

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

GENERAL MEETING

TENTH DAY

September 7, 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:

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

(*The meeting was called to order at 4:04 P.M. *)

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

P.O. GREGORY:

Good evening, everyone. Good evening, Madam Clerk. Could I have all Legislators to the horseshoe? Okay. Madam Clerk, can you do the roll call?

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

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Here.

LEG. FLEMING:

(Not present).

LEG. BROWNING:

Here.

LEG. MURATORE:

Here.

LEG. HAHN:

(Not Present).

LEG. ANKER:

Here.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Absent).

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Here.

LEG. CILMI:

(Not Present).

LEG. BARRAGA:

Here.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Here.

LEG. TROTTA:

Here.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Here.

LEG. STERN:

Here.

LEG. D'AMARO:
(Not Present).

LEG. SPENCER:
(Not Present).

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Present.

P.O. GREGORY:
Present.

*(*Legislators Fleming & Hahn returned to the auditorium*)*

MS. ELLIS:
Fourteen (Not Present: Legislators Cilmi, D'Amaro & Spencer - Absent: Legislator Lindsay)*

P.O. GREGORY:
Please make note that Legislator Lindsay has an excused absence.

Can we all please rise for the salute to the flag led by Legislator Fleming.

Salutation

*(*Legislators D'Amaro, Spencer & Cilmi returned to the auditorium*)*

Please remain standing while Legislator Fleming introduces our Pastor today.

LEG. FLEMING:
Good afternoon, everyone, and thank you for coming. Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. I'm so pleased to be able to speak to you here from lovely Riverside Hamlet in the Town of Southampton, which is in our 2nd Legislative District that I'm proud to represent.

We'll start off the meeting today with the singing of The National Anthem by a dear friend of mine, young Anna Schiavoni, who is in the 10th grade at Pierson High School which is in Sag Harbor. Anna is the daughter of our Town Justice, Andrea Schiavoni, who is here and a member of the Southampton Town Zoning Board of Appeals; and the Vice-President of the Sag Harbor School District, her Dad, the Honorable Thomas Schiavoni who is also here, and their son Thomas is here.

Anna is a true, proud daughter of Sag Harbor. She's from a long line of Schiavoni's, her great-grandfather started a plumbing business in Sag Harbor which was owned by her grandfather and great uncle and now run by her uncle. Her great-great-uncle opened the famous Schiavoni's IGA Market in Sag Harbor which is still in operation and is run by his grandson, Tommy John's brother. So without further ado, Anna is very practiced in singing, has won a Teeny award for Into The Woods, participated in the Long Island Musical Theatre Festival for the past four years. She has a brilliant gift that she's going to share with us now and I'm so glad. Anna.

Applause

MISS SCHIAVONI:
Thank you.

***Singing of The National Anthem
Performed by Anna Schiavoni***

Applause

Invocation

LEG. FLEMING:

Thank you, Anna. And now if we could be joined by the Reverend Jack King, another dear friend of mine. We served on the Anti-Bias Task Force in the Town of Southampton together.

Reverend King is Pastor of the Beach United Methodist Church in Westhampton Beach. Active in his community, he's the past President of Westhampton Rotary, current Chair of the Eastern Area Steering Committee of the Long Island Council of Churches, a member still of the Southampton Town Anti-Bias Task Force, and a member of the Greater Hamptons Interfaith Council. He and his wife Joyce have two adult children, Chris and Carissa, and twin granddaughters. Jack has been in the ministry for over 50 years and is a true leader in our community, so we're very grateful to have Jack with us today. Reverend?

REVEREND KING:

Thank you.

Applause

I don't usually get applause for my prayers.

LEG. FLEMING:

(Laughter) You should.

REVEREND KING:

Let us pray together. Gracious God, here we are down by the riverside where we lay our burdens down, but now freely take up our responsibilities. We thank you for the men and women of the Suffolk County Legislature and for their willingness to dedicate their time and skills and gifts to the welfare of all the people. Grant them wisdom and discernment and the willingness to reach out to one another as they move toward the common good. All these things we ask in your holy name, amen.

"Amen" said in unison

P.O. GREGORY:

Please remain standing for a moment of silence. Our thoughts and prayers continue to be with the Martella Family on the loss of their son, Scott. Scott worked for County Executive Steve Bellone and was a friend and colleague to many of us. Scott's shocking, untimely death has left us collectively mourning a young life lost too soon. Scott dedicated his life to public service and was known across Long Island as a leader and a great man. Our thoughts and prayers are with all those who lost their lives and suffered injuries in this horrific accident as well as their families.

Also, our Labor Day Weekend was not untouched by terrible tragedy. Several Suffolk residents lost their lives in multiple incidents of gun violence, leaving families in mourning and communities in fear. Such wanton disregard for life is unacceptable. This is not just a government issue nor is it just a policing issue, it's a community issue and we must work together to put an end to it.

Let us also remember all the victims of the terrorist attacks 15 years ago, September 11th, 2001. Never forget. We are all Americans, no matter how great or how small, every act of patriotism makes the nation stronger, every act of kindness fills the nation's heart. Every act of service makes the nation more whole. God bless the souls of 9/11 and God bless America. And also, let us always remember all those military men and women who put themselves in harm's way every day to protect our country.

Moment of Silence Observed

(Banged Gavel*)*

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay, our first presentation as far as proclamations is the Presiding Officer is going to bring a proclamation up for our departing Parks Commissioner, Greg Dawson.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

As we know, Commissioner Dawson is moving on, but we wanted to show our appreciation and respect for you. We did an all 18 proclamation recognizing your efforts and your time and your achievements while you were here in Suffolk County government. People don't realize that the vast array of parks and responsibilities that the Parks Commissioner has is a tremendous responsibility. You did it well and we are very much grateful and certainly appreciate your efforts for making Suffolk County and our park system the great place of enjoyment for the thousands of families that come here every year. So congratulations and thank you for your service.

Applause

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Thank you very much.

P.O. GREGORY:

Would you like to say something?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, thank you. I wasn't prepared to make a speech, but I just wanted to say thank you for the opportunity to serve the members and our residents of Suffolk County. And first and foremost, I'd like to thank all the men and women of the Parks Department who work so hard to provide those great services for our constituents. It was a great run at four-and-a-half years, I greatly appreciate it. I appreciate the support that's been given to me and the department by this body and by the County Executive's Office and I'm going to miss it, but thank you very much. Thanks.

Applause

D.P.O. CALARCO:

If we can all join them at the horseshoe for a picture.

(*Photograph Taken*)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, next we have Legislator Fleming who will present a proclamation to Police Officer Gannero Descalo of the Westhampton Beach Police Department. Officer Descalo responded to a call about a pregnant woman who was in distress; he arrived on the scene, she went into labor

and she successfully delivered the baby.

Applause

LEG. FLEMING:

The Presiding Officer took all my talking points.

P.O. GREGORY:

Sorry.

LEG. FLEMING:

That's okay. I am very proud. You know, I don't know that everyone knows -- as we are here in the Town of Southampton. I don't know that everyone realizes that we're served on the five East End towns by an extraordinary group of Town and Village Police Officers separate from the Suffolk County PD. And we recently, with Commissioner Sini and Chief Cameron, announced a great portal that's sharing intelligence, technology that's sharing intelligence with the Westhampton Beach Police Department. They really are on the cutting edge, small but mighty, and definitely keep us safe and secure. But I want to talk today about Police Officer Gannero Descalo who was only on the force for how long?

OFFICER DESCALO:

About six months.

LEG. FLEMING:

Six months when he responded to a call of a woman in distress. She was, in fact, having -- experiencing contractions. Officer DiCarlo -- Descalo, sorry, like all of our police officers, was by himself, they do not travel in partners, and had been trained as in the Suffolk County Police Academy to deliver babies. Thank goodness for this woman and her very young baby, she was only 30 weeks, but Officer Descalo successfully caught the baby and she's -- the Mom and the baby are doing well. And I want to congratulate you. You obviously started a brilliant career with the Police Department by doing one of the best things you can possibly do in helping a baby into the world. So thank you for your bravery and your service.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Sir, I have one question. Is the baby's name Gannero?

OFFICER DESCALO:

No.

P.O. GREGORY:

No, okay.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. FLEMING:

I do have another proclamation. And, you know, Anna Schiavoni is from the Sag Harbor School District, her Dad is the Vice-President of the Board, and I have another member of the Sag Harbor School community to honor. Very proud to call **Jack Louchheim** up to the podium. You can bring your family if you feel comfortable, if everyone wants to come. It's up to you.

Jack's story is a remarkable one. Jack is 15-years old and lives in Sagaponack, he attends the Pierson Middle School. Jack started playing tennis at the age of five. And tennis -- even though he consistently makes the high honor roll and was the valedictorian of his 8th-grade moving up ceremony, his passion in life is tennis, and he started playing tennis at the age of five, as I said, and practices almost every day. Jack has played and practiced at a number of clubs including East Hampton Indoor Tennis, the Bridgehampton Club and currently the Ross Tennis Academy and competes regularly at UA -- UATA tournaments -- USTA Tournaments across the Eastern Section in 7th and 8th grade. He actually played second singles on the East Hampton High School Varsity Tennis Team and has an overall record of 21 to 1.

But the reason why I have Jack up here today is because he decided at his young age to launch the Bridgehampton Youth Tennis Project in order to share his passion for tennis with children in the community who might not otherwise have the opportunity to learn the sport. The project involved presenting his idea to the Board of the Bridgehampton Child Care Recreation Center, soliciting bids for construction of a youth tennis court, hiring a contractor, overseeing the building of the court and fund-raising and he met and exceeded a goal of \$50,000 in fund-raising.

One of the remarkable things about this is that Bridgehampton Child Care Center is a really critically important -- plays a critically important role in our community. It was actually borne out of tragedy; in 1949, when a migrant campfire killed two children of seasonal migrant farm workers. And the center continues to serve the African-American and growing immigrant population in the Bridgehampton area. It runs a low cost summer camp for 80 community children and many after school programs; supervised homework, weekly field trips, etcetera, and now they have a tennis program thanks to this young man.

Applause

Congratulations. Very, very quick.

MR. LOUCHHEIM:

Thank you. Before I sit down, I just want to say thank you to my community and everybody who has helped me and supported me in creating this opportunity to play tennis for the kids at the Bridgehampton Child Care Center. So thank you.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Next we have **Legislator Krupski** who will make a presentation.

LEG. KRUPSKI :

I'm going to start with Judge Boyd here. And thank you for coming today. So **Ed Boyd** has been an EMT and Firefighter in several fire departments since 1975 and he was a Federal prosecutor in Brooklyn and then he was Justice in Greenport for years, so I think everyone knows him as Judge Boyd. He is really a dedicated member of the fire department, he responds to over 90% of the emergency calls. And he's also very active in the Suffolk County Regional Emergency Medical Services Council, and he's the person who picks and nominates the recipient of the organization's yearly Award for Excellence and Basic Life Support.

So this year, unbeknownst to Ed, the members of that Council, who Ed's a member of, decided to nominate him because of, you know, the dedication to the community. I mean, you put so much hard work into it. Nobody really thinks about the hours that go in when you call 911, what happens behind the scenes. The people who show up are prepared to help you. And because of all that dedication, you know, you've certainly helped the lives of so many people over the years and for

that you really deserve to be recognized and thank you for all your years of service. Do you want to say a few words?

Applause

MR. BOYD:

Well, thank you, Legislator Krupski. There are so many of us who provide emergency medical services in Suffolk County. I would be really remiss if I passed up this opportunity in front of the Legislature to urge you to think of all of us and to think of the volunteer service constantly. We need your support, we need your continued support, because without the volunteer service we would be faced with an unbelievably steep bill to cover the emergency medical needs of the population of this County.

The Bureau of Emergency Medical Services and the Health Department is undergoing some very difficult times at present and they need all the support they can get. So if something comes before you and you have an opportunity to help emergency medical services, please think of the citizens of the County and please give every support you can to them. I thank you for the award today. I accept it on behalf of all of us who participate in this. Thank you.

Applause

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And I have another presentation today. Tom Wickham, when I say he's a local farmer, he's -- I don't know how many generations, you know, the Wickham Family goes back to on the North Fork. I also had an opportunity to serve with Tom on the -- I was on the Town Board. Tom was Town Supervisor in Southold for years, so he served the town in many different capacities. And I also remember, you know, your father as a farmer and I have many great memories of him.

Here's an agricultural award that's given, the Environmental Management Award, that's given every year. And believe it or not, in Suffolk County, and we really are one of the leading agricultural counties in New York State. This is the first time a farmer has received this award from Suffolk County, and I think it's -- you know, it's certainly a testament to how Tom farms. He's got a large acreage there in Cutchogue and he manages it and takes care of it in a way that's -- it's responsible and it makes us all proud. You know, he's in food production and vegetable production, and the way he's managed his farm, it's a great example for all of us.

So I know he wants to say a few words, but I want to also recognize the members here of the Farm Bureau and Soil & Water who are -- you know, everybody, there's a lot of support people here in agriculture. And I know if, Tom, you can say a few words.

MR. WICKHAM:

Thank you, Albert. It's a pleasure to be with you today, and thanks to the Legislature, the various members here who are here. It is an honor for me to stand in front of you and to have received the award from New York State that Albert referred to, but it's even more important to understand the basis of that award and what it really represents.

I picked up on a number of programs that are made available to farmers out here in Suffolk County. Those programs are mounted by the Soil & Water Conservation District, by Cornell Cooperative Extension in Suffolk County, by NRCS and various different agencies that are here to support agriculture. All I really did was at a voluntary capacity pick up on some of those programs. We put some of them in place. Other farmers have put more of them in place, I'm not the only one. What do those programs do? They provide for environmental preservation benefits to the whole community, not just to farmers, but to all of the people who live around here.

I'd like to give you just two quick examples of what those projects are. One of them is a way to reduce the intensity of sprays, spraying insecticides that we do here. And I brought with me one of the devices that is commonly used now on my farm and on several other farms which is essentially a contraceptive for insects, so that when they're in the tree and when they're on your property, they won't mate, they won't breed and you won't have more of them. These -- this and a second program, which is to monitor those insects in your fields, the ones that are not affected by this, every week my trees are being monitored by a Cooperative Extension technician so I have better insight as to when and what materials to spray with. These two things have enabled me to reduce by more than 50% the extent of spraying that we do on our farm.

There are other environmental benefits that I've taken advantage of, one of them is the replacement of underground tanks. I put -- in 1974 we put in a used tank for heating oil for our greenhouses; that's being replaced this week as I -- with a new tank that has been supplied through the auspices of the Soil & Water Conservation District. These programs would not be possible without the technicians and the people who interact with farmers, who explain them to us, who help us with the paperwork and make them all accessible in our need. They provide an incentive for the next generation of farmers to maintain what we're doing here and what we have done in the past and to move up to a higher level of farming. The benefit goes to the whole community but not just to the farmers.

So on behalf of my son, who now owns our farm, and our family and farm workers who are with me, I express my appreciation for the award in New York and for the proclamation today. Albert?

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. **Legislator Hahn** will make a presentation.

LEG. HAHN:

Hello, colleagues and folks in the audience who are here today. I am just thrilled to have with us -- you know, I'm constantly, continually amazed by the caliber of research and teaching that continues to improve at Stony Brook University, and I'm just always impressed by what I hear coming out of there and this is yet another phenomenal example of what we have right in our backyard.

I'm pleased to recognize **Dr. Alice Nemajerova** and **Dr. Ute Moll** who are both renowned researchers at **Stony Brook University School of Medicine**. Dr. Nemajerova and Dr. Moll identified a tumor suppressor gene called P-73 that is linked to a higher vulnerability to Chronic Obtrusive Pulmonary Disease, or more commonly known as COPD. The American Lung Association estimates that more than 11 million people have been diagnosed with COPD and another 24 million Americans are living with it but have yet to be diagnosed. According to the Centers for Disease Control, COPD is the third leading cause of death in the United States. Dr. Nemajerova and Dr. Moll's finding is a major win for public health, as it will help pave the way for a diagnostic technology capable of identifying people with a defective P-73 gene so that corrective and preventative measures can be taken to reduce the risk of developing COPD.

I commend Dr. Nemajerova and Dr. Moll on their commitment to COPD research and look forward to hearing about their future research developments. So I really want to -- you know, as someone who grew up in Stony Brook and represents Stony Brook here on the Legislature, I want to thank you for your -- I'm sure this is years and years of work, commitment and dedication to very scientific research at the highest levels and it's paying off for you, for the university, but for the health of people throughout the United States. And so everyone here would like to thank you for that and congratulate you.

Applause

DR. MOLL:

Could I say something?

LEG. HAHN:

Yes, please.

DR. MOLL:

Just a second. So it goes both ways; we really would like to thank you, Legislator Hahn. It's very encouraging and really heartwarming for us. Science can be long, lonely and tedious sometimes, to see how much interest the community takes and now the Suffolk Legislature. Thank you.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Browning has a couple of presentations to make as well.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. I am going to introduce you to a young man by the name of **Keith Caputo** who will put us all to shame when you hear about him. You want to join us, Keith? And Legislator Krupski.

While I've known Keith for quite some time, quite a few years, he actually does live in Legislator Krupski's district, but does a lot of work in mine. So Keith has been fund-raising for several years now. He raised a substantial amount of money for the Moriches Community Center Santa Workshop and their Building Fund. Keith has his own non-profit, 501(c)3 organization called Helping Makes U Happy, Inc., so that he could focus totally on encouraging and inspiring people to do volunteer work.

Helping Makes U Happy, Inc., has raised over \$20,000 through various events, t-shirt sales, community yard sales, Superbowl party raffles, a guest chef night and an annual Chinese auction. He has donated to the Chemo Cinch Sacks to Stony Brook Hospital for children going through chemo treatments; donated custom superhero cars to Stony Brook's Children Cancer Center; donated thermal totes to Stony Brook Hospital for mothers of premature infants; every winter donates hats, scarves, gloves and food to the less fortunate at the various churches in their community; donated hoodies for the homeless all year long through John's Place, a homeless shelter, working with people in Greenport and Mattituck; blankets for the homeless through the Eastport-South Manor Stuff-a-School Project; he's provided financial assistance through Make-a-Wish of Suffolk County for help in granting wishes of children with serious illnesses.

Last year he collected and gave away hundreds of free Halloween costumes to area residents, provided financial assistance for local children to attend summer camps through the Moriches Community Santa Programs and provided books for each of their Santa workshop families. He's collected and helped -- we're almost done. Collected and helped purchase approximately 500 toys for families assisted by the Family Service League of Mastic at holiday time, and also toys for local families being assisted by religious organizations. This year he's provided \$1,000 scholarships to Center Moriches, Eastport-South Manor, William Floyd and Westhampton Beach High Schools; he's established a birthday club for families in need through local schools, providing toys, paper goods and birthday cake items and provided Easter baskets also. He's supported the Center Moriches Robotics Team and the Community Library Friends of the Arts. Should we continue?

MR. CAPUTO:

Yes.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. BROWNING:

Provided financial assistance for children of families in need to attend theatre camp; supported the Wounded Warrior amputee softball team; supported the Boxtown College Event to support the homeless; provided financial assistance and donated to families affected by sudden devastating illness; supported kids that need more by providing needed items for their day camp program for children affected by cancer in their families and donated to their fund to provide a generator for the camp; established a Feeding the Families Project to provide 20 families in need who have no transportation and were referred to them by the school, a weekly groceries over -- with weekly groceries over the summer. He's established Martha's Closet, an on-line yard sale raising funds to provide back-to-school outfits for children in need; and provided 63 backpacks filled with school supplies to students in need. Is that all?

MR. CAPUTO:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

That's it?

*(*Laughter*)*

Applause & Standing Ovation

I told you you're a superstar.

MR. CAPUTO:

Yes *(laughter)*.

LEG. BROWNING:

So Keith works tirelessly to raise funds all the time. He was featured on Kathy Lee and Hoda Show for Random Acts of Kindness Week after the entire community wrote in and made a video about him and his service to others. He is also the recipient of the New York Knicks Sweetwater Clifton Award for Community Service in November of 2014, receiving the award in the middle of Madison Square Garden in front of 20,000 people. So Keith, thank you. I don't think there's enough thank you's for the work that you do. And like I said, you could put us all to shame for all of the work you've done. And let me tell you, thank you. Keep doing what you do. And also, thanks to Mom and Dad for their support, because you know they helped you a lot with this. So he's got one public service announcement, right?

MR. CAPUTO:

Yes. Thank you, Kate Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

Go ahead.

MR. CAPUTO:

Well, good afternoon and thank you so much for the award and privilege. I want to thank Helping Makes U Happy Board, and accepting the award for them and me. Thank you so much and have a nice day. Thank you.

Applause

LEG. BROWNING:

Chinese auction.

MR. CAPUTO:

Oh. I want to say on October 15th, the Chinese auction is around the corner. Thank you so much and have a nice day.

LEG. BROWNING:

Al?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Congratulations.

MR. CAPUTO:

Thank you.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I just would like to thank Keith for all his efforts, the past ones and then the ongoing ones. You've really made a difference in your community. And I would like to thank Legislator Browning for not only recognizing Keith, but for reading all those accomplishments.

(*Laughter*)

Applause

LEG. BROWNING:

Congratulations, Keith. Good job.

MR. CAPUTO:

Thank you.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Keep up the good work.

LEG. BROWNING:

And this is for you. Okay? Okay. My last one, but not least, is a young man that I met many, many years ago when I was a school bus driver and he was on my bus with two of his brothers; I think two of your brothers were on the bus with me. I have Joe Smith, Jr. Joe, if you want to come up? And if you want to bring your coach? He's going to bring his Mom, Marie, and also his Coaches Jerry and Phil Capobianco.

