we have plenty of space. And then we have some days where we can't accommodate all the decedents that come into our office. So what we've had to do is we have -- luckily, we have an arrangement with Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services that have a refrigerated car, basically, to store excess bodies, okay? The issue with that, though, is that, number one, it's a -- that, you know, we -- of course, they have to loan it to us. But even a bigger issue is actually mechanically getting those bodies into the cooler. You actually -- it's difficult, because you have to basically bend down, and it's difficult to get bodies out of there, especially the ones that are heavy.

So with this, what we're proposing here is, designing with the morgue cooler, is just maybe basically create a stack tiered system where we have racks, and having those racks will easily accommodate in a very -- in a relatively small space the capacity to handle, you know, overloads, or when we get particularly busy, without having to keep using the FRES truck, and, again, exposing people to -- you know, to those workplace hazards. So that's really what that is. It's just -- it's what we felt was a reasonable way to approach that issue.

LEG. FLEMING:

Thank you.

DR. CAPLAN:

The other -- the other things that we're asking for was that there was a microscope room, and basically what that is, is, you know, when we look at -- we look at slides under the microscope, so as Pathologists, there's a certain amount that we can tell from the naked eye. If somebody has an obvious, you know, heart attack, we can usually tell that. But sometimes it's a little more subtle and we have to look under the microscope to make the diagnosis, a certain infection or something like that.

So, right now, we're -- the microscope room, because -- is sitting in a little audiovisual cubicle that fits about one-and-a-half people. So what we're really looking for there is to expand that, because now we have, you know, full staff of five Pathologists, plus myself, plus the Chief Deputy. We also now have a regular rotating program of pathology residents and medical students. So the purpose there is to create a microscope room to be able to use as a teaching, and to share slides and to share opinions.

And one of the things about pathology nowadays that we realize is it's very important to have discussion, especially about controversial and difficult cases. So it's really -- it's really, you know, to create that.

The other smaller issues, we're looking to update the laboratories just to -- just to have eye washes, stations at each sink -- at each room. It doesn't have to be at each sink, but one in each room, because of the hazards, you know, chemicals that we're dealing with.

And then the other items have to do with the Public Health and Environmental Laboratory, looking for modifications to expand the Radiochemistry Section, and that's related to the Radionuclide Rule and the Safe Water Drinking Act. So there's a special sample preparation that's required for that, as well as some sample bottle preparation and analytical procedures, and those are both issues in the Public Health Lab.

But I'd say, from the Medical Examiner's Office specifically, you know, the morgue cooler, of all of these, is the biggest issue. And the one other thing that I should mention is that we had an explosion room that was originally designed for the storage of dangerous chemicals. So this basically was -- it's a roof, it's a Plexiglass roof with a bubble that was designed, you know, to -- in case of an explosion. So we're just looking for a roof replacement and additional lighting there.

LEG. FLEMING:

Thank you, Doctor. Mr. Presiding Officer, when it's appropriate, I'd like to make a motion to reconsider 1343.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. So we have a motion and a second, right? Right. You have the motion and the second?

MR. RICHBERG:

Yes.

MS. ELLIS:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. On **1344**, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1344A, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present)

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Not Present)

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present)

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. *I.R. 1345 - Appropriating funds for the purchase of replacement Vehicles for Medical, Legal Investigations and Forensic Sciences in accordance with Section (b)(6) of the Suffolk County Code and in accordance with the County Vehicle Standard Law (CP 1138) (Co. Exec.).*

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Can we get on --

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

We're going to do it next.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Do you want an explanation?

P.O. GREGORY:

He explained it.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Not the vehicle.

DR. CAPLAN:

Yeah. No, I haven't explained the vehicle.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, you didn't?

DR. CAPLAN:

No, I didn't do that.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, I thought you did.

DR. CAPLAN:

Yeah. No, no problem. I know I talk a lot.

*(*Laughter*)*

All right. Sorry. I'll make this short. So, basically, what we're asking for is a replacement for our 1999 Ford Cargo Van that's got -- right now, it's got almost 112,000 miles, okay? Basically, this is a van that's used for multiple purposes. It's a -- it's a pool vehicle. For one, it's for Analysts to go to court. Another is responding to crime scenes, okay? And it's also used as a backup crime scene vehicle. And, specifically, what I'm talking about here is that sometimes at crime scenes, there's large pieces of evidence that we have to take from the crime scene back to -- back to the office to analyze. It may be, you know, some kind of furniture or some kind of heavy item. And the one thing about this vehicle is that it has very limited shelves, so it has sufficient space for large items, you know, that may have physical evidence on them that can allow them to be brought back. So this is really just -- it's a replacement van, as I said, it's got 112,000 miles on it, and it's for -- and it's for multiple purposes.