So like I said, I'm very impressed with Joe. I've followed how he's doing. I think you can tell why he's here. Joe grew up in Shirley, Long Island, and the oldest of seven brothers and one sister. He started boxing at the age of 13. I remember him on the bus with his brothers and let me tell you, when his brothers were acting up I used to say, "*Joe, could you do something with them?*"

(*Laughter*)

He was great. He was a lot smaller, very skinny and very blond, so he's changed a lot. But I have to say, as a way to stay off the street and stay out of trouble, Joe channelled his energy into the boxing ring. Joe Jr is also a member of Local 66, Laborers Union. His nickname -- which I love, the

Irish Bomber -- is fitting with his 17 of his 21 career victories, coming away of a devastating knockout. He is trained here by Jerry and Phil Capobianco, who is also a former Light Heavyweight Contender. Joe enjoyed the similar success as a professional and he did -- as he did in the amateur ranks where he's captured multiple titles including the Title World Championship in 2006; Junior Olympic Champion, 2004, 2005 and 2006; the Empire State Champion in 2006, 2007 and 2008; and the New York Metro Champion in 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009.

In 2008, he celebrated the birth of his daughter, and just weeks after that he became the New York Golden Glove Champion with an impressive win over Sean Monahan in a fight that New York's Boxing Hall of Famer Randy Gordon said was perhaps the most exciting Golden Glove fight he had ever seen. Joe has turned pro in October of 2009 winning his debut fight on Halloween by a first-round knock out. However, this year, June 18th of 2006, for someone with little experience in major fights in the professional world, Joe defeated -- I'm not sure. Do you want to tell me what his name is?(*Laughter*). Andrzej Fonfara?

MR. SMITH:

Yeah.

LEG. BROWNING:

From Illinois, right, from Chicago?

MR. SMITH:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

That was a fight that recently occurred and he was the favored to win, Joe being the underdog. However, Joe won the WBC, as you can see, Light Heavyweight Title fight at UIC Pavilion in Chicago. So I'm the daughter of a boxer, so my Dad was a boxer. I love the sport, I don't know how many of you do; I know some people do, some people don't. But having known Joe since he was a little boy on my bus and seeing how he has -- what he's accomplished and what he's done with his life, I want to say thank you, Joe. Congratulations. You are definitely a mentor and an example to what can be done when you set your mind to something. So we look forward to seeing more. And I just want to know, former winners; do I see --

MR. SMITH:

Yeah.

LEG. BROWNING:

Former Cassius Clay, Mohammed Ali is also a former winner of this belt. So, Joe, congratulations.

MR. SMITH:

Thank you.

LEG. BROWNING:

We're very impressed. And I don't know if you want to say anything?

MR. SMITH:

I guess I just would like to thank you for presenting me with this award and, you know, recognizing me for my achievements. You know, I'm happy to bring home this title to Suffolk and I'm looking forward to bringing home the World Title next.

LEG. BROWNING:

Thank you. Good. Congratulations, Joe.

Applause

(*Photograph Taken*)

P.O. GREGORY:

Next we have Legislator Anker who is going to make a presentation with Legislator Browning.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay. We have Nancy Nowaski-Roesler here today and she is an amazing person. Again, we're here to honor those that inspire and encourage us to do amazing things. And Nancy is a resident of the Ridge community and has been active in the Ridge Fire Department, Ladies Auxilliary, the Ridge Civic Association, church committees, Longwood PTA, Longwood Veterans Memorial Committee and the Longwood Victory Garden. Nancy has been a member of the Longwood community forever, since she's been born. She also was raised in Middle Island where she met her husband, James, and they've raised their children, Cindy and Michele, in Ridge.

Nancy is a shining example of true community dedication and generosity. In June she used her network of friends and outreach expertise to host a chinese auction at the Coram Fire Department as a fund-raiser for the Bonacasa Family and raised over \$20,000. Now, the Bonacasa Family, they are a family who had lost a member, Staff Sergeant Louis Bonacasa, who was killed overseas while protecting our country, and he left a wife and a young daughter, Lily, behind, and that was so amazing. It was -- you know, this basically -- when did you start it, maybe a month or so?

MS. NOWASKI-ROESLER:

Maybe three months.

LEG. ANKER:

Three months; okay, three months. They had I want to say between 700 and 800 Chinese auction baskets donated by friends and family and businesses. It was just so -- and I went with my daughter and there were not enough tickets to give out. There was so much overwhelming support and because of what you have done, again, leading this beautiful event.

There was also another event only three weeks after that, in July of this year. She went ahead and got her friends back together, the fund-raising team, to help a local Ridge family who had been in a terrible car accident and she held a spaghetti dinner at the Ridge Fire Department and a chinese auction and again raised over \$16,000, and that was just in a matter of weeks.

So again, it gives me great pride and privilege to present you with a proclamation for your dedication to our communities. And it's just amazing, here's a person that brings everyone together to celebrate those and also to help those in need. So again, I just want to thank you so much from the bottom of my heart. So thank you.

Applause

And I have Legislator -- Legislator Browning would like to say a few words?

LEG. BROWNING:

No, that's okay.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay, I think she's talked out. Yes?

LEG. BROWNING:

No, thank you.

LEG. ANKER:

And I wanted to mention, though. You know, Legislator Hahn had the speciality people from Stony Brook, from COPD, and you have that.

MS. NOWASKI-ROESLER:

I have COPD.

LEG. ANKER:

You do, you do.

MS. NOWASKI-ROESLER:

I wish I would have known then.

LEG. ANKER:

I will get you together, I promise. I promise I will get you with the experts of this country together so maybe they can help you because you're helping so many people.

MS. NOWASKI-ROESLER:

And I'm continuing, we're doing another thing in November. We're doing something for -- it's called Team Jessie and we're raising funds for the children of fallen soldiers.

LEG. ANKER:

Oh, that's wonderful.

MS. NOWASKI-ROESLER:

And that's at the Coram Firehouse November 12th. It's going to be a chili cook-off, so anybody who thinks their chili's great, come on down.

LEG. ANKER:

Come on down. Thank you so much.

MS. NOWASKI-ROESLER:

Thank you. Thank you for this.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, that concludes our public portion, or the cards that we -- I'm sorry, presentations. I'm getting ahead of myself, sorry.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

You only wish.

P.O. GREGORY:

I only wish, yes. So we have -- we'll go through our agenda. We have -- next is **statements and presentations by Village and elected officials**. I understand we have Mayor Jeffrey Sanders from Northaven?

MAYOR SANDERS:

I'm from the small Village of Northaven on the East End and I'm here to speak with regard to approval of the funds for replacement of the guard rails on Short Beach-Long Beach Road. I know the Legislator is considering that, and I'd like to strongly encourage the County to approve the funding to replace the rails on Long Beach Road.

The current metal rails were installed by the County as a safety measure a year ago. The rails end in the Village of Northaven, and at the time of installation the outcry from the public was significant in my village and the surrounding area. The public overwhelmingly objected to the installation from an aesthetic and safety standpoint. The stretch of roadway where they're installed is one of the most beautiful vistas in Suffolk County and is used extensively by walkers, bikers and joggers. The area is a destination for motorists to enjoy the views and watch the sunset. The Village and town had no prior notice of the installation and no opportunity to look for better alternatives.

After the installation, at the time Legislator Jay Schneiderman held a number of well-attended public forums to review the reasons for the installation or explore alternatives that would mitigate the public concerns. Earlier this year Legislator Bridget Fleming held a public forum to review the replacement of the rails with more attractive wooden railings. The public overwhelmingly agreed that the new rails would be far more attractive and we encouraged Ms. Fleming to proceed to gain County approval. At that time, we also began pursuing another action which would eventually allow us to place a walkway on the outside of the rail where the public would feel less exposed to traffic and have a greater feeling of safety. And if we were to install the wooden rails as a replacement, the County would be able to create a break where we would link to this outer roadway.

So I'd like to urge the Legislature to consider approval of this funding. It's my understanding that the State is going to provide the majority of expenses for the replacement and the amount that the County has is relatively small in relationship to that.

You know, while driving down here today, I was thinking about, you know, how do you make a case for the aesthetics. And I realize that we spend significant amount of money throughout Suffolk County, particularly on the East End, to preserve the beauty of the County that we live in. We have community preservation funds which go a long way to preserve open space and farmlands, we've had funding to bury unsightly power lines so that we can preserve the beauty. We have Village Boards throughout the County that ensure that the aesthetics of construction meet the standards of the village and don't provide unsightly views. And I think this is really an extremely important item from a preserving the beauty of this particular stretch.

We were blessed this last week with having some spectacular sunsets, and when I drove down this area there were cars parked everywhere to observe it. By replacing the rails with these much more attractive rails would go a long way to preserve that beauty and maintain it, and I certainly urge you to consider it. And thank you for your time.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Mayor.

Okay, we're going to go on to the public portion. Let me remind people that you have three minutes. We have many cards, we have 33 cards, so you do the math. First up is Ben Zwirn, and then on deck is Gene Demers.

MR. ZWIRN:

Good afternoon. It was a very impressive group of people who were given presentations today, from the National Anthem on down. It makes me very proud to be from Suffolk County.

There are a number of issues that are before the Legislature today with the college, none of them controversial. There are two appointments for the Board of Trustees, I urge you to approve those because we could use a full board. Some members have resigned, some terms have expired; they went through the Education Committee, they were unanimously approved.

The Presiding Officer has a bill on to extend the Budget Committee that was with the college and the County to look at ways of how we can fund the college in the future going forward. We need a bit of an extension to write the report. The County Executive's Office was kind of busy with his budget people preparing next year's budget, so they were unable to participate at the very end. So if we can just get a few more months to get that done, that will be done.

And finally, in your packets there are five grants that are 100% funded with no contribution from the County or the college. I would urge you to, you know, adopt those, they're being pursued during Local Law -- by Local Law 40, and I appreciate the help of the County Executive's Office in helping to get that done.

And I'd also like to thank Legislator Krupski today for meeting with members of the Administration as we talk about the bus service program going forward and how it'll affect some of the students at the Community College. So thank you very much. I know you have a busy evening ahead of you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Next, Gene Demers; and then Thomas Bove.

MR. DEMERS:

Go afternoon, folks. I was here I guess a couple of meetings ago about the alarm law. I'm probably going to ask a bunch of rhetorical questions that can't be answered, but probably should have been or should be answered.

I don't have -- I really don't have the means to do any total investigation here, but it doesn't seem to me with regard to this alarm law that there's been any visible effort by the Police Department to decrease false alarms. There's been no reach, outreach to the organizations in the United States, namely the Security Industry Association, Stan Martin who travels around the country to various Police Departments to help them mitigate the problems that occur in various communities. I don't see any evidence of that at all.

It seems to me like the Chief makes some -- has made a lot of unsubstantiated claims as to how many false alarms they respond to. I don't see any proof anyplace of how many alarms are responded to, but even taking his figures, it doesn't seem like that much time is taken up considering all of the police officers that are out on the street and all the hours that are spent. It doesn't seem like there's that much time out of a police officer's time on duty that's really spent on false alarms.

I think I mentioned this last time, one of the things that was said is that they could be out patrolling rather than responding to false alarms. I think responding to false alarms is patrolling. They go through neighborhoods to get to these alarms and there's no reason why that can't be considered patrolling, the showing a presence in a neighborhood.

It impresses me that one person has the ability to make a presentation or to take -- pass a law through this Legislature and you all sign off on it and now we're in a position of having to rescind or modify a law that shouldn't have been passed in the first place. I don't understand how that can happen. It would seem to me that somebody should have said, *Hey, maybe we should look into this*, rather than just carte blanche passing this law. I have a customer whose permit number is 3900 --

(Timer Sounded)

P.O. GREGORY:

Sir, please wrap up.

MR. DEMERS:

Am I done?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes. If you have written remarks, you can hand them in and they'll be distributed to each Legislator.

MR. DEMERS:

All right. My point was is that there's close to a quarter of a million dollars that has been collected so far. This is a money grab, that's all it is.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you for your comments. Okay, Thomas Bove; and then on deck, Margaret Malby.

MR. BOVE:

Good evening. This is in regard to item number 1757, the appraisal of the land at the old K-Mart in Brookhaven for the purposes of purchasing for fields. And like I said, my name is Tom Bove, I'm the President of the Longwood Youth Sports Association. I've been on the Executive Board for over 37 years. On many occasions, way back since 1980, we have been trying to aggressively get land so that we don't have to use the school fields. School fields are always at the mercy of permits, the safety of the fields due to inclement weather and other organizations vying for that, so we really need to have our own fields.

On occasion, back in early 1990s, the Suffolk County Legislators that were on board at that time, I approached each of them and they approved unanimously to buy us land that was on Longwood Road between the two schools. Unfortunately, something went wrong political-wise, I don't know what it is, but Suffolk County at that time did approve this purchase. So we're asking again if they could look into this again for us.

I just want to point out that this is really, really important. The youth of our community needs a place to play. We know that when kids are playing sports, they're less likely to get into trouble. They're more likely to do well in school. This is scientific fact and that's what we want to do, we want our community to have well organized sports so that the kids can play and we need to do that on our own fields. We have over 2500 families with multiple kids from each family playing, so we really have no room to put them on school fields. We can't grow any further than we are, and a lot of kids don't get to play, so we want to open it for everyone and the size of the fields that we're talking about would accommodate the whole community, not to mention other communities because there will be more recreation, a walking park, fields and we will maintain it. LYSA has dedicated to maintain these fields and we've been in existence since 1962, so we are well equipped to be able to continue on. I think that's it.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Sir.

Applause

Margaret Malby; and then on deck, Gail Lynch-Bailey.

MS. MALLOY:

Actually, my name is Margaret Malloy and I'm here also --

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, that's an O; I'm sorry.

MS. MALLOY:

M-A-L-L-O-Y, yes. Also with some comments about Sarah Anker's appraisal of the land at the old K-Mart site. I'm a board member of the Middle Island Civic Association and I've been a residents of Middle Island for 31 years. When I first moved into my house, there was a horse farm where the King Kullen strip mall now exits. I used to cross-country ski down the north end of Wading River Hollow Road where there are now houses. I recall fox hunts on the south end of Wading River Hollow Road on Sunday mornings. Although I realize that progress is necessary and welcome improvements to the area, over the years I've become increasingly dismayed at the lack of services and the sprawl in the surrounding area. We have seen many boarded up buildings along Route 25 running from Coram through Ridge. The Renaissance Plan that was put together many years ago never came into full fruition. We have suffered with a boarded-up gas station for over ten years at the center of our town. A former restaurant, the Island Squire, was an eyesore for 20 years and still shows signs of a depressed area, although we're very grateful that the main building was finally demolished.

It was with great celebration we witnessed the demolition of the K-Mart building after ten years of driving past that eyesore. And we thank Supervisor Romaine, Legislator Anker, Councilman Mike Loguercio and Gail Bailey, the President of Middle Island Civic, for all their efforts in making this happen. However, there are many vacant stores in the surrounding strip malls and you would be very hard pressed to find an upscale restaurant or a ball field where our local teams can play.

We watched as Heritage Park took off to the north of us and Wertheim Preserve blossomed with a new science center to the south. Shoreham is moving forward with a bike trail and the Tessler Museum. Patchogue is becoming revitalized. And we applaud all of these efforts and thank everyone here who contributed to that, but we wonder what is happening with Middle Island. Middle Island just seems to be left behind, because we are not on the shores and do not have a strong lobby group, we are left without restaurants, walkable roads or family-centered parks. The recent preserve in Ridge was a wonderful surprise and I'm sure will be an asset to the community. Fairfield taking over our old Tudor Oaks, an area that someone driving through would have thought was in a third world country. We need a place where young and old can congregate to see a ball game, grab a decent meal, go for a walk, or watch children and grandchildren frolic in a playground. We in Middle Island and the surrounding towns have endured so much blight and frustration over the past few years while we tried to improve services and draw people to our town. I implore you to move forward with our field of dreams and help us to continue with the work we have done with the community garden, our veterans park, a walking trail and business improvements. This is our chance to make the entrance to the Pine Barrens a place where people will want to shop, eat and play. Thank you.

Applause & Cheers from Audience

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Ms. Malloy. Gail Lynch-Bailey; and John Turner on deck. I don't know if you can outdo that, Ms. Bailey, but --

MS. LYNCH-BAILEY:

I'll certainly try, Mr. Presiding Officer. And thank you. Good afternoon, everybody. I am Gail Lynch-Bailey, President of the Middle Island Civic Association. It's certainly a wonderful pleasure to

see all of you again, having seen you in Hauppauge in March, I hope everybody had a wonderful summer. And I'm certainly happy that we're all safely through whatever that storm was.

And I'm also here to speak in support of efforts to create a place we are calling the field of dreams park at the old K-Mart site in Middle Island. Many of you know that this is the largest example of blight in our hamlet, that the old K-Mart building, empty for more than a decade, was finally torn down this spring. A few of you may be old enough to remember when this spot was home to Fairy Town, which was a nursery rhyme-themed amusement park. I went there as a girl and I'm very excited about being able to return there to have some outdoor fun again. And so are many others from Middle Island and the Longwood area who are with us this evening from the Civic, from the Middle Island Fire Department, the Longwood School District, the City on a Hill Church, Birchwood at Spring Lake and many other supportive people from Longwood. And we are here to urge you to approve Legislator Sarah Anker's resolution, 1757, which authorizes the appraisal of this premier property on the north side of our community's main street overlooking beautiful Artist Lake.

The willingness of owners Wilber Breslin and Fred Collin to sell the northwestern 48 acres of this parcel on Middle Country Road is a unique and important opportunity for government and citizens to create a lasting community treasure which we deserve. The southern 21 acres will be devoted to active parkland and the northern 28 acres will be preserved as open space where walking and hiking can continue to occur.

The really good news is that the New York State DEC very recently sent a letter to the County indicating its desire to appraise and purchase that northern parcel. So this lightens the lift considerably for Suffolk County, which is really good news.

More good news is that Brookhaven Town Supervisor Ed Romaine and Councilman Michael Gercio have promised that if the County buys the land, the Town will build a park consisting of sports fields made of turf, long-lasting, a community walking path around those fields and a playground. And as you've already heard, LYSA, our local volunteer sports group, will enter into an agreement with Suffolk County and the Town to maintain that park with help when required.

This type of partnership has worked so well at Mt. Sinai's Heritage Park and it's also in play in Middle Country at Boyle Road; I know Legislator Muratore has worked with the Town on this. These collaborations are the way of the future and they involve local groups and the improvement of their communities and provide much needed recreational outlets for all ages, especially our young people. And to that end, our LYSA group has been serving thousands of youngsters since 1962. It's one of the largest sports associations on Long Island and is older than the original Star Trek series which is having its 50th Anniversary tomorrow night, folks.

*(*Laughter*)*

And they've been searching the universe for fields of their own for half a century. Many previous opportunities have gone into black holes via lawsuits, Pine Barrens restrictions, etcetera.

(Timer Sounded)

Now that we finally have an opportunity for LYSA to call home, we implore you to please help us make our field of dreams a reality. Thank you so much, Ladies and Gentlemen.

Applause & Cheers from Audience

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Mr. Turner; and then on deck, Patricia Ariotti.

MR. TURNER:

Good afternoon, Presiding Officer Gregory and members of the Legislature. I'll be very brief, because you have a long list of speakers tonight. I just wanted to express the support, strong support of the Seatuck Environmental Association where I serve as the Conservation Policy Advocate, for two resolutions that are before you today; IR 1649 which would put in place a five cent fee on disposable bags, and a companion legislation that would really assess and analyze the impacts -- the logistical, financial, social impacts of the legislation which is IR 1767. We strongly support it and hope the Legislature will enact both of those today and reaffirm, once again, the Legislature's leadership role in environmental protection in the County. That's it. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Thank you, John. Okay, Patricia Ariotti; and then on deck, Kristie Malkasian; did I pronounce that right? Malkasian.

MS. ARIOTTI:

My concern's regarding adopting the law on carry-out bags. My shopping trips usually use seven to nine shopping bags with a range of three to 13 bags. Unable to predict how many bags will be required each trip, all 13 would have to be carried to the store every trip. The purchase price would be up to \$26; just this morning I priced the three different sizes at King Kullen. All bags would have to be cleaned, all 13, after I return from the trip. Reusable bags are not feasible for those with full shopping carts and it would be unfair to penalize them at five cents a bag. I'm really big on environmental issues and I know it's a really important problem, but quick fixes aren't -- aren't going to do it for us. I know it's a frustrating problem but, again, quick fixes that aren't feasible are not the solution. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Okay, Kristie Malkasian?

MS. MALKASIAN:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Oh, wait, I have two cards for you.

MS. MALKASIAN:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

I have two cards for you, but you're only allowed to speak once for three minutes.

MS. MALKASIAN:

Okay. This is on 1761. And I fully support 1760, regulating rescues, but this is about 1761 for the most part. First I'd like to thank Legislators Hahn and Martinez for bringing both these forward. Regulating pet dealers and animal rescue are very necessary for the safety of the animals and the strong consumer protection measures. I'd like to take a moment to put our current laws in context with this 1966 review.

In February of 1966, Life Magazine published an article and series of shocking photos that generated a huge outpouring of the most passionate letters the weekly had ever received. The outrage was in response to an article titled "*Concentration Camps for Dogs*", exposing the inhumane, indeed horrifying treatment of dogs by men and women who, as Life put it, were "*taking advantage of the growing demand for dogs for vital medical research,*" and in the process were cashing in on, "*a lucrative and unsavory business built and maintained on the misery of man's best friends.*" It cast a

light on a shadowy but, at the time, legal business in which dealers rode the country paying a buck or two to anyone who comes forward with a dog, no questions asked. So family pets were being stolen and everything else out of their yards to be sold for medical research.

Within six months of this article, Linden Johnson signed the 1966 Laboratory Animal Welfare Act. Two important items here; the 1966 Laboratory Animal Welfare Act covers the very operations that our pet dealers use today. While profit has shifted from medical research to consumer demand for puppies, it is still, in 2016, lucrative and unsavory. It is the reason Suffolk passed the first pet dealer law and is poised to pass stronger measures. If any of us kept our own pets according to the unchanged 1966 minimum standards of care for livestock as the USDA implemented, we would be arrested for animal cruelty. The USDA classifies their dogs as livestock, not companions, making what we would consider inhumane treatment legal.