P.O. GREGORY:

You're done? Oh, okay.

LEG. BROWNING:

So can I ask you, this is the only one, so it's a replacement vehicle for one vehicle that you have? How many do you actually have like this?

DR. CAPLAN:

We have -- right now, we have one that's like this, and this is the replacement for that.

LEG. BROWNING:

Right. And has this -- the one that you currently have, is it breaking down on you?

DR. CAPLAN:

Yeah. It breaks down about once a month.

LEG. BROWNING:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Roll call?

P.O. GREGORY:

Right. I'm sorry.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sorry. My big head remembered these things.

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

I forgot we did the bond -- we did the -- we didn't do the bond yet. So we have a motion and a second on **1345A**. Roll call.

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

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present).

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Not Present)

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present)

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fourteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. I will entertain a motion to reconsider ***I.R. 1343A*** from Legislator Flemming, I'll second.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***I.R. 1343A***, bond resolution is before us once again. Same motion, same second to approve. Roll call.

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

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present)

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Not Present)

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present)

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fourteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

PUBLIC WORKS, TRANSPORTATION AND ENERGY

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1342 - Calling for a public hearing for the purpose of increasing and improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 16 - Yaphank Municipal (CP 8158) (Co. Exec.).

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Browning.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

I.R. 1356 - Appropriating funds and accepting Federal Aid (80%), State Aid (10%), and serial bonds (10%) for the purchase and installation of bus shelters (CP 5651) (Co. Exec.).

LEG. FLEMING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Fleming, I'll -- second by Legislator Krupski. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer).

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1356A, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

No.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present)

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Not Present)

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present)

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Thirteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***I.R. 1358 - Appropriating funds in connection with Water Quality Protection and Restoration Program (Nissequogue Tributary Headwaters) (CP 8710) (Co. Exec.).***

LEG. KENNEDY:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1358A, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present)

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Not Present)

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Huh?

MR. RICHBERG:

I'm sorry. Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present)

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. *I.R. 1359 - Amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating additional funds in connection with Pavement Resurfacing of CR 100, Suffolk Avenue from the vicinity of Washington Avenue to the vicinity of NY 454 (CP 5599, PIN 076084) (Co. Exec.).* Motion by Legislator Martinez, I'll second. All in favor?

LEG. CILMI:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, on the motion, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Could we ask Commissioner, through the Chair? Hi, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Good evening.

LEG. CILMI:

Good evening, indeed. So this relates to a revised project cost for the repaving of Suffolk Avenue. Could you explain why the revised project cost? So requested increase of \$550,000.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

LEG. CILMI:

Only 110,000 of which is our share, I guess.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah. We've identified additional funds for this project. What we're hoping to do or what we need to do for this project is to -- we're requesting these funds to bring on some additional construction inspectors from, you know, our consultant pool to help us manage the job. Right now, we have five inspectors and 12 projects, and in order to really be able to inspect all the projects, with the staffing that we have right now, we would need another 20 inspectors, so we're asking for these funds to help us do it. There's various levels of inspection going to be needed, asphalt inspection, concrete, oversight of the actual work, you know, and we, our staff, actually oversee the inspectors.

LEG. CILMI:

So -- but the funding is going to a contractor?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, the funding -- the funding -- no. The funding would be for -- I want to just make sure I have this absolutely right. The funding is for a -- well, it's for a consultant, it's not for a contractor, to oversee.

LEG. CILMI:

It's for a consultant?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah.

LEG. CILMI:

And the consultant's role is?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

To inspect the work of the contractor, and to help us inspect the work of the contractor.

LEG. CILMI:

And is that something that we normally do ourselves?

LEG. KENNEDY:

We used to.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No. Normally, we oversee the consultants. It's been a long time since we've actually had a full gamut of inspectors. So, in most cases, we use our -- we go from our pool of consulting engineering firms to, you know, help us.

LEG. CILMI:

So we oversee the consultants. So, I mean, typically, how many inspectors are overseeing how many projects, and how many of our staff are overseeing how many inspectors?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right now, as I said, we have five inspectors.

LEG. CILMI:

For the whole department, or for this particular project or --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, for highways. For highways.