Besides that, licensed -- unlicensed, unregulated operations exist today, just as they did in 1966. These unlicensed, unregulated facilities, as in 1966, are operating legally yet outside the law. Since then there have been hundreds of exposes of USDA licensed and unlicensed operations supplying pet dealers across the country, including Suffolk. The USDA standards are abysmally low resulting in poor quality product which means puppies. Suffolk's pet dealers are also sourcing puppies from entirely unregulated, unlicensed operations. Caged tags in stores, be it hobby or private breeder. This gives the illusion of a nice, safe home-based breeder. In reality, many of these private or hobby breeders have canceled their USDA license to avoid any inspection at all, or never bothered inspecting in the first place. None of our pet dealers in Suffolk County source from local unlicensed breeders. Why not? And that's because the large majority of Long Island breeders are true hobby breeders, they don't need third party sales.

(Timer Sounded)

The pets are vetted. The price of a high quality, vetted pet is unprofitable for dealers. We need to end the practice of hobby and private breeders, they must be at least USDA licensed. Thank you.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Next I have Adrienne Esposito; and then on deck, Meryl Cassidy.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Good evening, Members of the Legislature. Thank you for so much for the opportunity to speak. Well, after one year of lots of discussion and lots of debate and more discussion and more debate, I'm here again to ask you, as it comes before you this evening, to vote yes on the plastic bag bill 1649 and the companion bill, 1767.

Look, I know for some of you this presents some challenges, and I appreciate a lot of the thoughtful dialogue and the thoughtful discussions that we've had over the past year. I think that shows due diligence and it is very much appreciative. But I actually want to say to you, and I firmly believe this and guarantee this to you, if there -- you are brave enough to pass this bill, six to 12 months after it's implemented you will actually see a difference. You can't always say that with things that you do, but you will see a difference. You will see cleaner roads, you will see cleaner highways, cleaner beaches, cleaner parks, cleaner communities. You will get to see that.

So the point is really that these plastic bags are a mistake of the past. Reusable bags are the solution for our future. We're asking you to correct the mistake of the past and help us do the right thing for the future. This bill simply incentivizes making the switch, and we need you to help do that. The education is very important, but the incentivization is critical to the success. Help us move

in to the global movement of stopping already with the plastic pollution.

You know, oceanographers are telling us that by the year 2030, not that far away, that there will be more plastic pollution in the ocean than there will be fish. That's disgusting. And we need to stop accepting the status quo and make some changes. And I know it's not always the easiest thing and I know people don't always like change and I know it's going to be inconvenient for the first couple of months, I know. And I'm going to hear it like you hear it, too, but I'm okay with that and I hope you are, too. I don't come here for every issue and ask you to stick your neck out and vote, I don't and you know that. But we have 40,000 members on Long Island and 80,000 members statewide, and I am here today asking you to vote yes on these two bills and to do the right thing, because it will make a difference in the future. Thank you for all the effort and the attention that you have put into this issue, it is appreciated. Thank you again.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, Meryl Cassidy and then Hector Gavilla.

MS. CASSIDY:

Hi, everybody. As Executive Director of Response of Suffolk County, which is Suffolk's only 24/7 suicide prevention and crisis intervention center as well as the area provider for the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline, and as the Co-Chair of the Suicide Prevention Coalition of Long Island, I'd like to thank all of you for the opportunity to thank -- to speak today, and I'd especially like to thank Legislator Kara Hahn's office for introducing a resolution to designate this week as Suicide Prevention Week in Suffolk County.

September is an important month for suicide prevention. World Suicide Prevention Day is September 10th and National Suicide Prevention Week is this week. These events provide us with opportunities to encourage people who are struggling with suicidal behavior to seek help, to assist friends, family members and helping professionals and supporting individuals who are struggling with suicidal thoughts and behaviors and to expand the number of people who are actively engaged in suicide prevention and mental health promotion. But these goals require much more than just shouting our messages from the rooftops or designating a day or a week or a month to focus attention on suicide prevention, they require an informed and serious conversation. And for far too long conversations about suicide, if they took place at all, have focused on hopelessness and despair and inevitability, but both research and practice shows us that suicide can be prevented. We know that individuals at risk for suicide can overcome this risk and live healthy, productive and fulfilling lives, and we know that applying evidence-based practices and delivering comprehensive and integrated prevention programs can reduce the rates of suicide and populations.

So September provides us with an opportunity to rededicate ourselves to changing the conversation about suicide from one of despair and inevitability and hopelessness to one of hope and health and resilience. We can frame our messages to encourage hope. We can remind people at risk that there is help out there and that there is hope. We can remind friends and family that there is help and we can remind clinicians who are often very afraid to tackle this issue that they can provide that help. This week both the Suicide Prevention Coalition of Long Island the National Suicide Prevention -- National Suicide Prevention Lifeline have launched social media campaigns and so we are trying to shout our messages from the rooftops of Facebook and Twitter and Instagram and you can check out what we're doing there.

Those of us in the field of suicide prevention will be doing a lot of work this September. We'll be reaching out, we'll be speaking out, we'll be lighting candles, but let's also use September to renew our dedication to continuing to reframe and expand the national conversation about suicide, and by

doing so to turn hope -- to turn hurt into hope, pain into promise and anguish into action.

(Timer Sounded)

So once again, thank you, Legislator Hahn, for bringing this resolution to the floor and to all of you for putting suicide prevention on your agenda tonight. I really appreciate it. Suffolk County is once again proving to be a trailblazer and a role model for other counties to emulate and I am really proud to be a part of this important milestone. So thank you very, very much.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you.

Applause

Okay, Hector; and then Carlton Stewart.

MR. GAVILLA:

Good afternoon. My name's Hector Gavilla and I oppose the Red Light Camera Program. It was about a year ago that I first came up here to speak about it and we learned a lot in that year. What I'm passing around is something that's really appalling. I got one of the original red light camera tickets back in 2010, and just so you know, I think I only got one or two tickets. I want you all to understand, I'm not opposed to people breaking the law, I want people to be caught and ticketed if they're running red lights. But this is not the way to do it and I oppose the process.

Now, this letter, in my opinion -- and maybe Mr. Nolan can review this -- is unconstitutional because what you're doing -- I don't even think all of you are aware of what's going on in the process, but you're hiring an outside company, Xerox, to run the entire program, including the enforcement of it and the collection of the tickets, of the money. For many years my ticket was in the collections. I successfully had it removed and this year the collection agencies addressed all the camera companies and said, *Do not send the tickets to them anymore*. It's illegal to report it because it has nothing to do with my credit worthiness. So in response to that, the company in Maryland puts this letter out disguising it as a letter coming from the Traffic Bureau; it's not even signed by Paul Margiotta. What's that all about? And it also threatens they're going to boot my car, which I don't even own anymore; they're going to garnish my salaries, seize my bank account. Where do we live; are we in Cuba or the United States? This -- how can you take something that's supposed to be a traffic ticket, a traffic violation and then convert it to a civil case? This is unprecedented. This has never happened before. And you're disguising revenue for safety.

The only way to really prevent accidents is by having more police out there. When I was younger, I was 17, I was a teenager, what I remember, what stopped me from speeding, from reckless driving was, of course, number one being responsible, but also I saw more police officers out in the Suffolk County roadways than I do today. We cannot replace police officers with technology.

And I also was here a few months ago when you were passing around that speed camera like show and tell saying that we were going to have speed cameras that are going to replace what a police officer can do. I will tell you that if you want to keep the public safe, you have to have police officers doing their job. They have to pull people over, because that person who's speeding may get into an accident. You can't just take a video and say, *Hey, give him a ticket*. That person might be drunk and might run into somebody and kill somebody accidentally.

What am I going to do with this? I rip it up; I'm still not paying. This is a ticket that has not been paid since 2010. Okay? And this is a corrupt program. And what I'm announcing today, too, is I'm forming an exploratory committee, I already have my forms in, and I'm going to be running in the

16th District, and I hope I do as good of a job as you. Thank you very much and have a great day, everybody.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Hector. Carlton Stewart; and then Laurette Richin.

MR. STEWART:

Good afternoon, everybody. My name's Carleton Stewart, I'm a lifelong Brookhaven Hamlet resident. I'm also a board member of the Brookhaven Village Association and I'm basically here to reverberate the words of Adrienne Esposito in regards to the plastic bag surcharge that is going to be proposed soon. I fully support the measure.

Where we live, it is very environmentally sensitive. We see plastic bags getting lost in the woods or in the brush and it just breaks everybody's heart whenever we see it. And sometimes our members have clean-ups and we have residents come out and actually clean up the garbage that's on the side of the road. And it's one of those things that it breeds mosquitos when they trap the water in it, and also it's an unsightly thing. And I'm sure all of you have seen empty plastic bags rolling around in parking lots everywhere you go. It would be a wonderful thing if we could reduce that. We know we won't totally get rid of it, but any step or any measure that we can do to do that would be greatly appreciated and we hope you vote yes on that measure. Thank you very much.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Carleton. Lauretta Richin; and then on deck, Michael Mulcahey.

MS. RICHIN:

Good afternoon. My name is Laurette Richin, I am -- I started Long Island Bull Dog Rescue in 1999, so for 17 years I've been rescuing English Bull Dogs in Nassau, Suffolk and the five boroughs. We have spread out quite a bit, too. But in 1999 I had 13 dogs, this past year we had 360; that's a lot of dogs that people are spending between two and \$5,000 on, and an enormous number of them are -- because you can't breed these dogs healthy, randomly in packs just because they're cute. They're coming in with enormous health problems and they're coming in with what I see in the bill 1761, which I'm here supporting; what does URI mean? It's kind of a catch-all phrase, upper respiratory infection, which used to be something called kennel cough which goes like mad amongst populations of dogs, and it's curable pretty easily. By some -- you know, it's a virus, it runs its course, it's like a common cold.

Now we have things like all variations of K-9 influenza. The more dogs we have in crowded and unhealthy, unclean conditions, the more this creates this problem. To get an English Bull Dog healthy from K-9 influenza, it costs about, on Long Island, \$8,000. So what I'm getting is people buy puppies from puppy stores, bring home the adorable puppy, the puppy gets desperately sick, they go to the vet, they do this, they do that, the puppy is dying and we wind up with the puppy because we are able to raise that kind of money; your average family cannot. And this speaks to the conditions of crowding them together, willy-nilly, dogs from all different areas. They're not locally sourced, no one would ever say that they are.

So what we have is families spending money, spending emotional -- they're grief stricken. I listen to people cry day and night. They either have these respiratory infections or they need -- they now have tracheas, they need eye operations that cost \$1900. People can't do it, and they need to be -- these pet stores have to be run in a way where the animals are kept clean and the people are educated on something about the breed they're buying. Like I see people come in, they'll try and

give me a dog like an enormous dog that has got -- a Mastiff, and it's going to a family that has never trained a dog before and it's just you buy the dog, there's no thought about it, no consideration of the family. So there's that part of it. And the other thing that's going on is I was interviewed on Telemundo for this animal leasing business, which is really quite shocking because the family comes in, they usually lean on people who are a little confused about the language.

(Timer Sounded)

Here we go. Well, anyway, a dog that should cost \$3,000 winds up costing \$10,000, and then you have to give the dog back at the end of it. So anyway, thank you for listening.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Ms. Richin. Mr. Mulcahy; and then on deck, John -- I can't understand the writing -- Butler?

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

MR. MULCAHY:

Good evening, everyone. Thank you for taking the time --

P.O. GREGORY:

Can you please hold the mic a little bit closer to you?

MR. MULCAHY:

How's that?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yeah, better. Thank you.

MR. MULCAHY:

As President of the Long Island Alarm Association, I'd like to speak about the alarm registration legislation.

All membership does not disagree that there are too many false alarms, and we strive to reduce them. I just feel that the existing legislation was ill-conceived, because, as Gene mentioned, it does not do anything to address the amount of false alarms. The fees collected go to the Police General Fund, and your Chief of Police told us in a meeting that he didn't know exactly where the money went. So, you know, if you collect from 10,000 people, that's half a million dollars just in registration. That's a lot of money to not know exactly where it's going.

I'm dismayed that we weren't asked for our input before the law -- the legislation was enacted. We have a large membership that worked tirelessly with our customers to reduce false alarms, and we're pretty much out there every day dealing with this and we would have been a valuable resource for you. So please reconsider the legislation. Thank you for your time.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, sir.

*(*Applause*)*

Okay. Again, I think it's it John Butler, Batler. I'm not sure if it's a U or an A or -- okay. And then on deck, Ellen Hanzl.

MR. BOTTKE:

It's Bottke. I'm here trying to understand why Cupsogue Beach is closed for drive-ons. If it was going to be closed continuously, then why is Suffolk County issuing permits to drive on the beach when it's not allowed? The economic impact to business and everything else, and there's also an economic impact to the County, that each past permit should be refunded. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Ellen Hanzl, and then William Graham.

MS. HANZL:

Hello. My name is Ellen Hanzl and I manage operations and events at the Suffolk County Environmental Center in Islip. I work for Seatuck, a conservation agency on Long Island, and we manage the property and we manage all the private event rentals that come through the property.

So I am here tonight to request your support for two Certificates of Necessity that you'll be presented with at today's meeting. Both are to authorize upcoming events at the Suffolk County Environmental Center. Seatuck is co-hosting with two organizations, the Islip Chamber of Commerce and the Rotary Club of Bay Shore. These are annual events which we have held in the past. Unfortunately, we were late getting in the paperwork, hence, the Certificates of Necessity. Proceeds from the events will support the Chamber, the Rotary, and also help support Seatuck and the important conservation work that we do at the center.

I know it will be much later when you will vote on these certificates. In the meantime, Legislator Cilmi has my cell phone number, and should you have any questions, he can contact me. Thank you so much for your support, and thank you to the County Executive's Office for working with us on this. Have a good night.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

Okay. Mr. Graham. William Graham going once, William Graham going twice. William Graham? Okay. Robert Spota? Spercia?

MR. SPETTA:

Spetta.

P.O. GREGORY:

Spetta.

MR. SPETTA:

I'm here to speak about the false alarm law. Before I begin, I'd like to personally thank Legislator Browning for all the hard work and time she put in to amend this legislation. And being a "Political Pollyanna", I clearly see that she holds herself to the higher standards of County government.

Why was this law created? To reduce false alarms. According to the police website, a false alarm activation, resulting in a physical response by a police investigation, is determined not to have been caused or committed by -- or committed or an attempted crime. So as the central station, if we receive an alarm and dispatch the alarm, and then the owner calls the central station back and says, "Cancel the alarm," the central station calls the police to cancel the alarm and the 911 dispatch center replies, "It's up to the responding officer to cancel the alarm." So what does that mean? Aren't we trying to reduce false alarms? We're trying to tell you not to go, but it seems totally up to the police whether they want to respond to a false alarm or not. We told you not to go, so why would you bother -- why would you want to accept the response? Aren't we trying to reduce false alarms? These types of responses happen every day, and with this type of response, there is an open book for abuse of false alarm fines. I have examples of these activations and in writing and on tape. But due to the sensitive nature of this, I'd be more than happy to play these things for you privately.

The next section that I'd like to address is Section 2290-90, Appeals Process of the Law. If a person feels they did not have a false alarm, they can appeal it in writing. But going to Suffolk County P.D. or suffolkpd.org website, there's no form, no address, really no way for a citizen to appeal this fine. It's up to the Police Department Commissioner to determine whether the alarm is false or not. If a citizen wants to further appeal the process, he has to file an Article 78, which would require him to either get a lawyer or file the paperwork themselves, which would be cost prohibitive for an individual without the expertise or financial resources to file. In short, the citizens of Suffolk County are dealing with a law where the odds are stacked against them. It would appear that the law is just another way to generate income for the County.

In the nine months that this law has been enacted, Suffolk County Police have made little attempt in instituting a false alarm program other than fines and permits. If they really wanted to reduce false alarms, they would be instituting programs for proper usage of alarm systems and using resources to help reduce these false alarms. It's a terrible law and as it stands, and the amended legislation is a step in the right direction, at least with dealing with the citizens of Suffolk County. The ultimate question is what will your legacy be, terribly conceived and implemented law, or one where the obligations of your constituents come first? Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, sir.

*(*Applause*)*

Okay. Paul Pressman, and then on deck, Keri Michel.

MR. PRESSMAN:

Good afternoon, Legislators. First of all, I want to thank the Transportation Committee for their willingness to go after Suffolk County Transit about these bus cuts. I just want to give you a little information on how I got here today.

I took the S40 bus from West Islip to come here to go to Patchogue, besides the fact that one bus driver passed me by at a bus stop. Not one AVL system was working. The bus driver was smart enough that he turned on the old system, and the old system actually told people where they were stopping at, where the bus transfer points were, etcetera. I then got on the S66 bus, but Suffolk bus ran out of buses today because they had breakdowns. So the Clipper bus, with no back door, was the bus that I was on coming into Riverhead, and that is one of the busiest bus lines on the Suffolk County Transit, yet you want to cut eight buses tomorrow, and cutting those eight buses will end up you with no State or Federal funding for next year.

I am asking all the Legislators to show up tomorrow and on Friday in Hauppauge at the public meetings to listen to the public talk about this horrible bus service, which Legislator Browning was nice enough to eloquently explain to Suffolk Transit at that meeting a week ago Monday, and Ms. Fleming was also nice enough to put them on the carpet, which that they had no answers for.

You, as a Legislator -- as Legislators, spent \$100,000 two years ago for this AVL system that has done nothing in two years. I could sit down with Mr. McVoy and get you a system that would get more ridership, more money into this County in three hours than the 35 years you have not changed one bus schedule yet.

*(*Applause*)*

I have nothing else to say. The Legislators on the Transportation Committee know exactly what the situation is. And I can't thank Chairman Krupski enough, and his Legislative Aide, Mr. Stype, for all the help they have given me in the last year-and-a-half. And I have been to every single meeting, Transportation, and almost every single Legislative meeting, bar the times I got stuck because the buses didn't get me here. And I suggest that all the Legislators get to that meeting on the next two days, because, otherwise, you will not have any State funding, and then what are you going to tell the people when they can't get around anywhere, and then you lose money because they don't have jobs because they can't get there? Thank you very much.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Mr. Pressman.

*(*Applause*)*

Keri Michel, and then Chris Henby.

MR. HANLEY:

Hanley.

P.O. GREGORY:

Henley? Hanley, excuse me.

MS. MICHEL:

Good afternoon, Councilmen and Women. I come before you today to respectfully ask that you pass amended pet dealer law being proposed, which will strengthen regulation for pet dealers and pet stores in Suffolk County.

I am in my second year of peacefully protesting Little Wonders Puppy Emporium in Sayville, New York. I stand with the same dedicated group of community volunteers and animal advocates. We are there to bring awareness about what puppy mills are and their connection to the pet stores. Our goal is for people to make informed decisions. And with each passing day, we learn of more and more sick animals being acquired from pet stores. Many of these stories have had fatal endings. Consumers are constantly being duped by pet stores into thinking their pets are purebred, healthy and come from local breeders. This is far from the truth. Every single Long Island pet store is selling puppy mill puppies. They're acquiring these animals from the Midwest and having them shipped on 18-wheeler trucks to the northeast. The parent dogs are continuously bred at every heat cycle, and once depleted, they are killed in an inhumane fashion. These pet stores are profiting off the backs of suffering animals. Many of these puppies are being sold with multiple congenital diseases. Many pet dealers continue to be in violation of current pet dealer law by buying from hobby breeders, from breeders with multiple USDA violations, and by not disclosing required brokers or breeder information on their pet cages.

For those unaware, Missouri is the puppy mill capital of the world, and Iowa is ranked number two. Long Island pet stores are buying from here. I had the opportunity to visit more than a dozen Iowa puppy mills last week, and I have presented to you today CD and photos I took on my trip. You will also see documented proof of where Little Wonders Puppy Emporium, the store I protest, buys from. Don't be fooled by the beautiful appearance of the store. Like we tell consumers, it is the source in which they come from. One kennel has over 30 years worth of USDA violations. On March 9th, 2016, the previous kennel owner cancelled her USDA license, and on that very same day her daughter-in-law renamed the kennel and has been running it since.

I've also dedicated a lot of my time acquiring breeder and broker information from other pet stores across Long Island. These, too, have disclosed many multiple -- these, too, have disclosed many multiple USDA violations, and have been notated on the Humane Society of the United States' "Horrible Hundred" list of puppy mills.

I'm asking you to please take the time to read all. There is currently over 200 municipalities across the globe with bans and restrictions against the retail sale of commercially bred animals and retail outlets. Until the day comes where New York joins that list, I implore you to pass this well-needed reform to the current law. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Okay. Chris Handley, and then on deck, Brian Calhoun -- Culhane.

MR. HANLEY:

Hi. I'm Chris Hanley. I'm a lifelong resident of Suffolk County. I'm here to support Sarah Anker's resolution for money for appraisal fees of the K-Mart in Middle Island land acquisition. Thank you very much.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Okay. Brian, and then Tracy Bell.

MR. CULHANE:

Hi. I'm Brian Culhane. I'm here today representing Habitat for Humanity of Suffolk County. I am their real estate manager, and I'm here to speak about the -- you have four items on your agenda extending the 72-h Program for affordable housing. And I wrote a letter to the committee regarding one property that's on there that we currently have under construction, and I just wanted to express my general support for the resolutions continuing this.

I'll be meeting with the -- with your Real Estate Director to try to figure out ways that we can get better properties through the 72-h program, properties that we're able to develop, and try to avoid putting a lot of effort into properties that in the end we may have to end up transferring back to the County.

So that's about all I have to say about this. I did promise John Turner that I would also express my support for the bag bill, and thank you for your time.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Tracy Bell, and then on deck, Michael McDermott.

MS. BELL:

Good evening, County Legislators. My name is Tracy Bell and I live in Medford, New York, and I am here today to comment on Introductory Resolution 1761-2016. This Introductory Resolution would seek to strengthen the regulation of pet dealers and pet stores in Suffolk County. I am here to voice my support of this legislation.

I am a volunteer at a local municipal shelter who have seen many animals who may not have needed to be there. There is a tremendous influx of animals that arrive in local pet stores who come from nonreputable sources, more commonly known as puppy mills. The people who run these puppy mills have only one objective, to make money. They are not interested in the welfare of the animals themselves. This is evident in the conditions that the animals are bred in, transported in, and cared for. The female dogs are forced to breed over and over again until they are unable to and then they are put down. A good breeder respects and cares for animals first and foremost.

The legislation before you today seeks to ensure that anyone selling an animal must provide proof of where the animal came from. This legislation also forbids pet leasing and renting. This is a truly inhumane practice. This legislation also creates a website and database where reputable pet stores can be registered and be rated.

While this legislation sets the fine for violations at \$500 per violation, I urge the legislation to adopt a harsher penalty of at least \$1,000. Pet stores involved with puppy mills must understand that we, the residents of Suffolk County, will no longer tolerate their activities.

I would like to close by reminding everyone that, unfortunately, there are many dogs and cats in our municipal shelters. They need homes, too. While they are not often custom breeds, they are wonderful animals who will make wonderful members of your family. So I end by saying, I say this so many times, don't buy, adopt. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Okay. Michael McDermott, and then Katie McEntee.

MR. MC DERMOTT:

Hi. My name is Michael McDermott. I'm the Chairman of the Suffolk County Libertarian Party. I'm running from Congress in the Third District, and I'm very active in trying to help people and listen to them. And one thing that I've noticed tonight, especially when the proclamations were going on, which were wonderful, by the way, you're all paying really close attention. However, when people are here pouring out of their hearts very serious issues, you're all talking among yourselves like you're doing right now. And I'll tell you, it really bothers me, because, you know, I do realize --

*(*Applause*)*

-- that it's boring, and, you know -- and I do understand. But when you talk amongst yourselves, like Mr. Whatever-his-name-is over there, right now, to Mr. -- in Cilmi's seat, you know, you wonder, are you really listening to people? I mean, really, are you really listening to people? There are some serious issues going on here. And I'm running for political office, so is Steve Ruth, who, believe me, wouldn't be if it wasn't for these red light cameras, and believe me, he's got a big following. If he gets elected, there's going to be hell to pay, because he's not going to sit down and take it.

And I can tell you something else. I really am opposed to these red light cameras. I've watched them, I've videotaped them, I've counted the yellow lights, the yellow lights -- and many of them are only three seconds; some of them are five, some of them are six. People don't know what to do. They're all concentrating on whether they should go or not go. And I know you're not really paying attention because you've been told this so many times, but I'm telling you, you have to get rid of these things. Recently, a Judge in Chicago ruled them as unconstitutional. Now unconstitutional, you know, the Constitution goes from Chicago to New York, in case you're wondering, and I'm telling you, they're unconstitutional. You can't face your accusers. And to do this just to make money, because if you didn't, you would lengthen the -- at least lengthen the yellow lights to eight seconds. Nobody died from and eight-second yellow light.

Mr. Cilmi, I don't see him over there, but he put a bill, he's says there's a bill floating through to do just that. I don't know where that is or what's happening with it, but I'd like to know. If he were here, I'd like to ask him that. But I really think, at the very least, if you can't just suspend this flawed program, this terrible program, even though it makes you a lot of money for Suffolk County, which is in desperate need of money, there are other ways to make money and to save money in a budget. First among them is to stop spending, stop spending foolishly. Pay attention to what these go. You don't just pass things to spend more money and then say we need the red light cameras because we need revenue, because if it wasn't for the revenue, you'd make the yellow lights eight seconds. And, you know, eight seconds, like I said, nobody ever died from an eight-second yellow light, so why not do that? Well, I know the answer. It's a rhetorical question. The answer is you won't make the money. So it really comes down to all about funds.

And I think that coming up here and speaking, and thank you for paying attention, I really appreciate it, because you do, but not many -- not many others do; Mr. Barraga has. But I want to say that -- Mr. Cilmi, I just asked you a question. What happened with that yellow light extension bill. Is that in order?

P.O. GREGORY:

Sir, you can't ask, you can't ask questions.

LEG. CILMI:

I'll come out and I'll speak to you.

MR. MC DERMOTT:

Say yes or no.

P.O. GREGORY:

Please, your time has expired.

MR. MC DERMOTT:

Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:

Katie McEntee.

MR. MC DERMOTT:

In closing, I've decided that talking to you people, with some exceptions on occasion, is not going to do anything. The only thing we can do is when you're all up for election next year is to replace you, and I'm going to work very hard to do just that. You have time to change things and I wish you would.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

Katie McEntee, and then Jonathan McCann.

MS. MC ENTEE:

Hello. Thank you for letting me be here today. My name is Katie McEntee and I'm with the Southampton Animal Shelter Foundation. I'm here to talk about 1761.

We need to strengthen the regulation of pet dealers and pet stores in Suffolk County. Sick animals being brokered throughout Long Island, people renting puppies, things are bad and animals are at risk. We need to stand together and support this law. This is a great step in the right direction.

Pet stores stock their stores with puppies from puppy mills. This is a horrific industry where the lives of dogs are not taken into consideration. Money is more important than the lives of these dogs. As a shelter, we receive and help animals in many different situations. We see what happens when backyard breeding goes bad. We see the dogs sitting day after day waiting for homes while the unhealthy puppies are being brought in on a daily basis.

We educate the public about spaying and neutering while stores are handing out puppies unaltered. We rescue the moms from puppy stores and backyard breeders that would have been discarded or even killed in some circumstances. These dogs never have known the touch of a human hand. It takes us weeks or even days to be able to pet them. We rescue their puppies as well. Their puppies usually come with major health issues. Recently, we met a puppy names Hazel who was a Basset Hound who was born with no hip joints. SASF never turns away an animal in need. We get the sick puppies from the breeders, from the new owners who can't afford or do not want to deal with helping them.

Renting pets should be prohibited for the safety of us and for our animals. Bringing a sick puppy in the home can turn -- can hurt your pet and your family. Contagious zoological diseases need to be considered. Spay and neuter and sterilization services by a licensed veterinarian need to be made available. At SASF all our pets are spayed and neutered, vaccinated and microchipped. We are fighting an uphill battle of overpopulation of pets in Long Island and these services need to be made available to pet owners. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Jonathan McCann, and then Jill Rappaport on deck.

MS. RAPPAPORT:

Jonathan's here.

P.O. GREGORY:

Gotcha, okay.

MR. MC CANN:

Good afternoon. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak regarding Chapter 299, Suffolk County Code. I'm Jonathan McCann, the President of the Southampton Animal Shelter Foundation, which is a leading shelter in the country. It's in the top 10% of all shelters. I just wanted to give you a look at the background of our shelter and show you how it relates to Chapter 299.

We're an open no-kill shelter that serves Suffolk County. Our adoption rate is very high, because we offer exceptional training and top medical care for all the animals. The animals come to us from a number of different avenues. There are a number which are owner-surrendered every year. To date, there are 68 of them. About 20% of the owner-surrendered dogs are purebred. Often owners buy these dogs on impulse at pet stores, and find that they cannot care for them, and turn them into our shelter. We have to give them training and make sure that they're medically clear before we put them up for adoption. We also make sure that we support all adopters of these dogs, which pet stores never do. They do not -- do not in any way help owners who come up with problems, and we make sure that either the owners bring these dogs back to the shelter for additional training, or we send trainers into their homes.

We also take in approximately 80 dogs from puppy mills. We rescue the parents of the puppies that are sold at pet stores. If we did not rescue them, those parents of those dogs would be killed. All of the dogs that we bring in from the puppy mills are purebred dogs. Strays come to us often from owners who turn them out, no longer can care for them. And we also take in dogs from shelters within the area that are overcrowded. Our animals are adopted out with full disclosure, which does not happen in pet stores, and we strive to find permanent homes for all the animals. The insecurity for the animals of not knowing where their permanent homes are can create a number of problems. The point that I wanted to stress regarding --

P.O. GREGORY:

Sir, please wrap up, your time has expired.

MR. MC CANN:

Okay then. So I just wanted to terminate with a quote from Gandhi. The greatness of a nation and its moral progress can be judged by the way its animals are treated. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, sir. Jill Rappaport.

MS. RAPPAPORT:

Hi. My name is Jill Rappaport, I'm an animal advocate. And, first of all, I just don't think we should have pet dealers, period. I'm very grateful that we're taking a step in the right direction. What is a pet dealer? You are selling animals. We don't know. How do we regulate where they're coming from? This is how the whole puppy mill started, the whole puppy mill movement, and it is so unbelievable. I have friends that have gone to pet stores. Their animals have been sick for the remainder of their lives. We cannot regulate these, quote, animal dealers, pet dealers enough to make sure that these animals are safe. We need to adopt, not shop. I am really here to say that I don't believe --

*(*Applause*)*

-- that any animal should be for sale. And I just wish we can get to a point in our lives that pet stores do not have pets for sale anymore. Let them sell dog food, let them sell cat food, not animals. And, you know, to say that we can regulate these pet dealers, you can't. There is no way to really know who is reputable and who isn't; am I right?

*(*Applause*)*

So I'm here to say please adopt, don't shop. Please understand that they are our children, they're an extension of our family, our animals. We are pet parents and we wouldn't sell our family members. And you cannot regulate the laws properly to make sure that these animals are taken care of. I applaud this committee for at least trying to take steps in the right direction, but the real right direction is to stop the sales of animals. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Okay. Please don't be offended. Alycia, is it Frank? I can't read it. I don't know if it's an H or a K.

MS. FRANK:

Alycia Frank, you're right.

P.O. GREGORY:

It is Frank?

MS. FRANK:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. And then Diane Madden.

MS. FRANK:

Hello, everyone. I'm used to speaking at Islip Town Hall, it's a lot smaller. Okay. So I'm just going to start by saying that I am also an animal advocate and I care about the welfare of all animals. I'm here today to show my full support for the Local Law strengthening regulations of pet dealers and pet stores in Suffolk County.

Also, while I'm here today, I'd like to urge the Board to please reach out to the Town of Islip about their long overdue T&R program. I have no doubt that there will eventually be a program for Islip, but I strongly urge that the time is now. So if any one of you can please give them a call and steer them in the right direction, that would be appreciated. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Okay. Ms. Madden, and then Craig Burkhardt.

MS. MADDEN:

Hi, good evening. My name is Diane Madden. I am President and cofounder of an organization called Hope for Hempstead Shelter. That became necessary to address the animal shelter issues and reform issues. It was about then, years ago, that I discovered that animal welfare is completely 100% political. I am now an animal advocate.

I'm from Nassau County and I came out here. Really, it's a tough call to decide which of these bills to discuss. I do prefer to discuss 1760, because I do have a rescue background.

Getting back to the political part, I only wish I can convince every rescuer and advocate that it is political, because they probably by now have their own political party. We are a great deal of people out there that love animals and want them protected.

This bill is so important. Probably not just for everyone's purpose out here, but I'd love to be able to go to Nassau County and say, "Look what they did again. We need to keep up." This bill is important because so many rescue organizations, well, they're not regulated. And, you know, both of these issues, again, speak to the overpopulation of animals. And what happens there, it becomes such a consumer issue, because the consumers are subsidizing these issues that these animals come up with, the hereditary issues, the congenital issues, the behavior issues.

I was rescuing from an animal shelter for ten years, and, you know, although people at times will call themselves rescuers, they're really not rescuing the animals in our own backyards, and I believe charity begins at home. They're bringing many animals and puppies from down south. And what breaks my heart is they're leaving the parents oftentimes. And although that's their discretion, it's up to our elected officials and elected officials in general to regulate these kinds of -- this kind of conduct, because it does hurt the consumer. It also competes with our animals in the animal shelter. You go to adoption events and you see these shelters bring all of these beautiful animals to adoption events, and they can't compete with tiny puppies, that many of them end up in the municipal shelters right next to them months later. So I urge you to pass that.

I have to say that you have the best animal advocates out here, they really are, they're knowledgeable. I could have just probably said to everyone here, "Listen to them, take their advice," because they really -- they set the bar. And, again, you know, with this -- with this rescue bill, it does trickle down to the shelters, you know, the inaction of Legislators not to regulate. Our shelters have standards of care, our shelters have levels of responsibility. Individual rescues, smaller shelters, everyone should be regulated so that these animals are getting the best of care.

And I'll say one more thing, that anyone to oppose a rescue bill, anyone to oppose that is the reason we need it, because that means they're not doing the right thing. Thank you very much.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Thank you. Okay. Mr. -- is it Burkhardt?

MR. BURKHARDT:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. And then on deck, Joseph Biondo.

MR. BIONDO:

Yes.

MR. BURKHARDT:

Hello, Ladies and Gentlemen. My name is Fred Burkhardt. I am the owner of Smith Point Bait and Tackle. Sorry, I'm one of the last speakers; a little late today. I had to close the business to come down here and talk to you people.

My major issue is the access at Smith Point County Park. Some of you heard me speak before. It's very important to me to have this access to our beach. A lot of people spoke about, you know, animals, walking their dogs on the beach, their children, recreation. Suffolk County is parks and recreation, and by closing our Smith Point outer beach for 15 weeks this summer, we are missing out on a huge part of our recreation. Not only does it affect my business drastically, I just got an email from one of my distributors that I'm down 51% this year because the beach stayed closed so long. Not only does that affect me on a, you know, business sense, but also as my family goes, my

children. You know, I mean, my kids love to go to the beach. Thank goodness it opened in time for my son to have his birthday down there. That's what he wanted. "Dad, I want to go to the beach for my birthday." How many other kids in Brookhaven are like that? There's got to be hundreds, if not thousands of children who want to access Smith Point County Park.

And we're dealing with this closure every year, more and more and more. Nobody's standing up for me, nobody cares. It seems like I've fallen on deaf ears. I come to speak in front of everybody and every year it gets worse. Why are our constraints so much tougher at Smith Point than they are when you go west? You have 150 feet from the bird, apparently, when you go to Democrat Point, but you have 1500 feet when you go to Moriches. How is that fair? We're on the same Island. It's destroying me, you know, I mean both in my heart and my mind and in my business. And I just don't -- you know, I don't know what to say to anybody anymore. Something has to change here, you know. I have nothing more to say. I don't -- I don't know what to do anymore. Thank you very much, Mrs. Browning, for all your help.

*(*Applause*)*

These are my family, my friends, you know, I mean, and they're all affected. This is what we love, this is what we live for, this is what we're on Long Island for, parks and recreation. That beach is beautiful. Thank you very much for hearing me.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you for coming out, sir. All right. Mr. Biondo, and then William Pearson.

MR. BIONDO:

Good evening, all. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak. I, too, am speaking to the access of the Smith Point beaches, as well as the other town beaches and "Cuppy". I've been a lifelong Suffolk County South Shore resident. As a child -- as a child, the bay and the ocean beaches offered me a wondrous playground. As I grew up, I became more cognizant of the interactions between the flora and the fauna and the unique ecosystems which they form. I am now taking my children to the same places I frequented as a child, an adult. I marvel in the excitement in my children's eyes for the first time when they see a crab scurrying across the beach, or a school of fish bursting to the surface at the ocean. This is one of our legacies are the access to the beaches. It is our birthright to enjoy these beaches. I have -- my grandchildren are fifth generation of children enjoying this beach, and to close it down is a travesty for them, for the simple reason is that the outer beaches represent the learning and interaction with nature to see how the ecosystems work. Please keep our outer beaches open so that our children and grandchildren can enjoy the wonders of nature as we have enjoyed them and grown to love them. Thank you very much. Keep the outer beaches open.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, sir. Mr. Pearson, and then Ken Dennisly (Densieski).

MR. PEARSON:

Good evening. I'm here to speak about the alarms, the alarm fines and fees. Last week I was here and I heard people speaking, the Chief of Police, Ms. Browning was chairing it, and they all said it was a revenue grab. Well, lo and behold, a week later it's a revenue grab, Newsday, compliments of Newsday. They came out and printed it what we saw, what we all believed.

This alarm stuff is going to have unintended consequences. Elderly people are going to turn off their alarms. They're the ones that have the most or the least dexterity and the least response time to push the buttons on their alarm when they're panicked. So, therefore, they're going to disarm them, or disable them, or get rid of them, okay? That's one thing, because they can't afford the fees.

The second thing is people that have alarms are preventing crime. You're now telling people having an alarm is going to cost you to prevent crime. Go to a house that doesn't have an alarm, it's easy to burglarize. Go to a house that has an alarm system, it's not that easy. People are going to pay one way or the other, but, again, it's a revenue grab. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Ken Denisly? Did I pronounce that right?

MR. DENSIESKI:

Close enough.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Densieski.

P.O. GREGORY:

Densieski. Oh, that's a K. I thought it was an H. I'm sorry. And then Klaus Rondinella.

MR. DENSIESKI:

Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Legislature. My name is Ken Densieski. I was born about a half a mile over there on the other side of the river in what is now the Cranberry Bog Park. So I have been related to the Parks and Recreation Committee for my whole life, ever since they basically used eminent domain to take the land from my parents.

Right now, our land is being taken at all the beaches because of the piping plovers. Unfortunately, what I saw at Cupsogue the last -- excuse me, Smith Point the last couple of years brought tears to my eyes. I saw the bulldozers over there clear-cutting the whole barrier island creating the habitat for these birds. Therefore, now we buy a \$100 permit that we cannot use for two-thirds of the year. Are these people going to be reimbursed for these? I doubt it. At the bottom of now the Parks Department has put that they have the right to close the beach at any time for any reason.

I have been here before both the Parks and Recreation Committee meetings on May 4th and this past Wednesday, so I'm not going to get into the details.

One of the other problems I had was I could not even be provided with a map. We had to go through the Clerk's Office and everyone else. Within a week's time I was able to get a map.

I would definitely like to meet with the Board and the Parks Rec. Committee, Mr. Krupski, Ms. Fleming. And, of course, Kate Browning, you were wonderful last week. If we can please schedule and arrange a meeting to meet with these places, show you the buried snow fences --

LEG. BROWNING:

Sure.

MR. DENSIESKI:

-- because you folks are going to be served with a lawsuit real soon. There is buried stakes in the beach. They are put their own purpose to keep us from driving across the beach. I'm a Southampton Town resident. On September 15th, at 6 o'clock at night, I am allowed to drive on the beach in the Town of Southampton 24/7. I come to a fence at the Brookhaven Town line, where Cupsogue begins, and they will not let me drive through on the beach, even though I have a County permit. I have to drive a mile back on the beach, get off at Pike's to drive to the end of the inlet down to Burma Road to make a U-turn to access another 1,000 feet of beach. They won't allow us to drive in front of the pavilion. We drive in front of the pavilion at Ponquogue, at Tiana, at Coopers Beach, at numerous other beaches and there has never been anyone run over.

Getting on the piping plovers, though, it's okay when the people, they bring their dogs and they let them off leash, and a lot of them are bird dogs, and that's the first place they go is up in the dunes. That's it, game over for those eggs, they are done for the year. We need more enforcement. Somehow, a picture is painted as us as families taking our kids and grandkids to the beach. This is the only way the elderly, the handicapped, and the disabled have access to the beach.

Again, thank you for your time. I look forward to meeting with you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, sir. Okay. Klaus?

MR. RONDINELLA:

Thank you to the Legislature for allowing me to speak. My name is Klaus Rondinella. I am the President of the Long Island Beach Buggy Association. I'm also President Pro Tempore of UMAP. I represent 18,000 members all throughout our community on Long Island and on the East Coast.

Suffolk County has one of the best beaches on Long Island, probably the best beaches, and I deal with the whole East Coast. You have something that is -- it's not there anymore. You don't have long stretches of beaches that are wide open.

Smith Point is a jewel, it shouldn't be closed in the summer. The birds have to be protected, we understand that, that is a given. It is a Federal mandate that you have to follow. But having Burma Road -- now, if you don't know what Burma Road is, it's an access road behind the dunes that allows you to go from the area coming into anywhere out there. To close that and not have access, it makes no sense. You force all the people in western Suffolk County to have to travel all the way out to -- at least to Cupsogue. That means going out to Southampton. And then there are restrictions on how many people will go to those beaches. So you're effectively cutting off a whole population of western Suffolk County to the beach access. It is ridiculous, it really is.

There are things called Section 8's that you can as a County go to the Federal Government and get -- you can speak to them and there are ways of getting around this. I'm dealing with this right now up on the Cape and down to Cape Hatteras. In Cape Hatteras, we spent a quarter million dollars down there to alleviate the problems. I really don't want to do that up here. I think it could be done on a Legislative level. You people are servants of us. We're asking for your help. Please help us get this open. It's not fair.

And the other thing is the local businesses are starving. It's not right. How can you -- like I said, you as our servants, you can't let us starve out there. Craig, who has a business down there, he's been there forever. This is a family business that's falling apart. It's a shame. You really need to do something about it. Thank you very much.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, sir. That's the last card I have. Is there anyone else that would like to speak that has not spoken? Please come forward. Yes, ma'am. Oh, boy. We have ten minutes before we get to public hearings.

MS. WOLMUT-STANKIEWICZ:

I actually submitted card.

P.O. GREGORY:

You have to speak on the --

MS. WOLMUT-STANKIEWICZ:

I submitted card and then nobody called me.

P.O. GREGORY:

Are you Barbara Dennihy?

MS. WOLMUT-STANKIEWICZ:

No. Ewa Wolmut-Stankiewicz. It's spelled E-W-A.

P.O. GREGORY:

Did you fill out a yellow card or a green card?

MS. WOLMUT-STANKIEWICZ:

Yellow card. Yellow.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Go ahead.