LEG. CILMI:

For highways.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

And we also have oversight staff, which is our construction team. They oversee the actual consulting engineers. Our inspectors also work either in tangent with the consulting engineers, or as oversight, and to make sure that they're getting everything that we need done to make sure that the project is done correctly.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I would state for the record that this is, you know, federally funded, so it is reimbursed through the --

LEG. CILMI:

Even our portion?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

With the exception of that --

LEG. CILMI:

110,000 or so?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct, the 20%. Although there may be -- that may be lessened if the State provides Marchiselli funding, but we can't guarantee that.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. And this was not -- this was not anticipated, or it's just that we could use the extra inspectors, or inspector, or whatever it is?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I am -- I don't know for certain. I'm assuming by the wording that this -- we got the project, it was bid in December, and the cost came in higher than we anticipated, so we needed to get it. We have enough to do the construction, but we don't have enough to do the inspection.

LEG. CILMI:

And while the 500 -- or the \$440,000 of Federal money, while part of this includes \$440,000 of Federal share, who makes that request? Do we make that request? Does the County make that request? In other words, do we say to the Federal Government, "We're going to need to, you know, increase our consultant staff here, it's going to cost us "X" amount of money, you're in for 80%, we're in for 20%"? How does it work exactly?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah. Generally, we have a construction estimate or cost estimate before we go out to bid. We obtain the money, you know, we come before you, we request the funds. We then go out to bid. If it's not sufficient funds, we then have go back to the Federal Highway Administration and say, you know, "Whoops, we need additional funds," and get those funds approved by them, and then we would come to -- before the Legislature and ask for the additional funds from our share.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Who is the contractor in this case?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That I don't know. I can get that for you.

LEG. CILMI:

I'm just -- without more detail, and maybe I'm overthinking this, I mean, we're approving half a million dollars to a contractor or to a consultant to do work that I'm not sure, because it doesn't sound like you're sure, whether or not it was anticipated from the beginning. Do we need it? Do we not need it? Or are we just writing a check to the contractor for a half a million dollars in this case and asking the Feds to fund 80% of it, and they're saying okay? And, I mean, I don't know how necessary it is, I guess is my point.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, it's necessary to proceed. Otherwise, we -- we need the funding to be able to properly inspect the project.

LEG. CILMI:

So without the funding, we wouldn't -- we wouldn't be able to properly inspect the project?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right. As much as --

LEG. CILMI:

At all, or in a certain amount of time, or --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We wouldn't be able to provide sufficient inspection on this project. So there -- as I said earlier, there's different tasks that are required by the construction inspector or the construction inspection team, whether it's asphalt inspection, materials testing, you know, concrete.

LEG. CILMI:

And that's ongoing throughout the life of the project, right? It's not something that the project's done, you have an inspector take a look at it, you're all good, whatever?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

LEG. CILMI:

That's stuff that goes on?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Continually onsite, you know, full time. Once their -- once their services are not needed, we take them off the job and, you know, we don't continue their services.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. And so that brings me again back to -- I hate to reiterate the question, but this is for a project which has a fairly explicit definition, right? It's for resurfacing of Suffolk Avenue in the vicinity of Washington Avenue to Vets Highway. Why -- why is it that the initial appropriation wasn't enough?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I have to believe that the bids came in higher than we anticipated.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. All right. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You're welcome.

P.O. GREGORY:

I have Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

How many inspectors do we need for this road project?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

For this one, I don't have the exact number in front of me. But as a total, with all the projects we need, if we were to -- we have 12 ongoing projects that we're doing, these large Federal highway projects. In order to do them, we would have to increase our staff by 20 inspectors.

LEG. KENNEDY:

All right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That's what I'm told.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Now, when somebody's checking asphalt, don't you have to send it out to be tested? Is that another thing that we need tested?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, there's inspection of when they're placing it. There's inspections of after they've -- you know, theoretic -- you should have somebody at the plant when they're batching it.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You should have it when it's placed in situ. And then you want to -- you want to do testing after the materials are placed, you want to do cores.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I understand. So is that three separate inspectors, or is that just one man?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's likely -- it's likely one inspector.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

But you'll have a concrete inspector, you'll have an asphalt inspector. Sometimes, depending on the size of the job, you can have it with the same guy. Sometimes you can have multiple staff, you know, doing that type of inspection, so -- and then there's also other tasks as far as, you know, verifying measurements, making sure that the quantities match what they're submitting, you know, bills for and everything else.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Martinez.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Hi, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Good evening.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Has any work been started on this project yet?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I don't -- I don't know. I would think not. But given that it was -- I don't believe anything started yet.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Okay. So just to my colleagues, I definitely invite you to drive down Suffolk Avenue all the way down to 454. It goes through the entire district, and that's Central Islip and Brentwood. So I really do hope I'll have your support on this. The streets are pretty bad, it does need to be repaved. And I walk those streets when we have parades, and let me tell you, I feel them right on my feet, even with shoes on, and not heels, Cilmi, yes, flats.

LEG. CILMI:

What did I say?