MS. WOLMUT-STANKIEWICZ:

Oh, hi. I am here in support of making laws stronger for pet dealers and for pet stores. I started to volunteer in the shelter about a year ago and I realized how poorly the animals are treated. So imagine for yourself this beautiful day, sunny, you meet your children or grandchildren, and you propose, "Oh, let's go make a field trip and we will go to puppy mill." So your children are walking between the cages, crying, and looking at the conditions of animals, what condition animals are living, and you turn around and you say, "Oh, it's okay, this is not against the law, the law allowed that." So that's why I am here to advocate, and I am holding you as lawmakers to make sure that the law for the pet stores and pet dealers are getting stronger.

And, also, I would like to invite everybody to the shelter to see our fabulous, fantastic shelter dogs. Thank you very much.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, ma'am.

MS. WOLMUT-STANKIEWICZ:

Oh, hold on. I am just checking if I didn't -- making laws stronger not only benefit animals, it benefits our nation's soul and consciousness. Thank you very much.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Now Susan Reese.

MS. REEVE:

Reeve.

P.O. GREGORY:

Reeves.

MS. REEVE:

Reeve, no S.

P.O. GREGORY:

Reeve, okay.

MS. REEVE:

Say it any way you'd like, as long as you please listen to me.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right.

MS. REEVE:

All right. My people have been here. They were some of the first people to land on Long Island. As a matter of fact, they settled it. I belong to the Hallock, Tuthill, Reeve, and all the East End families on the North Fork. I'm related to most of them, if not all of them. What I want is the ability to ride my vehicle on the beach off-season, have Cupsogue open to us when we're supposed to have it open. Take down that fence that he was talking about, that Ken Densieski was talking about, because it's ridiculous that they have to waste all that gas to go all the way back and around to get on the other side of that fence. There needs to be more regulation, like he said, about the dogs running loose.

And one of the things that was brought up last week at the meeting that I went to was the fact that some of the homeowners were complaining about people driving on their beaches. First of all, it's not their beaches, the beaches are supposed to be for everybody, all the citizens, you and me.

(*Applause*)

Second of all, those of us who have been driving on the beaches for years, and I started out with a VW van camping down at Shinnecock East when I -- back in the '70s, when my son was little. We stop, we picked the garbage up. We help people that need help. We watch out for each other. We call on law enforcement when it's needed. We do not do harm on that beach. We tell people to straighten their acts out when they're not being good, for the most part. We watch out for the law enforcement when they are on the beach. If you close us and keep us off the beach, it's going to be just like some of the places that they've opened up to the public where the garbage is flying around.

And, by the way, we'll get to the plastic bags problem. Ban those suckers. I was in California all winter and I'll tell you what --

(*Applause*)

-- California is gorgeous. It's so nice to ride around there and not see plastic bags everywhere.

*(*Applause*)*

And if you can't pick up one of these cheap cloth bags, then stay home and get it delivered to you.

*(*Applause*)*

Thank you for listening. And I'm sorry if a little sarcasm comes through, but I'm a Long Island girl and it comes from the soul.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. All right. Anyone else? Yes, ma'am. Please come forward and state your name.

MS. DENNIHY:

Hi. My name is Barbara Dennihy, and I'm the New York Director for Companion Animal Protection Society. I'd like to thank Legislator Hahn and Martinez for bringing forth 1760 and 1761.

As it stands now, New York State and all of its counties have no laws regulating companion animal rescue groups. There's no inspections, no guidelines and no rules. Dogs and cats have no protection from cruelty or abuse while in a rescue, and consumers who adopt sick and vicious dogs have no responsibility for these irresponsible groups.

Suffolk County has many wonderful, caring, respectable and responsible animal rescue groups. Unfortunately, there are some who see animal rescue as an opportunity to make a fast buck and a huge profit. Negligent rescue groups prey on the sympathy of the public who believe they are doing a good deed by adopting an animal from a local rescue. These reckless rescue groups will pull dogs from out-of-state shelters that are overflowing at little or no cost. They pile them into a van and drive them to Suffolk County, where they are immediately offered to the public through adoption events. A fee is charged for the adoption anywhere from 250 to \$400. Irresponsible rescue groups will tell the adopter the fee is to help cover the cost of shots and spay and neutering. Many times the shelters that these dogs are pulled from have already done this. Other times only a rabies shot has been given, and the dog and cat is adopted out to the public as is. There is no isolation, no temperament testing, and they are not spay and neutered. The cost to vet these dogs and cats falls to the unknowing adopter.

Dogs crossing into New York State have paperwork called a Certificate of Veterinary Inspection. The key word here is inspection, not examination. The only money these unreliable rescue groups put into dogs and cats is the gas that it costs them to get to Suffolk County. At an adoption event, an adoption of \$300 per dog, if four dogs are adopted per week, this irresponsible rescue group has made \$1200 profit, minus the expense of gas. Even becoming a 501(c)(3) status does make you a responsible rescue. There is virtually no oversight of 501-3's, and certainly no one inspects the animals. I ask that all of you support 1760, and also 1761 for the pet dealers. It's outrageous that you can lease or rent a dog to the public. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Okay. Please state your name.

MS. GREEN:

Hi. I'm Pamela Green, Director of the Kent Animal Shelter over in Calverton. I'm here to support Bill 1760 and 1761, but I'll speak specifically about 1760, the rescue bill. And I'd like to thank Legislators Hahn and Martinez for introducing this very important legislation. It's all about regulation.

And Kent Animal Shelter has been operating since 1968. We rescue animals, we bring them in, in very -- from a lot of different sources. It could be animal shelters on Long Island, private families, abuse situations, hoarding situations. All of these animals are brought to Kent, they are vaccinated. They get whatever medical care that they need, including special surgeries, sometimes orthopedic surgeries. They're spayed and neutered, they're vaccinated, they're microchipped, and they're offered to the public only when they're healthy and they are ready for adoption.

Now, most of the time, what we put into these animals cost-wise we do not get back. It costs us money, that's why we're a nonprofit, to rescue animals. Unfortunately, what has happened is that these rescue groups, so-called rescue groups, are basically dog-flippers, if you will, and they take in animals. And we've had firsthand knowledge of it at Kent Animal Shelter, because people are coming in, consumers, saying, "Well, I got this dog from such and such a rescue group, and it's sick. It's costing me thousands of dollars at the veterinarian," and they have no recourse. They can, you know, either take care of it themselves. The rescue groups won't do anything.

This bill will allow oversight. They should have permits, just like regular animal shelters, to operate every year. They should have -- they should be open to inspection. They should have proper plumbing, ventilation, space for the animals. They should have four-foot by eight-foot exercise areas. You can't just keep adult dogs in small cages. Even if they can get up and turn around in these cages, they're piled high in these storefronts, they're dirty. And, you know, the animals are sick, and consumers are getting duped. And animals, of course, should be spayed and neutered before they're released. No rescue group should be selling animals, because that's what they do, they're charging 4-, 5-, \$600, and the animals are not spayed, and they're just not doing things by the book.

So there needs to be oversight, there needs to be a bill, and I hope that every one of you will support this bill for the consumers and for the animals.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Okay. We are going to go into the Consent Calendar. I make a -- make a motion to close the Public Portion, second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Browning - Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. I make a motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MS. ELLIS:

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Browning - Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Prior to going to Public Hearings, I want to make a motion to take I.R. 1754 out of order. It's on Page 10 --

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

-- on the agenda; second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions to take out of order?

MS. ELLIS:

Sixteen. (Vote Amended to 17/Not Present: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, I'm sorry. ***I.R. 1754 - Opting into state legislation in relation to special retirement plans for sheriffs, undersheriffs and deputy sheriffs (Pres. Off.)***. I have a motion, and second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions to take out of order?

MR. RICHBERG:

We called it.

P.O. GREGORY:

We had -- we called that? Okay. All right. I make a motion to approve, second by Legislator Calarco. Anyone have any questions? All in -- oh, Legislator D'Amaro. Page 10, Government Ops, 1754. Okay. So I have a motion and a second on I.R. 1754 -- to approve I.R. 1754. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:

Sixteen. (Vote Amended to 17/Not Present: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Now we're going into Public Hearings, it is 6:30. Okay. All right. ***I.R. 1309 - A Local Law to Limit Nitrogen Content in Lawn Fertilizers (Lindsay)***. I do not have any cards on this public hearing. Would anyone like to speak on it? Please come forward. Okay. I make a motion to recess.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MS. ELLIS:

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1332 (1322) - 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 do have one person, Jennifer Apple -- Appel?

MR. NOLAN:
1322.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yeah, 1322.

MR. NOLAN:
You said 32.

P.O. GREGORY:
Did I say 32? I'm sorry, 1322.

MS. APPEL:
Good evening. My name is Jennifer Appel. I'm the Vice President and General Counsel of the Long Island Housing Partnership. We are not-for-profit and have been developing affordable and workforce housing in Suffolk County for over 27 years.

P.O. GREGORY:
Ma'am, can you speak closer into the mic so we can hear you?

MS. APPEL:
Sure.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you.

MS. APPEL:
LIHP supports Local Law 1322, to further incentivize the creation of affordable workforce housing. LIHP feels that the amended legislation is critical in requiring that the workforce housing units be constructed onsite. We also believe that the amended legislation will entice developers to construct these workforce units at a greater percentage to gain a larger reduction of the sewer connection fees as is proposed. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Could I ask her a question? So exactly what was -- what was your role? What did you describe yourself as?

MS. APPEL:
We're a not-for-profit housing developer, and we also assist private developers in developing affordable housing.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
How do you assist private developers?

MS. APPEL:
Quite often, a municipality will request that we work with the developer to make sure that they price the units accordingly at the workforce housing levels, and that we review it to make sure that the -- either first time home buyers that we're selling the units to meet certain income levels.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And who pays you to do that?

MS. APPEL:

Usually, it's the developers.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So the question I have for you is you said that you are not in favor of letting the municipalities have any leeway in moving the affordables, some or all of the affordables off site from the project. Have you -- do you think that's -- is it a blanket statement from all the municipalities, or do you -- is that your opinion only?

MS. APPEL:

We don't represent the municipalities. We're just saying it's been our experience that when this requirement -- when this -- when you're allowed to build the units off site or at a different location, the units never get built.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

How often have you seen that happen?

MS. APPEL:

We've seen it happen a couple of times in I think the Town of Islip, and I know in Huntington they did eventually get built, but it was about 10 or 12 years after the market rate units were built.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Do you think if there was -- obviously, you can make a very easy provision in the law, since there's so much public money, taxpayers' money getting pumped into these -- some of these affordable housing projects, that there would be conditions that the affordability of the -- the affordable projects would be built at the same time as the market rate?

MS. APPEL:

There could be conditions built in that way, yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Okay. Thank you.

MS. APPEL:

You're welcome.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. Okay. Anyone else like to speak on I.R. 1322, please come forward. Okay.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion to close.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Browning - Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1503 - A Charter Law to Improve the County's Budget Approval and Amendment Process to Increase Transparency and Accountability ("Taxpayer Awareness Act.") (Cilmi). I don't have any cards. Is there anyone here who would like to speak on this matter, please come forward. Okay. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Motion to recess, please.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to recess by Legislator Cilmi, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Browning & D'Amaro - Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1598 - A Local Law to Register Retailers of Electronic Nicotine Delivery Systems in Suffolk County (Cilmi). I don't have any cards on this matter. Is there anyone that would like to speak, please come forward. Okay. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Motion to close, please.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to close by Legislator Cilmi, second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator D'Amaro - Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1754 (1752) - A Local Law to Amend Chapter 353 of the Suffolk County Code to Authorize the County Department of Audit and Control to Register Nonprofit Veterans Organizations (Co. Exec.). I don't have any cards on this public hearing as well. Is there anyone that would like to speak, please come forward. Okay.

MR. NOLAN:

Fifty-two.

P.O. GREGORY:

What did I say?

MR. NOLAN:

Fifty-four.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, gees. All right. I.R. 1754, excuse me.

MR. NOLAN:

Two

LEG. CILMI:

Two.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Two.

P.O. GREGORY:

Two. All right. Meeting adjourned. All right. I'm sorry. My apologies.

(*Laughter*)

Yes I see the representative from the Administration.

MS. HORST:

We just ask that you close this.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. A motion to close I.R. 1752 and 54. I'm only kidding. Second by Legislator Cilmi to close I.R. 1752. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1758 - A Local Law to prohibit unregulated Synthetic Opioids in Suffolk County (Stern). I do have one card. I know the Commissioner was coming. Is he here yet? Is there anyone else that would like to speak on this matter?

MS. HORST:

He hasn't arrived yet.

P.O. GREGORY:

He hasn't arrived yet? Okay. Would you guys mind if we skip over this? Okay.

All right. ***1760 - A Local Law to Regulate Animal Rescue Organizations Operating in Suffolk County (Martinez)***.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Motion to close.

P.O. GREGORY:

Hold on, hold on, hold on. I have one card, Ms. Dori Scofield.

MS. SCOFIELD:

Don't forget about me.

P.O. GREGORY:

We don't want to make you left out. Oh, there you are. Okay.

MS. SCOFIELD:

I'm short. So I do want to thank Legislator Martinez and Hahn for bringing forth this resolution. My name is Dori Scofield, founder and President of Save-A-Pet Animal Rescue in Port Jefferson Station, Executive Director of Guardians of Rescue in Smithtown, and Cofounder of Paws of War in Nesconset, all organizations that provide rescue dogs to the public, and Save-A-Pet and Guardians provide cats as well.

I've been an advocate for animal welfare for almost 40 years. In the past ten years, I've seen a drastic change in the quality of animal rescue here on Long Island. I never in a million years thought I would see this day of ways to now exploit rescued animals for money. However, this is not just a Long Island issue, it's a United States issue. Suffolk County can once again set a precedent on legislation that others will most definitely follow suit, it's inevitable.

As the pressure for regulation on pet dealers and puppy mills has increased, there's been a major influx of rescues cropping up on Long Island. Some pet dealers have given up their pet dealer's licenses and have become rescues, so they're not regulated by any entity, with the exception of shelters that are required to have permits of the County. While there's nothing wrong with opening a rescue, we are seeing many sick dogs, including those with deadly Parvovirus, heartworm, zoonotic diseases such as parasites, tick-borne diseases, overcrowded situations, animals with no medical histories, no Certificates of Veterinary Inspection, and many consumer complaints, and, sadly, deaths after adoption. We're also seeing purebred puppies from puppy mills labeled as rescues and for profit. There's a lot of money to be made on puppies when you're not doing right by them.

Every dog and cat should be tested for diseases, spayed, neutered, vaccinated, checked for external/internal parasites and treated accordingly. It is up to each reputable organization to do this for each animal. Sadly, we need to enact legislation to ensure what should be simple ethics, morals and common sense. I know this because at Save-A-Pet we get many phone calls from consumers asking us what can be done as they're grieving over the loss of a puppy they just adopted from a facility. I steer them to the Attorney General's Office.

Organizations are notorious for bringing up puppies from the South and adopting them out straight off transport trucks. Those of us who maintain our integrity and have labeled these puppy-flippers, they're so-called rescuers simply making a quick buck. They will charge hundreds of dollars for puppies that have not been quarantined, fully vaccinated, spayed, neutered, microchipped, or even be seen by a licensed veterinarian.

Many of the animals come without histories. I took one of these animals from a wonderful family who thought they were doing the right thing by adopting out a rescued black lab retriever off a transport truck. Little did they know he had severe aggression issues. He bit nearly everyone in the family. After several trainers deemed him unadoptable, they were brokenhearted to think he would be put to sleep. They were devastated. I wound up keeping that dog.

I have a lot to say, but we need to regulate rescues on Long Island, because it's really gotten out of control. Thank you.

*(*Applause*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Ms. Scofield. Anyone else like to speak on I.R. 1760? Okay. Legislator Martinez?

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Motion to close.

LEG. TROTТА:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to close by Legislator Martinez, second by Legislator Trotta. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1761 - A Local Law to Strengthen Regulation of Pet Dealers and Pet Stores in Suffolk County (Martinez). I don't have any cards on this matter. Is there anyone that would like to speak, please come forward. Okay. Seeing none --

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Motion to close.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to close by Legislator Martinez, second by Legislator Trotta. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1764 - A Local Law Establishing a Sewer Connection Policy to Foster Economic Growth in Suffolk County (Browning). I don't have any cards. Is there anyone that would like to speak on this public hearing, please come forward. Okay. Legislator Browning?

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion to recess.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1765 - A Charter Law to Establish a Multi-Year Financial Plan (Cilmi). I don't have any cards. Please come forward if you'd like to speak on this matter. Okay. Legislator Cilmi?

LEG. CILMI:

Motion to close, please.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to close by Legislator Cilmi, second by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Back to ***I.R. 1758 (A Local Law to prohibit unregulated Synthetic Opioids in Suffolk County (Stern).*** What's the update? Any -- I got to -- I got to keep moving on.

MS. HORST:

Keeping going.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. What do you want to do, Legislator Stern, I.R. 1758? Steve, I.R. 1758, what do you want to do, close, recess?

LEG. STERN:

Close.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to close I.R. 1758.

CHAIRMAN STERN:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. I'd like to make a motion setting the date for the following Public Hearings, October 5th, 2016, 2:30 P.M., at the Rose Caracappa Auditorium, Hauppauge, New York: I.R. 1771, I.R. 1772, I.R. 1776, I.R. 1777, I.R. 1850, I.R. 1851, I.R. 1852, I.R. 1853, the 2017 Operating Budget and Program, the Southwest Sewer District Assessment Roll.

MR. NOLAN:

You need a second.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Cilmi. I'm sorry. Also setting the date for the --

MR. NOLAN:

You have to vote on it first.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, I'm sorry. All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. I'd like to make a motion to set the date for the following Public Hearings on October 18th, 2016, at 11:30 a.m., Rose Caracappa Auditorium in Hauppauge, New York, for the 2017 Operating Budget and program, and also the Southwest Sewer District Assessment Roll. Second by Legislator Cilmi?

LEG. CILMI:

Sure.

P.O. GREGORY:

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. I have several requests for -- to take motions out of order, first being I.R. 1649 in Health.

LEG. SPENCER:

I make a motion to take 1649 out of order.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Spencer, to take *I.R. 1649 - A Local Law to reduce the use of carryout bags in retail sales (Spencer)*, out of order. I'll second.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, second by -- who was that, Krupski?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yeah.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

LEG. SPENCER:

I'd like to make a motion to approve.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to approve by Legislator Spencer.

LEG. FLEMING:

Second.

LEG. HAHN:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

Second --

LEG. FLEMING:

Oh, I didn't mean to.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yeah.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Fleming. Okay. The motion is before us, and Legislator Spencer has the floor.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. And I wanted to briefly, first of all, thank all of my colleagues for just months and months of deliberation. As I started this process, I sat down with someone from the other side of the aisle, with someone from the business community, with someone from the environmental community, to address a real concern that we see here in our County. I know that we have a lot of challenges with our fiscal issues, the opioid epidemic, where sometimes you may look at this and say, "Well, why are we spending all of this time dealing with the plastic bags?" And one of the things that I found to be important is when I looked at this particular issue, and a lot of influences from members of my district, I was shocked to see how truly this issue goes to the heart of who we are as Long Islanders.

I understand that there's no debate in terms of the environmental impact over these things, but some will say, well, you know, there's the same environmental impact when you look at paper, or bottles, or other issues, but plastic bags are doubly insidious. The reason for that is because if you look at where we really rely on our future, that is our drinking water, and it's also our natural beauty and our tourism. And so when you look at the impact of a plastic bag, it goes beyond just the bag itself and the impact that it has as far as in the ground, but they fly all over the place, they get into our fences, they get into our trees, they get into our streams, they block our stormwater drains, they lead to local flooding. We could leave the lights up.

*(*Laughter*)*

But I wanted to -- I don't think there's any question over it, but there is an economic argument here. California spends over \$20 million a year cleaning up plastic bags. And although we can't, depending on the assumptions with BRO, put a price on it here, we do know from our Supervisors from our Towns, from listening to our Public Works people, that there is a cost and power that we utilize in our workforce to clean these out of our streams, out of our recycling streams, and it's avoidable. It's something that it's happening all over the world.

We have an extra stake here in Long Island, and so I could go on and on, but I'm not. This is something that we've put a lot of thought into. And what I found to be the biggest challenge is that at some point, I've spoken to each and every last one of you to try to come up with something that works. It is impossible to find something that makes every single person happy, because sometimes what one person wants is exactly the opposite of what another person wants, so I've tried to do something that makes sense.

And the biggest concession, because when we were looking at reducing plastic bags, I have over 50 organizations, from chambers, from environmental groups, from civic associations, six Supervisors, we had three public hearings, we had over 150 testimonies with pretty much 95% of their testimonies being in support. And I get it, this is scary, I get it, that people are afraid of anything that relates to bans or fees. That's visceral, it's big, it's scary, but this is something that we can do. This is something that is tangible, that we can make a difference; that all over the world it has been shown not to have a slight impact, but a large impact.

And so looking at this, we put the education piece in place, we put the Task Force piece. We're going to monitor this carefully. We're giving a transitional period. We brought the grocery stores and the business owners to the table. We've listened to the opinion of those in our unions. We've

made concessions with the industry where we went with the 5 and 5.

So I know there's a lot of concerns, but I'm asking you to be brave, be bold, stand with me. Let's be Long Islanders. This is something we should have done a long time ago, and I humbly ask that you support me in this.

(*Applause*)

So, Mr. Presiding Officer, thank you, I appreciate it.

P.O. GREGORY:

Doc, I understand you want to -- you want to do your presentation now? There's a 30-second video or PowerPoint.