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. MARTINEZ:

So I really do hope you support this, because it's something that, you know, I get the calls on every day regarding our streets in my district. And it would be nice to have at least a County road that looks and feels good.

LEG. CILMI:

Flats as well as heels.

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Anyone else?

LEG. TROTTA:

I just have a quick question.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:

So we're borrowing money to pay and hire inspectors, consultants to inspect? We don't have people to do this? How much are we spending on consultants to inspect?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

In this particular case, it would be -- 110,000 would be our share.

LEG. TROTТА:

But it's 550,000.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right, but that's -- again, 80% is federally funded.

LEG. TROTТА:

No, but I'm not talking about that. We're going to spend \$550,000 on people to watch the pavement being put down?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

To watch the construction, yes. I can't really --

LEG. TROTТА:

How many miles is this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That I don't know. I don't have any detail on the project itself.

LEG. TROTТА:

How long is this project supposed to last?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Generally, these projects, these larger projects, 30 years; 20, 30 years.

LEG. TROTТА:

No, no, no. How long is it going to take to pave it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Oh. Again, I don't know. I don't have that number in front of me.

LEG. TROTТА:

Because, you know, you know what I'm leading down the road here. \$550,000, if this takes two months, we just spent \$550,000 to have -- pay guys to watch pavement to go down.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

And it's incredibly important that it's overseen.

LEG. TROTТА:

Well, we should be hiring people to do this.

P.O. GREGORY:

It's about -- probably about five miles.

LEG. TROTТА:

So 100,000 a mile to watch it go down, not even pave it, just to watch it go down.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No. It's -- there's a lot of steps involved in this. I mean, it's not just watching it go down. If there's any existing demolition, the drainage work has to be handled beforehand, all the concrete work has

to be handled beforehand. So that involves demolition --

LEG. TROTTA:

So this is -- this is not just repaving the road?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, it's not.

LEG. TROTTA:

This is like digging up the road?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Full reconstruction, correct.

LEG. TROTTA:

And putting new sewer -- you know, drainage in and stuff?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Drains, yes, yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Legislator Trotta, too, it's a 5.2-mile.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

There is also -- part of this, there's culvert work involved at Branch Drive, so there's some significant work going on.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Just one more quick thing. It's sort of tangential to this, Commissioner. But Legislator Trotta brings up a good point, which sort of jogged my memory here. Some time ago, we passed a bill here that required, I think, your Department and our Budget Review Office to collaborate on a study to determine whether or not it made sense to doing some of this work, type of work inhouse. My last recollection of the status of that was that the Department had sent a draft to the Budget Review Office, to which, I believe, the Budget Review Office, Dr. Lipp, correct me if I'm wrong, we haven't spoken about this in some time, but I believe the Budget Review Office sent back some questions to you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. CILMI:

I'm not sure if those questions had been responded to as yet.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I'll have to -- we have not provided a response to Budget Review. I'll have to find out exactly where that is and get --

LEG. CILMI:

Okay, because we're spending a lot of money here, we're writing a lot of checks.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I understand. And that was specific -- I'm not trying to be snarky here, but that was because of the architects --

LEG. CILMI:

I understand.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

-- you know, not -- this is a different level of service. But I understand where you're going with this. I will find out where it is.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Appreciate it, thanks.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yup.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. We have a motion and a second on ***I.R. 1359***. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1359A, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present)

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
(Not Present)

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
(Not Present)

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 1360 - Amending the 2016 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, second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 1360A, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present)

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Not Present)

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present)

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1374 - Appropriating funds in connection with Energy Conservation at Various County Facilities (CP 1664) (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Krupski.

LEG. ANKER:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

LEG. KENNEDY:

Whoa, whoa.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Can you tell me what the cost of the project is?

P.O. GREGORY:

I can't hear you.

MR. NOLAN:

Two million dollars.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Two million, okay. Thank you.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. ***I.R. 1374A***, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

No.

LEG. HAHN:
(Not Present)

LEG. LINDSAY:
(Not Present)

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
(Not Present).

LEG. MURATORE:
I made a mistake.

P.O. GREGORY:
Go ahead.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Go ahead, just say it.

LEG. MURATORE:
I want to change my vote.

P.O. GREGORY:
You want to change your vote? Yeah, sure.

LEG. MURATORE:
I want to change it from a nay to yay, please. Is that okay?

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

LEG. SPENCER:
(Not Present)

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. ***I.R. 1375 - Appropriating funds in connection with Replacement/Clean-up of Fossil Fuel, Toxic and Hazardous Material Storage Tanks (CP 1706) (Co. Exec.)***. motion by Legislator Kennedy, second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 1375A, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
No. And I'm sure.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. HAHN:
(Not Present)

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
(Not Present)

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present)

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Thirteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1376 - Appropriating funds in connection with the installation of Fire, Security and Emergency Systems at County Facilities (CP 1710) (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. BROWNING:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1376A, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:
You're sure?