LEG. SPENCER:

No. No, there's just some slides. All of the slides that you see here are actually landmarks right here on Long Island, where you can visually kind of get a sense of what's going on. And you can kind of get a sense. And, no, we could continue. I don't need to delay. But I'm going to advance the slides, and so it will -- they'll just run in the background also.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Well, I personally want to thank you. I know you put a lot of effort and energy in addressing this issue. And I know sometimes issues like this, it's a cultural change for people, that it's hard to get over, and so you're obviously facing that type of dynamic. But your perseverance and your willingness to give an open ear to those who did not necessarily agree with the issue and had some concerns, you certainly kept your door open and you made some modifications, which I think not only is a reflection of the leader that you are, but the character of the type of person that you are, and I think that's what, you know, is important. And something that we have to remember as leaders, that we have to ensure that we, you know, take all sides and all points of view in hand, and you really, you know, did that, and this bill reflects that. So I congratulate you in doing that.

You know, I told you that I support this effort. I think it's -- you know, sometimes, you know, we're just so busy in our daily lives that we don't really pay attention to issues like this. And, you know, some pay attention more than others, I should say. And so it's an effort that -- the efforts that you have put forward have really been an education and brought awareness to the plague, if you will. I don't mean to use too strong of a word, but certainly it's an issue of concern throughout not only just Suffolk County, but throughout Long Island, and throughout the country, in fact, in how this issue can -- you know, these -- you know, just people seem innocuous. We go to the grocery store, we get bags, and we -- you know, we put it in our -- in our cupboards, or whatever we do afterwards. But you don't see the carelessness that some behave in how they handle these bags and what effect it can have on our sea life and just on our environment in general, and you certainly have brought attention to that. So in itself, that's a remarkable achievement and I a congratulate you on that.

But having said that, we do have a list of folks who want to speak, first of which is Legislator Barraga, and then Legislator Krupski.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Thank you very much. In fairness to Legislator Spencer, even though I am going to speak on this particular bill in terms of being critical of it in one respect, I will be supporting the bill. But my concern is the 5 cent fee that basically is being allocated at the retailers. My feeling is that the retailers shouldn't receive anything. They're already charging you. When you have a basket of groceries and you go up to the checker, every item in your basket is predicated on the expense of

that business, plus a profit, including the plastic bags that you're receiving from that retailer, and that's not going to change when this particular bill goes into effect in January of 2018. The plastic bags or paper bags that are there you've already paid for. It's in the product line. That's the way they do business. You take your expenses, you add your profit, and then you charge the consumer. And when you go up there, you're paying for those plastic bags and those paper bags. The retailer should not be receiving the 5 cents, Suffolk County should be receiving the 5 cents.

Now, in taking a look at the financial impact that was provided by the Office of Budget, they indicate the following: "It is our understanding that the 5 cent bag fee is taxable, which could generate between \$250,000 and \$400,000 in annual sales tax revenue, depending upon single bag usage and utilization." Well, the question that I had when I read that, how many bags have to be sold to generate anywhere from 250,000 to \$400,000 in sales tax for the County? If you have 100 million bags sold, the New York State and Suffolk sales tax is \$431,250. The Suffolk sales tax portion is 231,250. The budgetary figure is between 250 and 400,000. At 100 million bags sold at a nickel apiece, that would generate \$5 million to Suffolk County on an annual basis if we keep the nickel. If you sell 150 million bags, the New York State and Suffolk sales tax is 646,875, the Suffolk sales tax portion is 346. But if we keep the 5 cents predicated on the 150 million bags being sold, we'd generate \$7,500,000 annually.

Now I received recently from the Citizens Campaign for the Environment a memo of support of the bill, and in it, it said, among other things, in Washington D.C., your 5 cent surcharge on single-use bags led to an 80% decrease of single use bags in the first year, and an overall decrease in single-use bags of 60% since the law was implemented. When I read the statement, I said to myself, "Well, what do they do with the nickel?" What do they do in D.C. with the nickel? So we contacted the Washington D.C. Department of Energy and Environment to ask that very question, and the response that we received was as follows: "The Majority of the proceeds" -- and this is -- their bag bill has been in effect since 2009. The majority -- and this is on the nickel. "The majority of the proceeds from the carry-out bag fee go into the Anacostia River Cleanup and Protection Fund." The retail establishment keeps not 5 cents, or 4 cents, or 3 cents, or 2 cents, the retail establishment keeps 1 cent from the 5 cent fee for each bag. The rest goes into this cleanup and protection fund by the Department of Environmental Control in Washington D.C.

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

LEG. BARRAGA:

Now, at the same time the Washington Post, on this very five cent rebate, did an article on January 9th, 2014, and they talked about Washington D.C. and the money that was being generated from the selling of these bags. They said the taxes generated 150,000 to 200,000 a month for the district's river Clean-up efforts, that's this Anacostia and other local waterways, per month. So on an annual basis, D.C. was collecting with bag sales -- because they keep four cents of the five cents -- anywhere from 1,800,000 to 2,400,000. Now, remember, the population of D.C. is 672,000 people; the population of Suffolk County is, what, 1.5 million. If you take 1.5 million and you factor in the four cents, we could generate anywhere from 4.5 million to six million per year by keeping the four cents and giving the retailers a penny.

I then contacted the Anacostia River Clean-up & Protection Fund itself and they sent me their fiscal report for 2015. Now again, their bag law has been in effect for like five or six years. Annual bag fee revenue has been roughly consistent year-to-year since the act became effective in 2010, though fee revenue has increased slightly. More bags are being sold because the district, like Suffolk County, was growing; there are more supermarkets, more stores going in place.

And then they gave me a breakout sheet. In 2010, covering a period of nine months, the fund basically got 1,510,000; in 2011, it went to 1,845,000; in 2012, 1,993,000; in 2013, 2,100,000; in 2014, 2,084,000; and in 2015, the fund received from their four cents \$2,236,275. If you use the four cents, predicated on the population of Suffolk County, we would be generating close to \$5.59 million per year.

The point is we should keep this fund. We should keep the fee. This bill, with all due respect to the author, should be amended for an appropriate new distribution of the five cents. Give them a penny, let's keep the four cents. I don't personally care if the millions generated to Suffolk County wind up closing the operating budget, or is spent on environmental issues in the future, but we shouldn't pass a law giving away this kind of money. This money would be consistent every single year. What we've done here, in essence, and I'm guilty of it as well, we've all taken a look at the environmental benefits associated with this bill, but over here was the issue with reference to the fiscal condition and how we can generate so much more income for the County by keeping four cents of the five cents.

Now, in a couple of weeks, in a couple of weeks this new budget is going to come through and it's going to be rather draconian. You can see what the Executive Branch has done with reference to agencies and departments. Right now we have a three year deficit, they say, of \$186 million, but it's more than that. You know it's more than that because we've been borrowing from Sewer Stabilization, we've been borrowing from the amortization on the pensions; it's closer to like 385 or 400 million, and then you have an additional 25 or 30 or 40 million in reduction of sales tax. We have almost 500 non-mandated contract agencies that we fund; we can't afford to do that. And you're going to be sitting around somewhere pulling out your hair trying to find out where we can eliminate or delete the cuts.

This amended version that I'm talking about where we keep the four cents gives you some latitude, gives you some flexibility. This bill is going into effect in January of 2018. Why? Let's amend it, have it go into effect January of 2017. The City of New York passed a very similar bill to this one; the Mayor signed off the beginning of May, it takes effect October 1 this year; five months. Why is this bill going to take 16 months to take effect in Suffolk County? There's no reason.

Look, all I'm asking you to do is to take a hard look at this, because when you approve this today as it is, that funding, that money, those millions every single year are gone, are gone. All I'm asking is that all the environmental issues stay the same. Just amend the proration of the five cents so that we get the lion's share of it and the retailers get a penny. Because the reality is it is a windfall. I met with a couple of retailers the other day, all they talked about was the nickel. I know why they were talking about the nickel, it's pure profit, because you're all going to pay for the bags.

But bottom line, you know, in the end you've got to do what what you've got to do. All I'm saying is that we have dire fiscal constraints, we're always hard-pressed for revenues, every time we try to do something on the basis of safety or health, people are yelling and screaming. This is an issue that's right before us, unfortunately we haven't seen it that way. We constantly talk about 100 billion of these bags being produced in the United States and they're all over the place. And I understand the environmental issue, but the fiscal issue is right there and we should not let this go. Washington D.C. recognized it, we should and we're a lot larger, and the generation of income could be a lot greater. Thank you.

LEG. SPENCER:

Mr. Presiding Officer, I know you have a long list. I just in ten seconds, just to let you know, I agree with you 100%. Washington D.C. is not constrained by State law. Our State representatives are looking at this. We're not allowed to keep it, it has to be through the State. I've worked with Counsel, we do have some of our representatives. So this is something that we can do and we have

the task force to monitor. And the State is looking at this carefully, but D.C. doesn't have to deal with that constraint; and if I was permitted to do that, I would definitely do that. But George, can you verify that?

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah, right. So many people, while we were working on this bill, you know, put that out, *Why can't we take the money?* And it's my opinion, and I think the County Attorney shares it, it would be an unauthorized tax if we took the money. And this is the type of bill that, you know, somebody might challenge this law, and that would be a grounds where the law might fall. So it's unfortunate, other people have done that and I think in other states they have the authority to keep the money and use it for the environment, but we're going to need the State permission to do that.

LEG. BARRAGA:

And the State Legislature meets in January, there's no reason why they couldn't do it.

MR. NOLAN:

It would be wonderful.

LEG. BARRAGA:

This isn't -- we not asking them, for example, to increase sales tax, this is a fee; it's a lot different. And they're not running. It's over for them in November, one way or the other. They go back in January, February, March, at any time they can pass this and give us permission. So that really isn't legitimate rationale for not doing this. The bill's not going into effect until January of 2018.

MR. NOLAN:

But Legislator Barraga, in the interim, if the State gave localities the authority to do that, then I think we could amend this law, if that was the will of the Legislature, to take a share of it and dedicate it to an environmental purpose. But right now legally we don't have the authority to do it. I advised Legislator Spencer of that and that's why the bill is the way it is, and probably is why New York City is the same way where the retailers keep it.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Well, we do respectfully disagree in terms of what, you know, the Legislature is capable of doing when they go back into session in January, February and March, because this bill is not going to go into effect anyway until 2018. In the interim, they could give us permission to do a distribution.

MR. NOLAN:

I think that's a big if, you know. You know how the State is.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yeah, but it's worth a shot when you take a look at the millions of dollars that are going to be lost if we don't do something here. This is something that's there, it's right in front of us.

MR. NOLAN:

Well, that might be part of our State agenda that the County Executive brings to Albany.

LEG. BARRAGA:

The sponsor of the bill just indicated he's going to pursue this, he's going to take a shot with certain Assembly persons and Senators in the Majority, and he should, because I think they would be amenable to do this.

MR. NOLAN:

And interestingly, when we met with Doc Spencer and some of the retailers indicated willingness to split the money and I was like, *We'd love to, but we just can't.*

LEG. BARRAGA:

So let's see how that debate develops, because right now if this bill passes and stays the way it is, we get zippo. We get nothing.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, Legislator Krupski and then Legislator Stern.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Oh, thank you. You know, last year locally there was a lot of discussion about banning plastic bags. And of course in East Hampton and Southampton, the towns took -- years ago banned plastic bags. And I asked some of my colleagues, would anyone be interested in a plastic bag ban and Doc Spencer really took up the charge, and I was really impressed with the way he -- he included everyone. You know, he included people from both sides of the aisle, he included the industry, whether it was the manufacturers we met with or whether it was, you know, the retailers that we met with that would be affected. He really did his homework, he really did his due diligence; very impressive.

Now, I know a lot of us supported the outright ban, and that the five cent fee on paper and plastic was a decision that he made to try to get something passed, and I respect that, that he wanted to get something passed. Because the goal here was to reduce the plastic bags, and I get that and you showed the picture in the tree and that was enough, because I'm tired of seeing as a farmer -- and people said -- some people came up and spoke, some of the people who came and testified at the hearings and said *We don't see the plastic bags alongside the road*; well, of course they don't, because they blow into my hedge rows, they blow into my fields, and that's where they are, they're in the cornfield. So, you know, I definitely support a ban.

So when it comes down to the fee, though, Legislator Barraga, you're absolutely right. Because this would be a voluntary fee, you don't have to take a plastic bag, you're right. And some people said, *Well, I'm getting this plastic bag for free*; no, you don't get it for free, you pay for it, when you go to the store you pay for the plastic bag. They let you use one to take your goods home, but you paid for it. So it's voluntary; you can bring a reusable bag, you do not have to take a plastic bag home. Whether you have one or whether you have 20, you can bring your reusable bag. You can -- in the past year, I made a conscious effort, and I'm not the biggest shopper in the household, but when I do go, I made an effort to either remember a bag or else to juggle whatever I buy on the way out of the store, so I don't have to take a bag to try to get, you know, accustomed to the concept of not using these bags that we've become very accustomed to using.

So I really like your line of reasoning on this, to give the retailers something and to give the County something. If you -- now, did I hear Doc Spencer right when he said he's going to appeal to his State representatives to work on legislation to authorize us to keep the money?

LEG. SPENCER:

(Nodded head yes).

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And then the question would be if we're going to keep -- I mean, I would advocate for keeping the money for land preservation, to dedicate it for that. I don't know if anyone else has any ideas right off the bat, what they'd like to keep the money for, but I would certainly agree that we should keep that because it is not a tax and it would be a voluntary fee. When you go into a store, you're going

to make the decision whether you want to pay that fee or not and everyone can consciously make that decision. So, you know, I want to thank you for that suggestion and certainly help Legislator Spencer, you know, work on this. And a question -- you know, as far as working on it at the State level. And the question for George Nolan, our Counsel, is if we pass this today, is it going to give us an advantage to have the State authorize us to keep part of it and then amend it afterwards because it would show our commitment towards passing this?

MR. NOLAN:

You know, I don't know with the State Legislature. I point out that the City passed a bill similar to this last year and there were moves Upstate to preempt the City legislation. It was actually legislation introduced and they were on the cusp of passing it to preempt legislation like this. So what they're going to do, I couldn't guess, I really don't know.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Okay. Because to me it seems like if we pass this it would show the commitment that we're really committed to reducing plastic -- because that's the whole goal, is to reduce the plastic bag use, and that those people who choose to use the plastic bags are going to pay a fee to mitigate something environmental down the line.

MR. NOLAN:

It's possible the State will look at it and say some of that money should go for a public purpose --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Right.

MR. NOLAN:

-- as opposed to going to the retailer, so perhaps.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, Legislator Stern then McCaffrey.

LEG. STERN:

Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. So I do all of the food shopping for the Stern house.

(*Laughter*)

And I go when my wife tells me to go (*laughter*), and I try to do it as well as I can do it. And if I'm going to the supermarket when this legislation is enacted, I have a choice; I can bring my reusable bags and avoid paying the fee, or I can go without the reusable bags and then I would be subject to the fee. And when I'm standing there at the checkout aisle, if I'm doing my bagging I have the choice; do I double-bag? Do I use a lot of bags for fewer items? If I'm, you know, a stronger individual, I can use perhaps less bags and fill them up and perhaps I can control how many bags I'm going to ultimately be responsible for.

On those days that I don't follow directions and I'm not able to get to the supermarket, my wife will make sure that I sit down and order by home delivery because we have to have our items as of a particular time. Now, if I'm at home because I've missed the opportunity for that week to go shopping, or much more importantly, if I'm a senior citizen and I'm homebound and if I'm someone with special needs and I'm not able to go to the supermarket on my own and I am now relying on home delivery, I don't have that choice. I don't have the ability to make that choice for myself,

whether I'm going to bring something reusable or I'm going to rely on the plastic bags. I'm now subject to whatever the method of home delivery is going to be. So my question, through the Chair, for the sponsor is what type of assurance can we give our consumers? What type of protection does the consumer who is ordering through home delivery have, that they are not going to be subject to the whim or the discretion of the home delivery company that they're going to get a run-up on five cent per bags when they have not -- they don't have the opportunity in that situation to be able to control whether or not they're going to be subject to the fee.

LEG. SPENCER:

That's a great question, and I actually did check into that after receiving a question. And the way the legislation is designed is that it is only brick and mortar. So once you are making that delivery, whether it's on-line, you lose -- you have no control over that process, you can't be charged in that situation. It's only when you're in the store and you're at the checkout and you choose. So if it's a delivery, whether or not you're getting something through Amazon or through Peapod, and the way that that's packaged right now, the legislation wouldn't cover that and you would not be charged.

LEG. STERN:

All right, thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator McCaffrey then Trotta.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Thank you. Doc, I just want to commend you for your work on this bill. You know, we were on different sides of this issue when you first came out with a plastic ban, I didn't think that was good. You know, we listened to all the supermarkets coming in and talking about how difficult it was for them, and this was at a time we just lost several of our largest supermarkets and the good jobs that went along with them, so I was truly concerned about what impact that was. But I care about the environment. I mean, every time I thought about where I was on this issue, a plastic bag would be blowing by me, you know, somewhere.

*(*Laughter*)*

So you really get torn over it, you know. But unlike Legislator Stern, I am not the primary shopper in our house, I'm a casual shopper and if you ask my wife she'll say that that's a stretch. But we've been using reusable bags for years; I mean, it's easier, everything fits in there better, it fits in the car better, you know. And so generally my job is to take the bags in from the car, so I can tell you that's -- it works very well. So but it really is something that you should be using for a lot of reasons, convenience, and I think once people start doing this they're going to catch on to it, whether it be convenience or whether it be, you know, saving money. And like the companion legislation, I think we need to get this task force out there. Maybe you can convince some of these people, although we can't mandate them, maybe we can convince them voluntarily to do -- you know, subsidize some of the reasonable bag costs for people and things like that and public service announcement. And I really think it's going to take off.

I hear from a lot of people about the bags, they say that they use them more than once; meanwhile, we've spoken around the horseshoe about that and I can tell you we have a German Shepherd at home, so we use them those bags more than once; twice, that's the max they get used. But people use them. It's a hardship on the people that are using -- used to using these bags as an alternative, but I think we need to take these bold steps, say enough is enough. We've seen these things blowing around and, as I said, I'm against taxing people and I think George said it was an unauthorized tax, but we found a way around that in the alarm bill and the red light cameras, people say that we've figured out a way to do unauthorized taxes anyway. But I think we need to -- like

Legislator Barraga said, is to come up with a way for us to get some of the revenue, because we spend a lot of money on environmental causes and it doesn't have to be a river clean-up. You know, we purchase open land, we do different things, storm water protection and those types of things, so we have the ability to use that money ourselves for the intention it was. So I would be glad to help with you in bringing our State representatives on board to bring that money and dedicate it to the environmental causes. So as I said, I opposed the ban and I think this is a fair compromise and I will be supporting this. So thank you for your work.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Why do you get a clap?

*(*Laughter*)*

Okay. Now, Legislator Trotta and then on deck, Fleming. Did I see a hand? Was that you, D'Amaro?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Not yet.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh. Was it you? Okay.

LEG. TROTТА:

In recent years and months, the County has adopted a philosophy whereby the taxpayers of this County are punished, fined and charged for virtually any mistake or indiscretion they make. Failing to complete a stop, a full stop on a right-on-red; having your home alarm go off accidentally; and now maybe forgetting to bring your reusable bag.

I applaud Legislator Spencer's efforts on this project, I think it's a great thing, I think something has to be done. I realize he put a lot of time into this, he's brokered many compromise. I just don't think it's ready at this point. There are too many unanswered questions and I can't support it. I mean, if -- the way this bill reads now, if I walk into a card store and I buy a card and put it in a paper bag and I walk out of that store and the Health Department stops me and that bag, that paper bag that it's in was made from 30% recycled paper, that store owner gets fined \$500. And I don't have enough faith in this Administration nickel and diming our taxpayers, so that when someone gives a plastic bag away for free, that store doesn't get banded \$500. There's a variety of other reasons just like that. And I am not for the County taking the money; I don't think that's -- at all. I mean, maybe some environmental purpose at some point down the road with some concern, but it's just unfathomable that we have the ability to charge someone \$500 for a minor violation. You might be thinking, *Oh, we're not going to do this, you know, that's never going to happen*, but guess what? When the guy just takes his foot off the break and doesn't stop all the way for that red light, we're banging him. And I have no faith in the Administration that this won't happen, so in this forum I cannot support it. Though I applaud your effort and I am against these bags floating all over the place, and I will work in whichever way I possibly can to get this done, but this bill is clearly not ready.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, Legislator Fleming.

LEG. FLEMING:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. I want to join my colleagues in congratulating Doc Spencer on leading on this, it really means a lot. And someone had to do it and I'm glad you did, Doc. Long Islanders, we are proud of our quality of life and our natural environment is a critical part of that. Our precious resources are irreplaceable and we have a duty to protect them. Indeed, out East, our natural resources, and particularly our marine resources, are the engine that drives our economy. So I'm proud to represent a district where an outright ban has been in place in much of the district since Earth Day of last year.

And regarding the fears of a cultural change, I can assure you that we've survived and none of the problems that opponents -- doomsday scenarios that opponents have outlined have come to pass. It's really a matter of changing your habits. And I want to agree with Legislator McCaffrey that once people start doing this, as in my district, it will fall into place. And I'm also -- that's why I'm also grateful for your -- Legislator Spencer, for your introducing the 5 and 5 Education and Effectiveness Working Group, and I'm happy to cosponsor that legislation, because the education piece is very important. And with a little education, we as consumers can make a transition to the reusable bags with really not as much pain as you'd think.

For instance, many of us keep these little bags with us. I have this bag, it was given to me as a gift on December 18th, 2014, when we passed the bag and I was a -- the bag ban and I was a Southampton Town Councilwoman. These pop out like this, then it is a bag. So we have a couple of -- I have a couple of them, I keep them with me all the time and you can throw them in the washer and they're very easy. And we also -- you know, when we do our big shopping -- and I think it's about 50/50 between me and my husband, since we're confessing our domestic roles here at the horseshoe -- but I do the full shopping and we just have in the trunk of the car enough reusable bags. At any rate, that's my own story, but our district is fine and we have a lot less of these bags floating around in the trees and harming marine life.

We're a coastal community on Long Island, we're an Island, we have an obligation. You know, there's an island of plastic in the middle of the ocean and we're a coastal community. We have an obligation to take our responsibility seriously as stewards of our environment. Thank you, Doc, for doing this. I'm very glad that you're doing the task force, and I'm very, very happy to support this important bill. Thank you.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

Again, I also want to thank Legislator Spencer for his amazing work, always looking out for our health, our environment. So I have some concerns with this bill, and one of them is the fact that we've been charging our residents to pay for something they need to, you know, be aware of not to do. Don't purchase the plastic or don't use plastic, that's what your second bill does and I fully support that bill, to educate the public. But, you know, I'm looking at the increases. PSEG just raised our electric 35%; National Grid just raised our gas 24%. Every little penny counts. And I have one of the largest senior communities in Suffolk County and I have gotten an earful. And to be charged for using plastic is not really supported by those seniors, by the residents.

So, you know, I'm looking to Legislator Barraga's comment about how in D.C., you know, they have this charge, and you would think it would go down. You know, it started at one point at 1 million and then 1.3 and 1.7, and now we're up to 2 million, and D.C. getting money for their plastic bags and maybe increase in population. But my thought is it may not be working. You know, that

creates concerns in my mind, because we should have banned plastic bags. You know, as mentioned before, we're an Island, we're surrounded by water. What other place in America is like us other than maybe Hawaii? We need to do everything we can to protect our environment, especially our wildlife and especially the turtles, because that's the main group that's really being affected, you know, as far as in our waters.

Why can't we work in having the company -- companies reimburse people who turn in their plastic bags? I think we spoke about State legislation like the bottle bill. Let's move in that direction. Why can't we charge plastic bag companies for using this? Why do we have to take from our residents? Why can't we go after the polluters to pay for the pollution that they're creating?

So again, I'm thinking out of the box. Biodegradable bags, you know, what can we do to encourage the corporations of these plastic bag companies to change, to help support our environment, to make convenience for our residents, you know, better in that respect? But again, I have concerns with this bill and I'm hoping, you know, that we can see amendments as we move forward. But I do appreciate your work on this, it's very important.

LEG. SPENCER:

Through the Chair, just because, you know, it's just directly towards me. Legislator Anker, your constituents are so fortunate to have a representative such as you that is sensitive to those issues. These are things that I've lost sleep over and really wanted to debate and make sure. There's a big difference here. And when PSE&G raises your rate, when the DMV raises your rate, is that you have no choice, you have no choice. Before 1985 there were no plastic bags, you didn't need them, and most of your seniors grew up in a time where the bags weren't available anyway. What I'm hoping is that your seniors will get mad as hell and will protest this and not pay the fee; that would be great. That's going to see the reduction.

Applause

That's what we want to see out there. And so you have been one of my best colleagues in this Legislature, we are of like-mind, you are just someone that's passionate, you've done a wonderful job. But the seniors -- and the other thing is I'm going to get you some bags, I'm working with large organizations for branding. There's going to be reusable bags, hundreds of thousands of reusable bags that we're going to put out there that will be free, that will be available, and we're going to assess how this is going. That's why the task force is in place, so we're not just going to put this out there and leave it. So it's a valid choice; in this one, you'll have a choice, don't pay the fee. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you. As with everyone else, I want to commend Dr. Spencer, this has been a haul. There's no other way to put it. I felt like a bipolar individual during this whole routine with all the machinations and all the changes. Initially my feeling was that negative reinforcement is far less effective than positive reinforcement and any charge whatsoever is a negative reinforcement. As of less than a week ago, going through the almost 6,000 phone calls, e-mails or letters I received on this bill alone, it was pretty much a little bit over the line and I was changing my opinion and I was going to vote for this bill, because I really feel that plastic bags are polluting our environment. But then at the end of last week, I probably, between e-mails and phone calls, got another 800 phone calls and e-mails, and the small minority was to charge the five cents and go with it. The majority were seniors and my young families, and my seniors were literally sobbing on the phone.

I'll go back to the story when it was ten cents and I had many more than one. I live in a community that is middle middle class, now struggling to remain middle class. I have to force my seniors, when I look at their income from Social Security, to apply for food stamps, and usually takes six, eight months for them to succumb. And with that, they get \$17 a month in food stamps. These are the people that have been crying the last week. They want to do the right thing, but an additional charge, as with their electric, their gas, their oil, is killing them. They can't stay here anymore, but they can't afford to go anywhere else.

I suggest that another amendment be made. That we think about what Legislator Barraga and what Legislator Anker has said, that we have to make changes so we can keep our people here. I do not want to vote against this, but now that the calls and e-mails and letters into my office are well over 6,000, I have to go with the majority and the majority says no, much to my dismay. Thanks.

LEG. SPENCER:

I understand the concern and the fear and I empathize with you. You are -- again, I know -- following your heart. I can do nothing but respect that. And I think that, again, you know, doing the research, looking at what has happened, and I think that we have the benefit of seeing that, when this has happened in other municipalities because of that choice, those concerns, we have history here, we're not in a void. And when you look at the D.C. and you look at places that have done it and that concern of this increase or expenses, it just hasn't been borne out because they have a choice. But I respect that and thank you. I do appreciate your kind words towards me.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. I'm going to pass, thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator D'Amaro?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Am I next?

P.O. GREGORY:

You're next.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. So I struggle with this legislation, as many of you know, because throughout my entire Legislative career here, I've always been and tried to be -- tried to be very supportive of environmental initiatives. And I think we could all agree that preserving our environment and protecting our environment is a noble goal and I think we do a pretty good job of addressing that.

The problem I have -- if you have a problem with these bags and the environment, and if they're noxious and if they're on roadways and they last for 10,000 years and we can't get rid of them, then let's ban them. Let's get rid of them. I'm all for it. When Legislator Spencer first told me about the first version of this bill it was, I believe, a ban, as well as I think there was a monetary component to it as well. And my comment to him was, *Well, get rid of the fee*. You want to ban these things if they're noxious, you know, that is what we do, we have a great environmental track record. We don't have to get into this whole thing about charging for these bags and the onus it puts on senior citizens and those that can't even go out to a grocery store. So that's the first point that I want to make today, is that irrespective of whether I support this bill or not, if we would move forward with

a ban, I would be happy to take a hard look at that and probably would support the ban if it's phased in the right way.

So you can agree with all the environmental arguments but you can still have a problem with this bill, and that's why I am struggling with this. I want the clean environment, I don't want the bags polluting our roadways, I don't want them affecting storm water runoff and all the other arguments that are made for the environment, I'm with you all the way. But we can't have the debate in a bubble. We can't just look at the environmental impact. We have to look at the impact on the folks that we represent as taxpayers, as residents, as single moms, people raising children, people having to put kids through college. You know, we can go through a long litany of the expense of living on Long Island and how expensive it truly is.

So what do we do? We say for this environmental initiative, the only way we can accomplish getting rid of these bags is to put the onus, financial onus on our taxpayers, on our residents; I do not agree with that concept. I agree with the environmental goals, I do not agree with putting it on the backs of our residents. There are other ways we can encourage our residents not to use these bags. We've already had a recycling program in place, whether it's effective or not, I don't have the data, I don't know. I've been told it's not all that effective, so maybe we need to do better. Maybe we need to educate people a little bit more about that.

Legislator Barraga makes a great point, and this is another thing that's concerned me from day one, is the windfall. What -- why are we not only telling our citizens we want to fix this environmental problem by reaching into your pocket, but by the way, when we reach into your pocket, we're not even keeping those funds to spend them for your benefit, we're giving them to the supermarket for a profit. To me, that is a non-starter for this bill. Now, I understand that it helps business, I understand that it's more revenue to business, and I'm not anti-business. But why on Earth, why on Earth -- like the argument's been made, the State of New York says we can't impose this tax, so instead of saying we won't tax you, we say we're going to tax you and we're going to let the industry keep it. Where is the sense of doing that? I really believe that this would be much more effective if you went to Albany and got permission to divvy that up so at least we can start to talk about using that revenue to help our environment or taxpayers or however you want to apply it. We already tax our residents for open space preservation, farmland preservation, land preservation, many, many, many environmental initiatives. They're already paying to support our environment. They're already paying through their sales tax, through the Quarter Cent, for many, many environmental initiatives. The 477 Fund, all these other funds that we have, if you're in a sewer district, there's all kinds of fees imposed on taxpayers already to support our environment and they do it because they care about the environment, but at some point you have to draw a line. Especially if there's a way -- a better way to do it. There's a better -- you know, if you're going to preserve open space and you need the money to buy it, I don't really see another way other than what we do; you need to ask people to contribute and then we go out and buy the land. But here, if you want to eliminate these bags, just ban them. Why are we asking our taxpayers and our residents again to pay for every single initiative when there's a better way to do it?

You know, those are basically the points that I want to make. It's a very difficult vote for me because I do believe that I value the environmental community, I value the environmental advocates, I value identifying with the environmental community. But I simply am not prepared to ask people, when they get up today they don't have to pay for that bag but tomorrow they do, whether it's a reusable bag or a plastic bag. Right now it's all factored in, maybe they're paying for it anyway, but now we're just giving that windfall over to industry and I just don't think it's -- it's a great goal, but I don't think the means of achieving that goal is appropriate, so I'm not going to support it. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right, thank you. That's all I have. All right, so we have a motion and a second. All in favor -- actually, let's do a roll call. Roll call.

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

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Pass.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

No.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Absent).

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Pass.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Thirteen (Opposed: Legislators Anker, Kennedy, Trotta, D'Amaro - Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, we've got to keep moving. Okay, I'm going to -- there's another request to take ***IR 1767-16 - Establishing the 5 & 5 Education and Effectiveness Working Group (Spencer)***. Motion by Legislator Spencer. I'll second to take out of order. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions to take out of order?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Spencer to approve IR 1767.

LEG. FLEMING:

Second and cosponsor.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Fleming. And put me as a cosponsor on 1754 (*sic*).

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, please list me as a cosponsor also.

MR. RICHBERG:

On this?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Any discussion on IR 1767?

LEG. TROTTA:

Wait a second. On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

On the motion, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:

What is it?

P.O. GREGORY:

1767.

LEG. TROTTA:

One second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Page ten.

LEG. TROTTA:

What is this?

MR. NOLAN:

Legislator Trotta, there's a resolution that creates a working group to do outreach and education to promote the law that was just passed, the 5 and 5 law.

LEG. TROTTA:

Does it cost us any money?

MR. NOLAN:

It's all -- it's mostly in-house representatives. It should be minimal, it's a working group.

LEG. TROTTA:

Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, anyone else? Okay. Motion to approve IR 1767. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

LEG. HAHN:

Cosponsor.

LEG. ANKER:

Cosponsor.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right, next motion is for IR 1757. We're going out of order, there's a request to take motions out of order. ***IR 1757(-16)***, page nine in EPA, it's ***Authorizing appraisal of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007, Old Kmart Property - Town of Brookhaven (SCTM No. 0200-379.00-01.00-003.001 p/o) – Southern Portion (Anker).***

LEG. ANKER:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Anker.

LEG. HAHN:

(Raised hand). Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Hahn to take out of order. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions to take IR 1757 out of order.

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Seventeen.

LEG. ANKER:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to approve by Legislator Anker. Second by Legislator Hahn to approve IR 1757. Everyone with us, page nine? This is the K-Mart property. Okay. All in favor?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I'm sorry, on the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, on the motion, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So I have a question for our legal Counsel on this. What sources of funding are available? You know, I know this is only for appraisal, but what sources of funding are available for this parcel?

MR. NOLAN:

This is the old K-Mart property? Well, definitely -- this is geared towards active parkland, so definitely the Drinking Water Program.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yeah, we had that \$20 million settlement. Is this -- could we use that money from the \$20 million settlement for this purchase?

MR. NOLAN:

I believe no.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So what -- I guess, first of all, why is that? Why couldn't we use that 20 million?

MR. NOLAN:

Well, I think it's -- it's under the Enhanced Drinking Water Protection Program. And in that program it delineated five types of properties that we could use the money for to do appraisals and acquisitions, and it did not include farmland and I do not believe it included active parkland as well, but that's just the way the Enhanced Drinking Water Protection Program was drawn up.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Who made that decision to not include those two categories?

MR. NOLAN:

Well, you'll recall that was part of a -- it was an outgrowth of a legal action that certain parties brought against the County for using money from the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund. So that was probably agreed to between the County Attorney, County Executive and those environmental organizations that were suing the County.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So, I mean, what this does is instead of being able to use that money for land preservation, in this case it would be density reduction in areas, certainly, and it would provide -- we've heard from residents how it would provide the community with some recreational opportunities. It puts the few remaining dollars that are available, you know, now you've got a competition between active rec, farmland preservation, and that \$20 million is out of play for -- you know, for those things. It's very unfortunate.

MR. NOLAN:

I guess this body and Planning will have to think about that when they go forward with acquisitions for all the different parcels, how to use the money so that we maximize.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Anyone else? Yes, Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

On the motion. Again, I just want to encourage my fellow Legislators that this is a very important parcel. It's 21 acres, it's hoping to be a public/private partnership so the cost will be shared with the Town of Brookhaven who has committed to build parks. We have a -- the private part of it, of the partnership is a not-for-profit, Longwood Youth Sports Association that currently has 3,000 members, and those are children in the Longwood School District. At this point they do not have a designated ballpark and they are willing to maintain this park.

Previously I worked to help create the Heritage Park in Mount Sinai which is the first public/private partnership, incredibly successful. And again, we're hoping to build our field of dreams at a blighted property which has been blighted for 15 years, and it will be just a centerpiece for the Middle Island community.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Anker, is this the property right next to -- there's like a Brookhaven golf course right down the road there, or am I thinking --

MR. NOLAN:

No, it's on 25.

LEG. ANKER:

It's located on Middle Country Road in Middle Island across from Artist Lake. And I'm also looking to acquire the northern portion of the property as open space and that connects to over 6,000 acres of open space owned by New York State.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:

I support this, obviously. Just one thing. The Supervisor came in and spoke on behalf of it and then I later had a conversation with him, and I want this on the record, that there was some possibility that based upon increased zoning on the portion that Breslin will be keeping, he might be willing to donate that property to the County. So --

LEG. ANKER:

That would be exciting, but we were excited five years ago, ten years ago, 12 years ago and 15 years ago; you know, again, it has taken so long. So this is just the appraisal.

LEG. TROTTA:

I understand that. But just make sure that if that possibility exists, I mean, I don't mind paying for an appraisal, but if we can -- if the Town can somehow give him increased zoning or whatever on another piece of property and we can get this for free, we can buy more property maybe in AI's district.

LEG. ANKER:

That would be -- that sounds good to me, yes. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

I'm sorry, is that it? Oh, I'm sorry. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Just one more question; and maybe to the sponsor. You mentioned a partnership with the Town; would this be -- like in many other cases with open space type purchases, the Town would be partnering on the purchase price, 50/50?

LEG. ANKER:

No, the County will acquire the property and then the Town will build the ball fields, so it's a partnership in that respect.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Why wouldn't they be asked to partner for, you know, the fee title? Like on many other purchases.

LEG. HAHN:

They're putting in all the money.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay, so the financial partnership will be we will pay for the land, they will pay for the ball fields which are going to, you know, be probably astro turf. They will also pay for the design, the engineering, you know, it's going to be a probably substantial cost. But it's been very successful in Mt. Sinai and Selden, Centereach.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Did you ever -- did you approach the Town on partnering?

LEG. ANKER:

Oh, yes, they've agreed.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No, on partnering on the purchase price.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes, they did not agree. They agreed to build the ball fields, that was a partnership.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

I'll yield.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right, anyone else? All right, so we have a motion and a second on IR 1757. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, next, ***IR 1493(-16)***, it's in Public Safety, page 11, ***Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to improve alarm system registration requirements (Browning)***. Motion by Legislator Browning to take out of order, or --

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

LEG. BROWNING:

Sure. I do see the Chief is here, so yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, second by Legislator Cilmi to take out of order. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

All right, the motion is before us.

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion to approve.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to approve by Legislator Browning.

LEG. TROTTA:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Trotta. On the motion, anyone?

LEG. HAHN:

Motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to table by Legislator Hahn.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. BROWNING:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

On the motion.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. I think I was pretty clear at the committee meeting. This is something I've worked on for quite some time, met with the -- Legislator Stern, some of his constituents who are business owners, met with them -- no thank you, passing cookies -- met with them and I think we came to a good compromise. What we have right now, and I don't -- no, the Chief is here. And I know in December of last year, many of us supported creating this alarm program because he said it was necessary. And yes, it is necessary to have the program because we have 96,000 false alarms. There's a 35% drop in alarm calls; I don't know why. Did some people cancel their alarms? You know, that's a pretty vague response to me. I don't know why there's a 35% drop.

My bill does not prevent the program from continuing. Something that was said way in the beginning was this is not a revenue maker, this is not a revenue generator, this is not why we're doing this. So if it's not, then I would hope you could support that a one-time registration fee for administrative costs is acceptable. I understand that the Police Department wants to know who these register -- who has an alarm system so that they can have their program up and running. But to continually ask them every year to pay \$35 or \$50 -- sorry, it was 50 -- for our residents, to ask them to pay every single year, I think that's unfair. And like many of you, I have received the phone calls about *I have an alarm, but my alarm never goes off. I never have false alarms, but now I have to pay to own an alarm to protect my home.* They feel that's unfair. However, not one person said to me that they object to a fine structure if someone has continuous false alarms; they have no objection to that.

So I think that, you know, those of us who -- many of us supported this bill in December, starting this program, and I was very clear back then that I was going to work to change it and make it easier on our citizens, and I think I've done that. So if you don't support this, then we have the status quo, and is that what you want. So I don't see the need to table it. I said if anybody wants to do something different with it, you have fun with that, you make all the changes you want. This is where it is. I think this is a fair compromise with the industry, I think our constituents will be happy enough with this, they will not be as objective to it. And if this is truly about public safety and about reducing our police officers' responses to false alarms and letting them do other things, the money has nothing to do with it, the registration has nothing to do with it. The fine will force people to make sure their alarms work.

So I am not supporting this program as a revenue generator for the County, I'm supporting this program to make sure that our police officers do not have to go to too many false alarms. So I'm asking for your support on this. If you don't support this, then we go back to the status quo; your choice.

P.O. GREGORY:

Kate, could you explain what the bill does, or George?

MR. NOLAN:

I think to summarize the changes to the current program, Kate mentioned it, it gets rid of the annual registration fee for residential buildings. There is a \$50 renewal fee. And I misspoke in committee, Kate, and I apologize, but there continues to be a \$50 renewal fee for commercial buildings.

Secondly, it really adjusts the fee or fine structure. Under the current statute, the fines can go as high as \$750 for a false alarm on the eighth or ninth occasion; under Kate's bill it -- the highest fine is 200 and \$250, so it really decreases those top fines.

Also, it gives people an extra strike, if you will. Right now if you're registered you get two false alarms within a year, you won't get fined; this bill would give people three opportunities before they would be fined.

Additionally, for residential buildings, on the first false alarm where they would be required to pay \$100 fee, they could avoid that by registering their alarm system within 30-days and then they would not have to pay the fine. I think that pretty much summarizes the changes to the existing program.

LEG. BROWNING:

And the reason for the -- you know, giving the 30-days, I can tell you I'm still getting phone calls. We just got a phone call this past week from a senior citizen. You know, she lives in Florida part of the year, came home, found out she's got a bill for a false alarm; wasn't aware of the false alarm program. So I would hope moving forward that any new alarm owner, anyone who gets -- decides to get an alarm, that the industry will tell the customer *You have to register \$50*. But I don't want to say that they definitely will; I would hope they would.

So I think out of fairness to our citizens, you know, we're getting too many calls from people who are now applying for the fair hearing on, you know, not having an alarm registration. I just think that's fair. So again, if you don't support this, you're supporting the status quo, and I don't think the status quo is fair.

P.O. GREGORY:

You and I have had conversations about this for, I don't know, maybe a year, or certainly nine months. I support the concept. We all know how this program came about. It was, you know, put in the budget and we kind of had a -- we kind of agreed to it I think before knowing how the plan was going to roll out and the process was going to roll out. So you and I had some early conversations. I certainly agree with some of the concerns that you have received in your office, I've received those very same concerns about residents who were not home and responded to a false alarm, you know, because maybe they had the window open and the blinds triggered an alarm. And that to me concerns me. But, you know, when the Chief came before us, before committee and he explained the issue, and I know in my own experience when I went on patrols with -- ride-alongs with the officers, the number of false alarms they had to respond to, so I know it's an issue.

What I would like to see personally is more defined guidance as to what is defined as a false alarm. I know this bill doesn't do that, but I would like to see that. You know, I don't want senior citizens, as someone mentioned earlier, feel like they have to give up a system that they feel is an extra layer of security for themselves because they don't want to have to pay \$50 or a \$700 fine for a system that, you know, is a layer of protection for them. You know, they don't have, necessarily may not have the wherewithal to know what's wrong with the system, but they're getting, you know, hit with these fines. I think that sends the wrong message. I really think that we should be telling people that we have a Police Department that's there to protect you if you need it. But prior to that, if you want to have an alarm system that you feel that's going to provide you an extra layer of security, or even when you're not even home, I think that's when this is most effective is when you're not at home and you want to protect your property, you have the right to purchase an alarm. And you shouldn't have your County government imposing onerous fines against you for what could be some type of technical glitch. I have a real concern about that. But I'm trying to balance that with the need of the Police Department to focus on their priorities and not be distracted by these false alarms. So that's a concern for me and I would like to see that addressed in whatever legislation there is.