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
(Not Present)

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
(Not Present)

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yup.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present)

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1377 - Appropriating funds in connection with improvements to the Riverhead County Center Sewers, Pump Station and Force Main (CP 8142) (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Krupski, second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1377A, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present)

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Not Present)

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present)

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1378 - Transferring Escrow Account Revenue Funds to the Capital Fund, amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest - Outfall Project Construction (CP 8108) (Co. Exec.).

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator McCaffrey, I'll second. Do you want to second, D'Amaro?

LEG. D'AMARO:

No.

P.O. GREGORY:

I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1379 - Transferring Escrow Account Revenue Funds to the Capital Fund, amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds for expansion to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest - Expansion Project - Construction (CP 8183) (Co. Exec.).
Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1384 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of sewer district serial bonds for the planning improvements for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 21 - SUNY (CP 8121) (Co. Exec.). I'll make -- oh, on the motion. I'll make a motion. Do I have a second?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator D'Amaro. On the motion, Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

SUNY Stony Brook or Suffolk?

P.O. GREGORY:

I can't hear you.

LEG. KENNEDY:

SUNY Stony Brook or Suffolk? SUNY.

P.O. GREGORY:

Probably SUNY Stony Brook.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

SUNY Stony Brook.

P.O. GREGORY:

They have their own -- yeah.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1384A, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

No.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present)

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Not Present)

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present)

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Thirteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Page 9. ***I.R. 1385 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of sewer district serial bonds for the planning improvements for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 20 - William Floyd (Ridgehaven) (CP 8147) (Co. Exec.).***

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1385A, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present)

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Not Present)

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present)

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***I.R. 1386 - Transferring Southwest Stabilization Reserve Funds to the Capital Fund and appropriating funds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (CP 8170) (Co. Exec.)***. Motion by Legislator McCaffrey, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1387 - Amending the 2016 Capital Budget, transferring Southwest Stabilization Reserve Funds to the Capital Fund and appropriating funds for the Expansion of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (CP 8183) (Co. Exec.). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay and Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1388 - Appropriating funds in connection with preparing a Sewering Feasibility Study for Downtown Central Islip (CP 8198) (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Martinez, second by -- oh, okay.

LEG. CILMI:
(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:
-- Cilmi, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. D'AMARO:
On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
On -- who is that? Oh, Legislator D'Amaro, on the motion.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah. Just Commissioner Anderson, if he's still here. Always interested in Sewer Feasibility Study. I know we've done some of our own. Is this in connection with the larger picture of what we already did with the Deer Park, North Babylon, West Islip, and all of those other areas?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is to study the feasibility of sewerage the Business District in Central Islip itself.

LEG. D'AMARO:
The Business District.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct. So Carlton Avenue and on Suffolk County.

LEG. D'AMARO:
For the courts?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, north of the courts.

LEG. D'AMARO:
North of the courts.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. But -- so this is just the feasibility study. This is going through the whole same process that we went through in the areas that I represent?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
It is. And it's just the beginning of it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. And we -- and just curious. If we haven't really even started on anything else that we've

studied and made a priority, why are we going forward with this study?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Realistically, it's -- with the interest that's been given to all of the economic development that is available through sewerage, we wanted to look at this area, because it is in close proximity to sewers down by the courts. And we felt it would -- you know, until we know what the numbers are, and if -- you know, if it could support -- if it could support a district, we thought it would be worthwhile looking at this, and that's why we progressed this.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah. I mean, I'm all for that and I'm going to support the bill. I just -- also, what's going on with the progress on this feasibility study that we conducted in my district, in my area?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, as you know, we're -- we got some of that State funding for different areas, one of them being up in the -- along the Carlls River, as we call it, which was up in that area that was looked at.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

And so, right now, we're in the process of designing that. So we got \$8 million from the State to fully design that, so that's where it's moving right now. Hopefully --

LEG. D'AMARO:

What area is that in?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I don't have the specific area, but it's up near the Carlls River. So it's up in -- just north of where Southwest Sewer District ends right now.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah. You know, we don't have to do it here, but I'll contact you --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- and maybe get an update on that global kind of picture.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Sure.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah. Okay. Thanks a lot. Thanks, Gil.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You're welcome.

LEG. D'AMARO:

All right. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Barraga.

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

LEG. BARRAGA:

Just let me follow up on what Mr. D'Amaro said. You know, a great deal of work was done by you and others and the rest of us in those certain hamlets. And really in the end, a tremendous amount of money had to be spent to sewer that area, and we're getting like \$383 million and, I mean, a lot of that work is already there. Is there any possibility or feasibility that a good chunk of that money can corner those areas where the studies have already been done and where the need really exists?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

In fact, yeah, the area up in North Babylon, the area north of Sewer District 3.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That was areas that were even studied and that's why were able to take advantage as quickly as we have been able to. Because, you know, we've done some studying prior to this, we know relatively what the costs are, we know what we need to do, so.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I recall parts of Wyandanch, maybe Deer Park, North West Islip.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Three or four areas there.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

LEG. BARRAGA:

A great deal of work was done, and in the end it was rather cost prohibitive, but now you've got this 383 million coming in.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I would hope that those areas where a lot of the study has been done, you should get some major emphasis in terms of the expenditure of those dollars to bring sewers to those areas.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right. And, I mean, it's -- again, we were charged with coming up with different areas, not only the area right, you know, North Babylon, if you will, area, but also looking at the Connetquot, what could be helped there; the Forge, what could be helped there; and the Patchogue. So this was the -- you know, this was how we progressed. Unfortunately, 383 million doesn't go as far as you would think it would.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:
The -- oh, God, what's it's called? The Ronkonkoma Hub thing?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Uh-huh.

LEG. TROTТА:
Isn't that supposed to come down Suffolk Avenue, possible?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. TROTТА:
So we're going to pave Suffolk Avenue first and then we're going to tear it up? We're going to make sure that's done before?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Where we would be crossing --

LEG. TROTТА:
I mean, if it comes through Islandia down Suffolk Avenue --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

LEG. TROTТА:
I'd hate to pave it and then tear it up a week later.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
What we're likely going to be doing -- there's two types of construction you can do in that particular case, because it's a force main. Is you can open trench and, you know, make the repairs, or in many cases what we're -- the newer technology allows you to directional drill, so you'll open up a pit and then go under the existing paving.

LEG. TROTТА:
Here's a crazy idea; when you're paving it, why don't you put the pipe in? Before you pave it, dig a hole and put the pipe in.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
If timing only would allow us that same consideration, but you never know.

LEG. TROTТА:
And at the same time hook the sewers up because you're doing a study for it.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
I love your thinking.

LEG. TROTТА:
You see that?

LEG. MARTINEZ:

I thought I would never say that.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. TROTTA:

Come and sit here. I want to make sure we don't pave Suffolk Avenue and then a year later tear it up.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That's a very good point.

LEG. TROTTA:

Which I think they're going to do in Mastic Beach, if I'm not mistaken.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes. Commissioner, the -- Legislator Barraga is right, I mean, we spent a lot of time and effort and money on that whole feasibility study.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And the area that you mentioned came after the study of the Connetquot area and some other areas.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

That the -- because the study I'm referring to started under the prior County Executive, I believe.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

The new County Executive came in and expanded on that. And, you know, it's just really important to me that you express to the County Executive that, you know, we put a lot of time, effort and that the residents of those areas have an expectation now. And I don't -- I want to put the sewers where it's important and it's a priority, but we had really come to those conclusions in those meetings.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Where we, you know, went into category, subcategories or subareas --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yep.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- and really identified them. And if the funding is available, you know, I really think that we should start that project. I think that project should go forward. I mean, we have the studies done. I know there's more to the process with the -- it has to go up to Albany, I believe, or the Comptroller has to approve it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, as part of once the map and plan is completed, it would go to the Comptroller.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right, but it's been like a couple of years now at least and that was moving on a very nice track and now it seems like it's not moving at all.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, the -- and I will express your concerns to the County Executive.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, the only thing I can say is that the way the funding was basically provided to the County from the State is there were certain criteria, and at the time we felt it best to try and spread that out as best we could, feeling that, you know, the North Babylon, Deer Park area was the low hanging fruit for us.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Because we had done so much work in that area.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

So, you know, we did have to jump through certain hoops with the State when we came up with those area other areas. Again, as mind-boggling as it is, the 383 million really doesn't go that far when you start talking about the individual sewerage, hooking up all the homes, everything else.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. I mean, I want to do it cooperatively with other areas and do it by priority, I understand that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But, you know, frankly, I mean, I passed a bill a long time ago, before any of this was really being brought forward to start the re-sewering.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I got it done. You were a tremendous help with your department in getting through the hearings and educating the community, doing everything we had to do, and it's now 2016 and I'm still, you know, waiting for us to get started.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I mean, these residents were told, maybe it was three years ago now, that, you know, this is all happening and we're going to come back and we're going to talk to you about the cost and all that, but we're just not moving. You know, we have a project, it's been prioritized, we've invested I think it was a half of million dollars or 400,000 in the study alone.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It's there, it's ready to go, it would certainly help groundwater protection. There's now funding that's available. I really don't see why that shouldn't just be moving forward at this point.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, it is. I mean, a part of it is, not the entire thing. Again, I don't remember the entire cost of it, but it was exorbitant, when you started looking at the entire area that was studied north of Sewer District 3.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You know, we're able to take a portion of this funding, we're hoping that the State -- you know, at some point there's going to be an accountability from the State for all funding that they've been charged with from the Federal government to bill out since Sandy. So at some point there's going to be money available, I believe, that will be able to go through other projects. And our hope is we're going to be far enough along that we can say, *Yeah, give us -- we've got other areas here that we can continue to sewer*, whether it's in, you know, Deer Park or Mastic or wherever. You know, we have a specific and dire need, there's no question about it.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. Right. So like I said, we'll talk more about it off-line, as they say. But it seems to me that it's really time to implement what we've talked about and what we've represented. And I know there are other areas that need funding and a portion can be set aside or whatever it is, but I really would like to move this forward and the clock is ticking.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It is.

LEG. D'AMARO:

All right. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Martinez.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Commissioner, I agree with my colleagues. And I wasn't here prior to that study being done, and I'm glad to hear that things are moving forward. The only thing that I ask in terms of my district, I don't want it to get left behind. You know, it want it to also be a priority. And things are being discussed in terms of downtown revitalizations and the Ronkonkoma Hub and connecting to sewer districts and, you know, it is a study, the monies have been appropriated, they are in the Capital budget. And I just don't want, again, you know, Central Islip that has the opportunity to revitalize itself and have businesses on Carleton Avenue rise and really you start really -- -- if you start going down Carleton Avenue, you're starting to see a nice change, and I would like to continue to see that.

I understand, Legislator D'Amaro, what you're saying in terms of other studies not moving forward, but obviously those also take priority. But please consider my district, too, to be a priority when looking into revitalizing downtown communities. And I believe Legislator Cilmi, you probably agree with me on this one, we are seeing a change down Carleton Avenue and it is up and coming and we would love to see that to continue to strive.

And with the Ronkonkoma Hub, we missed, I guess you could say, our opportunity and it started derailing the other way and Central Islip got left out due to issues that came about. So it was left out, it was already -- it was included in the original plan, then left out, and this is why I asked for it.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Let me just speak to that, through the Chair, if I may. I was not -- my dialogue with the Commissioner had nothing to do with your bill or this study. I said initially that I support the study, I have no issue with that, because we did the same thing in my area. I was talking to him more about the study -- like you're doing a study today? We did ours three years ago and we set the priorities and we had community meetings and we did everything we needed to do, and I'm just trying to move that along, not in place of what you're trying to do; all right, it's two different things.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

No, and I understand that. And that's why I began by saying, you know, to continue moving forward with the plans that you have because I completely agree with you. If you already started a project, they should continue moving forward. And obviously I thank you for your support on this bill, but I just wanted to reiterate that I would love for CI to continue revitalizing just like other districts.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Sure, absolutely.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Anyone else? Okay, we have a motion and a second.

LEG. CILMI:

Let me just -- I realized, Mr. Chair, that Legislator Martinez sort of looked at me and asked me if I saw the same thing that she did in Central Islip and I sort of nodded my head, and I recalled when Sarah Lansdale nodded her head earlier. And I do completely agree with you, there has been a change for the positive. And certainly it seems to me like the community in Central Islip has really come alive in a positive way and is working very, very hard to take back and to better their community and it's nice to see. And anything that we can do, you know, as a County to support that and continue to inspire that, we should do.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay & Spencer).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1388A, Bond Resolution (of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$200,000 Bonds to finance a Sewering Feasibility Study for Downtown Central Islip (CP 8198.110), same motion, same second; roll call.

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

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

No.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present).

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Not Present).

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yeah.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not present).

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fourteen (Opposed: Legislator Muratore - Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay & Spencer).

IR 1389-16 - Appropriating funds in connection with Reconstruction of Drainage Systems on Various County Roads (CP 5024) (County Executive).

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay & Spencer).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1389A, Bond Resolution (of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$450,000 bonds to finance the reconstruction of drainage systems on various County roads (CP 5024.311), same motion, same second; roll call.

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

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present).

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Not Present).

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

(Not Present).

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay & Spencer).

Ways & Means

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1354-16 - Authorizing the renewal of the lease of premises located at 32 Jackson Ave., Hampton Bays, NY for use by Suffolk County District Attorney's Office (County Executive).

LEG. FLEMING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Fleming.

LEG. BROWNING:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Browning. On the motion, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. BROWNING:

Don't say anything.

LEG. TROTТА:

On the motion. What is this used for?

LEG. FLEMING:

The DA's Office, Justice Court.

LEG. TROTТА:

I'm sorry, say that again?

LEG. FLEMING:

Through the Chair? This is the District Attorney's Office in the Justice Court in Southampton.

LEG. TROTТА:

So it's a court, it's a building, they have their court in there?

LEG. FLEMING:

That's correct.

LEG. TROTТА:

Their hearings or trials? Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay & Spencer).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1397-16 - Authorizing the reconveyance of County-owned real estate pursuant to Section 215, New York State County Law to Sam J. Mungo and Donna Mungo, his wife (SCTM NO. 0200-773.00-03.00-024.002) (Calarco).

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Calarco. I'll second.

LEG. CILMI:

Sure.

P.O. GREGORY:

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay & Spencer).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Krupski?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Mr. Presiding Officer, thank you. You know, last week we had 12 committee meetings here at this horseshoe, and I just want to thank all my colleagues here and all their staff and all the -- you know, and the Clerk and all his staff and everyone from the County Executive's side, everyone who came out here. The people on the East End really appreciated the opportunity to come and comment and interact with all the department heads and their County government. That's it. Thank you. We appreciate it.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

We should have done it sooner, Al.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

We should have, like in January.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, if you go to the manilla folder, there are two resolutions.

IR 1477-16 - Accepting and appropriating a grant award from the National Science Foundation (NSF) for a project entitled "GP Extra: Geoscience Educational Opportunities and Career-Orientated Research Experiences" (GEOCORE), 100% reimbursed by Federal funds at Suffolk County Community College (County Executive). Motion by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay & Spencer).

P.O. GREGORY:

Next is ***Home Rule Message No. 3-2016 - Requesting the State of New York to discontinue use of certain land for park purposes (Senate Bill S.06873 and Assembly Bill A.02223-A)(Stern).***

LEG. STERN:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

This is an amendment to a prior Home Rule. Motion by Legislator Stern. Second by Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

On the motion?

P.O. GREGORY:

On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So the Home Rule Message and the first RESOLVED clause says -- and I wanted to take a look at the old school house, I saw Legislator Stern where he carved his initials on the tree out back there on the playground.

*(*Laughter*)*

But it says here, *"Upon the condition that the County of Suffolk acquire and dedicate lands of equal or greater fair market value as additional parkland."* Is that -- is that normal?

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah, definitely.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Is there -- and does it say -- it doesn't say like is there a timeline, we have to do it next week, or we have to acquire and dedicate lands there or can we do it in Peconic or -- you know what I'm saying? What does that -- and what's the funding source for that acquisition?

MR. NOLAN:

Well, it's not identified. That's a condition of us alienating the properties, acquiring land of equal. I think it's even identified in the State legislation. The County's been working on that for a while to identify the offsetting parcel. And the other thing I would just mention is we approved this Home Rule Message essentially two weeks ago or the last meeting, but since then the Assembly bill has been slightly amended, so we just -- we have to pass it with the new bill number.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So the location and timing of acquiring the land is up to us.

MR. NOLAN:

It is up to us and we can't alienate this property until we have the offsetting parcel. But again, I think that if Legislator Stern might correct me, I believe that's already been worked on quite extensively by the Administration to identify the land, the acquisition that's going to offset this alienation, if it goes forward.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Legislator Stern, I have a list of parcels if you need any help.
Thank you.

LEG. STERN:

(Laughter).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Anyone else? Okay. Motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay & Spencer).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, I would like to waive the rules and lay the following resolutions on the table:

General Meeting - May 10, 2016

IR 1471, Public Safety, set Public Hearing for June 1st, 2:30 PM in Hauppauge; IR 1472 to EPA; IR 1473 to Government Ops; IR 1474 to EPA; IR 1475 to EPA; IR 1476 to Government Ops; IR 1478 to EPA, set Public Hearing June 1st, 2:30 PM in Hauppauge; IR 1479, EPA, set Public Hearing June 1st, 2:30 in Hauppauge; IR 1481, Economic Development; IR 1482, Economic Development; IR 1483, Economic Development; IR 1484, Economic Development; IR 1485, Public Safety; IR 1486, Government Ops; IR 1487 Economic Development; IR 1488 Government Ops.

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Lindsay & Spencer).

P.O. GREGORY:

That is our agenda, we stand adjourned. Thank you.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 P.M. *)

{ } - Denotes Spelled Phonetically