I also don't necessarily agree with the fact that if someone fails to -- with your bill they can take the approach, *Well, I won't register until I get hit with the fine.* You know? I know that's happening now and they're getting the -- that they do the \$50 registration and the \$100 fine, or whatever it is. I think that would discourage more people. I personally would like to eliminate the registration fee which would encourage more people to register, and then if you have two or three false alarms then you get hit. But people seem to think that that won't -- you know, people kind of take it for granted. But, you know, what became -- what was initially a policy debate or a concern in the Police Department has quickly become a budget concern.

So I know I've spoken to you myself, Legislator Hahn, Legislator Calarco, I understand Legislator McCaffrey, we're having a budget, a mini-Budget meeting with the County Executive on Thursday, and I was hoping that we would be able to table your bill pending that meeting because it is a budget issue now, so that we can talk to him about -- this is going to impact not only -- it's going to be an impact on next year's budget. I know you're not for that, I'm just putting it on the record that I asked you that. And I understand that you feel strongly about it, I feel strongly about it as well. But I wanted to state that. I wanted to state my concerns. You know, I want to support the Chief and this is an issue that he put forward. I have some very, very serious concerns about this program that I think have to be addressed; I don't know how it's going to be, but somehow it has to be.

LEG. BROWNING:

And when you say this has now become a revenue issue and a budget issue, that really disappoints me because this was brought to us to prevent police officers from having to respond to an exorbitant amount of false alarms. The Police Department, and I think the Chief was very clear, did not come up with the money amounts, that was the Administration. The Administration put \$7 million in the budget for this; they overstated it. It was speculative revenue. And moving forward, you have no idea how much money is going to be generated on fines or registrations or anything. So it's all strictly -- always, no matter what it is, it's going to be speculative.

If we pass this today, well guess what; they're going to have to do their budget based on what is approved today. I mean, the County Executive said he's going to veto it and bring back another bill where people will have to reregister. Well, you know what? That's fine, let him do that, let him do that. But I'm going to send each and every constituent of mine that have called me to his office. They didn't like it when I already told them *Call the County Exec's Office, he was the one that put this in place.* I got phone calls from the Administration, *Why are you telling them to call us?* Well, guess what? It was his initiative, so he should be the one to listen to it. Don't throw it on my lap.

I think this is less painful. Our senior citizens, Sarah talked about her constituents and the plastic bag bill and what it's doing to them. So now any of them that have an alarm are now going to have to -- every year they have to pay that registration fee. At least this is less of an impact on them and their pocketbook. And I think this is a fair compromise. There will still be some revenue, but you can't -- you can't speculate what your revenue is going to be. And with the alarm systems and the way they're working these days, they're better and actually the other gentleman, the gentleman who was here talked about there was times when the center had -- you know, they had gotten the call and it turned out to be a false alarm but the police went anyway; you can't blame the central station for that.

So the program still exists, no matter what the dollar amount is. So to hold it off for the County Exec to talk about a budget, take this out of your budget. This is not a budget item, this is a public safety item, this is about making sure our police officers are on the street and doing their job, what they're supposed to be doing, not responding to false alarms. The program still works. And I really do think it's very inappropriate for them to come to us last year during the budget process to talk about this is about our police officers and getting them on the street and having them respond to less false alarms, but now you just said it's a budget issue. That's his problem. So he needs to not be using that as a budget item.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. We have a growing list; first is Legislator Hahn, then Legislator Krupski.

LEG. HAHN:

I really think it's time that we bring the Chief forward. I think -- do you mind if we call Chief Cameron? Because I have a couple of questions for him.

P.O. GREGORY:

Does anyone have questions?

LEG. HAHN:

Yes, I do.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Chief?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Do you mind if I sit down?

LEG. BROWNING:

(Laughter) You might be here for a while.

CHIEF CAMERON:

I was trying to be optimistic. Good evening, everyone.

LEG. HAHN:

Good evening. Thank you, Chief. As the Presiding Officer knows, I'm one of the many individuals who feels passionately about this, this issue. I want to thank you, Chief, first of all. And I want to just remind everyone around this horseshoe how we have a Chief of Police, a Chief of Department, who is doing what we want our managers to do. We want our managers to analyze operations, we want our managers to identify areas of inefficiency and identify areas where we can improve operations. We want our managers to research how to then solve a problem that they identify by looking at what other similar municipalities do to solve the problem, or brainstorm ways to improve the problem and model success elsewhere in solving the problems that we face. He really went

above and beyond on this. I mean, identifying an area where one out of every six calls could be reduced, unnecessary calls could be reduced by 70% in some jurisdictions is an incredible, incredible thing to find and to identify. And the initiative that he took to take on this issue should be commended.

We all worked, and I want to commend Legislator Browning because many of us sat down with her, sat down with the Chief. I think the end goal was to get to a compromise bill where the Police Department felt like the program could still operate and could still be effective in reducing false alarms and where we felt like we reduced the impact on our residents. I don't think, Kate -- unfortunately, I don't believe we got there with your bill. Clearly we have the Chief of Police -- Chief of Department who is saying to us that some of the items in this bill that we're discussing tonight would undermine the program. And so I don't -- I can't, I just can't support -- and I appreciate all the time you spent on this, meeting with us and going back and forth, but I can't support something where our Chief of Department is telling us it's going to undermine what in a very short period of time, I mean, we've only really been fully implementing this since June.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Correct.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. So the question I have; sorry, I'm getting to the question here. I just want you to repeat because, you know, we did hear a presentation from you. Please repeat -- I don't want to put those words in your mouth, but how do you feel that this bill would impact the program and where your key complaints or problems with this are.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Well, as you know, the Police Department is not opposed to compromising. We understand that some of your constituents have issues with the fees that are involved here, and I did meet with many of you and I believe Legislator Browning came up with a compromise bill that I think at the time was satisfactory to everybody; it did reduce the fees, it didn't damage the success of the program. And as people have said, we identified this is an issue, and I really believe responding, having officers to respond to 97,000 false alarms is a complete waste of our time. And policing is very dynamic now, there's a lot of new problems cropping up. You've probably heard the expression *Jack of all trades, master of none*; we cannot continue to always do the things we've always done and yet add new responsibilities to the Police Department, because you can't do everything well. So something has to give, and I think giving up false alarms is a great way to resolve things.

So with respect to the bill that's before us, there's -- and I understand the issue that, you know, people have said, *I never had a false alarm. Why do I have to pay for a permit fee?* Okay, I understand that. But there is value in the Police Department to having people reach out to us, both residential and commercial every year, with respect to renewing their permits, because we're gathering information from them. And just this last week I've seen two commercial alarms where there were breaks, where the precinct wanted to get a hold of a representative to find out if the building had been entered, if something had been stolen, if someone could come down to secure the building, and they were unable to do so back through the alarm company. I'm very confident that the Police Department will be able to keep better records, we'll be able to have alternative contact numbers and we'll be able to get ahold of those people. So I do think there is value in renewing the permits.

The clause in the bill where if you have a false alarm and you don't have a permit, you can retroactively get a permit; I think that will completely undermine the permit process. And I'm not aware of any other government process that requires permits where that's allowed, that's kind of atypical. And when we identified this as a problem -- like you said, Legislator Hahn, you know, we

didn't pull this issue out of the air. You know, we did a lot of research and we identified best practices from other municipalities. There's thousands of alarm programs all across the country and most police departments have initiated a program like this to eliminate the problem. So our program is based upon best practices and it's based upon information that we glean from reports from agencies like the International Association Chiefs of Police who recommends programs like this. So that's one issue I have with retroactively being able to get a permit.

As far as reducing the escalating fines, and Legislator Browning said this herself, most people complain that they don't have any alarms that are being penalized. Reducing the escalating fines is actually benefiting the most egregious offenders, the people that have the most false alarms, and those are exactly the people that we want to curtail with this program. We want to have a disincentive for them and an incentive for them to either repair their alarm system or be more diligent in the operation to reduce false alarms.

So I believe reducing some of the fees like was in the original bill is fine, I don't think that will compromise this program. And as you've pointed out, the program is doing extremely well. I'm very happy with the progress. Alarms are already down over 30%, so that would translate into a reduction of 30,000 wasted calls that our police officers are responding on every year if that held up. And it's actually escalating, every month we're reducing more false alarms as the program matures. And that's probably about 15,000 hours of time that our police officers could do something else that's more productive.

LEG. HAHN:

So I was wondering, I've heard -- in fact, one of our Legislators who had been a police officer in the past had talked about -- I wonder if you can comment about patrol and exactly how you see the patrol function. Do you see patrol -- should it be strategic in how it is deployed? I imagine you want to choose where you're going to patrol? Tell me how important that is to a functioning and effective Police Department.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Most modern, progressive departments are engaged in like laser-focused enforcement. We're bringing intelligence to police officers at an unprecedented rate. We have a new portal that's available to our police officers in the car where they can glean almost real-time intelligence that helps them identify offenders that are potentially involved in crime patterns, crime trends, so they can channel their activities in the most productive manner. But in order for them to do that, they have to have time to go on the portal and do some research, to learn about the new patterns, and we have other issues they have to address like traffic. A half an hour of time doesn't seem like a lot to many of you, but a half an hour of time in a patrol car, you can do a lot traffic-wise. You can make a big impact, you can address probably one or two traffic complaints from the communities, people are blowing through stop signs. You can write a lot of tickets in a half an hour. So I think freeing up that time will be tremendously advantageous to the Police Department.

LEG. HAHN:

You weren't here this morning, but a speaker this morning -- and this is kind of what I was trying to get at. A speaker this morning suggested that just by responding to false alarms, that the officers would, therefore, be effectively patrolling neighborhoods because they're reacting and driving through neighborhoods in response to false alarms.

CHIEF CAMERON:

After 31 years with the Police Department, most of which in patrol, I find false alarms to be a nuisance and a waste of our time and basically noise in the background and it's wasting time that could be used a lot more productively.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes, and I would also imagine that we wouldn't want to be deciding where cars get deployed based on where false alarms come in from. I imagine you would want to strategically decide which street to be patrolling based on crime patterns, based on, you know, needs of the communities, not based on which alarm happens to go off, you know, at any given hour.

CHIEF CAMERON:

That's absolutely true. And many times when I talk to the officers in our precincts and I ask them, you know, can you do this extra thing, oftentimes they'll say, I'll work a tour, I'm going from call-to-call-to-call and I have absolutely no discretionary time to work on things that I would like to work on, like learning from the portal, like doing traffic, like generating human intelligence by talking to people, by making self-initiated arrests, that's what we need our officers to be doing to reduce crime even further from where it is now.

LEG. HAHN:

But it also needs to be based on statistics and crime patterns, not just where a call comes in from.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Right, that's correct.

LEG. HAHN:

So would you be willing -- there's also something, an issue that was brought up about the possibility of creating a protocol -- and you may already have this, maybe it just needs to be further reinforced -- but a protocol for when the actual -- as they're being reduced, but when an officer does have to respond to an alarm call that there is a protocol for what they do to check the residence or business, to make sure that they're getting out of the car, they're walking around and checking; before it's marked as a false alarm, that they're actually confirming that there weren't break-ins.

CHIEF CAMERON:

I think that policy exists. I think most of our officers are extremely diligent, they're checking the premise to make sure that all the doors and windows are secure and there's no evidence of a criminal trying to break into the establishment, and I think that's directly in line with all the other alarm programs that I reviewed. And we actually went so far as to send officers to some agencies that had existing programs to glean, you know, real-time data from them when they visited them.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. Thank you. Again, and I reserve the right, you know, to continue to ask questions. But I really, I feel strongly that reducing response to false alarms is -- I agree with you, it's critical to the operations of our -- you know, of our department. We have serious issues in our neighborhoods, the drug epidemic, gangs in some neighborhoods and speeding on highways where people are dying in the streets. We have some serious issues, and freeing up our officers to address those seems like an important goal. So thank you for all your hard work on this.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Last week I attended the Public Safety meeting, and I just want to thank all my colleagues for allowing the committee meetings to be held out here. I got a lot of positive comment from my constituents. No, it was important to them. They were able to come here and take part in

County government and they appreciated that, so I just want to thank you on the record.

And as far as this bill goes, you know, I've had conversations with the Chief before, I don't think I need to ask you any questions. You know, I was at a meeting with a number of Legislators a long time ago about this. This is not a new concept; all the East End towns have various versions of this law. And the reason is because false alarms are a complete waste of police time, and you want to allocate your resources and manage your police force as effectively as possible, and false alarms are just a big distraction. So, you know, I appreciate, you know, the Chief's attitude on this, you know.

You know, as far as -- Kate, as far as your law goes, I think you need the higher fines for repeat offenders. I think -- I do appreciate, and some towns don't have a reset on it. Some towns, once you have two false alarms you pay forever, you never get reset for the rest of the year. And I think the reset is fair in this -- in the original bill for -- you know, for Suffolk County. So and -- so I wouldn't support this. And if there's other adjustments to be made, but this isn't precedent setting. You're not breaking new ground here, you're really trying to manage your department and I appreciate that.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:

You know, none of this has anything to do with what we're talking in this bill that reduces the effectiveness of doing away with false alarms. They're going to be fined, they're going to pay, and all this is is the Administration trying to suck as much money out of the taxpayers as they possibly can. Why would you have to register? You know, I understand that some information might be lost if you don't register every year. But guess what? Let's do it every six months then because something might have happened. Why not make it every five years? Because the amount -- once you start banging someone or charging them \$250 for a third false alarm, they're not going to want to pay \$250 so they're going to fix it. So this 35% probably -- or 30%, I would say half of that is people who canceled their alarms. Because people called me and they said I'm just -- I cannot tell you how many calls I got that said that's it, they're not doing it. I was actually recommending to people to just don't even have them call the police, have them call you, because as we know, 99.99% of all false alarms are false alarms, and all alarms are false.

So to say that this is in any way hindering the program, it's not at all. They're still going to have to register, they're still going to have to find -- oh, and by the way, how the police know how to go to the house is because they're registered with the alarm company. They have the information. And if the alarm company can't get in touch with them, which happens all the time, it's because they're not answering their cell phone and they're not answering their home phone or they're away or they're out of the country, which is going to happen if the the Police Department has the information anyway.

So the crux of what we want to do is eliminate the false alarms; everyone agrees on that, and we're doing that. But we're doing it probably half as much by people cancelling their alarms, so what public safety is that? So why not have them register once and maybe in five years you have to register again just if you wanted to by why do you have to charge. And the reduced fee is actually a good thing because -- you know, I'm looking at the numbers, no homeowner is going to want to pay \$50 a month, register and then pay another \$100, they're going to learn their lesson. This is not -- this should not be about taking money from the taxpayers. It should be about reducing the alarms.

So, you know, the only reason they want to do this every year is recurring revenue, that's it, plain and simple. You think the alarm company updates their information every year? Of course not. It's about revenue. And I think the Chief will admit that it's going to go down and it might have some

slight effect by not getting the five or ten or a hundred people that change their contact information ever so slightly, why should the rest of the people be punished for that? They shouldn't be. So, you know, for anybody to sit here and say I want to table this because it's not good -- oh, I wanted to address the Presiding Officer about the false alarms. I mean, you don't know it's a false alarm. Someone could have jiggled the back down, went through the back door and be done; the cop shows up and he writes it up as a false alarm. You don't know, the window is left open, maybe the guy tried to open it and close it and then he ran away. You know, there's a lot of grey area. So now we have a situation where we're going to be probably fining them for that and they didn't do anything wrong. You know, how do we even know that? We'll never know.

So I think that's why they're -- another effective way to have the reduced fine. I mean, I don't -- I think everyone agrees that this is going to solve a lot of the problem and that it's disingenuous to say we have to do this every year. You want the money for it, and the County Executive should budget for once a year, one time, that's it, and whatever fines come in, I think they're going to be down -- you know, by what you said, it's going to be down 30% at least from the revenue, which is a good thing. So I think that everyone should support this. If they're looking out for the taxpayers of this County and the people who have alarms and the alarm companies, the right thing to do would be support Kate's bill, and I will be supporting it.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Thanks. Along the same lines of what Legislator Trotta said, nobody can convince me -- no, I'm not going to get into the 99.9% of false alarms are false alarms.

P.O. GREGORY:

(Laughter).

LEG. CILMI:

I'm not sure what the other .1% of false alarms are. Nobody can convince me and, the Chief has -- you know, has brought to us evidence, he says, that in other jurisdictions that have done this, and he's talked about many other jurisdictions that have done this, other Legislators have talked about other jurisdictions that have done this, that false alarms have gone down, but we don't know why those false alarms have gone down. And nobody can make a cogent argument that says they've gone down because we're charging people \$50 a year to register their alarm systems. If you want to make the argument that the false alarms have gone down because you're fining people who have multiple false alarms, that's a reasonable argument to make. I could see how people would be fearful of getting charged because their alarm continues to go off, and therefore do something to prevent that from happening. What that something is is anyone's guess. Do they cancel their alarm, their central station monitoring? Do they make some arrangement with the alarm company? Do they take their alarm out altogether? I don't know what the answer is. Do they fix problems that might be with the alarm? Do they update the technology in the alarm system? All those could be possibilities, we don't know. But nobody can tell me that a registration fee contributes to a reduction in the number of false alarms, that's my first point. So plain and simple, the registration fee is a public safety tax on the residents of this County who choose to put alarm systems in their houses to protect themselves.

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

LEG. CILMI:

I'd be curious to know what the cost to the County is for an investigation on an actual burglary or robbery versus the cost to the County for a sector car to drive by and get out of his car or her car for ten minutes and take a look to see what's going on when a false alarm has gone off. And, by the way, we talked about 97,000 false alarms in a year. I'm not sure if that's true or not. As Legislator Trotta pointed out, and I really hadn't even thought about this before, if you leave a window unlocked and you have an alarm system activated, and a would-be burglar opens that window and, therefore, triggers an alarm and runs away, is that a false alarm or is it not a false alarm?

My point is that whether or not it's 97,000 alarms is not the point. I don't think it is 97,000 false alarms in the end. But even if it were, when you divide -- and, listen, would we all love to see fewer false alarms? Of course we would. But when you divide the number of false alarms by the number of precincts in the County, in the Police District, by the number of sectors in each precinct, and then by the number of shifts in each sector, which for the most part is three, it works out to .6 false alarms per sector per shift, .6. If a police officer can't find time to respond to less than one false alarm in an eight-hour shift, we have much bigger problems.

As I said, of course we would like to reduce the number of false alarms, and if there's a program out there that could help us reduce the number of false alarms, I'm all for that program. But you can't tell me that forcing people to pay a \$50 fee, or a \$25 fee, now, in the future, whenever it is, is going to stop false alarms from happening, unless you're just going to get those people to cancel their alarms, which in the end might cost us more, because now we're going to have to invest resources in investigating burglaries and robberies. And, God forbid, somebody cancels their alarm system and is home when -- you know, when a robbery occurs, and, God forbid, gets, you know, injured as a result of that robbery. So I mean, the liability costs alone could be more than the savings here.

So I don't know. This is -- from the very beginning, the registration fee was nothing more than a public safety tax. I'm going to support Legislator Browning's bill, because it reduces the cost to our residents, but I -- as Legislator Trotta might have said, he and I have sponsored a bill to eliminate the registration fee all together. This is a step in the right direction. I think we need to continue the step in the right direction, because we're not quite there yet. And if you want to charge people for multiple false alarms, fine, and maybe you'll have the number of false alarms go down, but don't charge them a public safety tax to protect their own property and their own lives.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Legislator Cilmi. Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

And I agree with Legislator Cilmi, absolutely.

LEG. TROTТА:

Twice in one night.

LEG. ANKER:

I never voted for the alarm bill. I have heard from, again, seniors complaining, or, you know, with their concerns that they don't want to turn their alarm on, because what if it goes off, they'll have hundreds of dollars they'll have to pay, you know. And it's not even seniors, it's anyone with an alarm system. You know, we're putting the expense burden on our residents with alarm systems when it should be on the people that are creating the problem, period, that's it.

P.O. GREGORY:

I know we have Chief there, who's sitting there very patiently waiting for questions. If I may, before I move to the next person, you know, you and I spoke yesterday and I expressed some of the concerns that I have. And, you know, many of the people that have talked have mentioned that -- mentioned those concerns. Legislator Anker just referenced the seniors. You know, they have increased costs, whether it's utility costs, you know, their COLA is going down, they're on fixed incomes. And here we are, they're trying to -- they're trying to protect themselves, and they feel like -- and, you know, my district complains -- you know, I get very few complaints. I've gotten complaints about the red light cameras, but I've gotten more complaints about this bill than anything. You know, through layoffs and all the tough things that we've done, this is what I've gotten more complaints about.

And when people say to me -- I was at a meeting and one of my civics, and this came up, and one of your officers, your COPE officers were there, and they can tell you about it, you know, I had to like jump out the back window. I mean, it was like it got very heated very quickly, because, "Wait a minute, I paid over \$1,000 in Police District taxes and you're telling me that I have to register now for my alarm? I have never had a police officer come to my home." So some of these people paid thousands of dollars over the years, and so what, a police officer comes to their home because of a false alarm because a device that they have activated to, you know, give them a sense of security. They feel that that's a price that's worth -- that's worth paying.

And, you know, and my wife and I, you know, I had looked into -- we had a discussion, I was going to get a gun license, and I know one of my colleagues here. I won't mention the person's named, because he used me as a reference. I like to put things in perspective. I can go out, I could say -- I could cancel my alarm and get a gun license, which is cheaper than registering for a false alarm -- for an alarm. That to me is a little ridiculous, and I think that's the concern that people have.

I can go to the -- I can go to the Police Department and pay \$10 to get a license, that means a hundred and whatever dollars to do the fingerprint check, but it's \$10 to get the license, and it cost me \$900 to get the gun. But, you know, I think the 80-year-old woman or the senior citizen who's saying, "Hey, I just want to protect myself," who's not going to go out and buy a gun, "but my County is making it more complicated, more difficult for me to do that." That's a challenge, and I think that's why we have to -- and I appreciate the concerns that you had expressed about your officers, and the patrol, and using the time wisely, but I really believe we have to find a way to define, and I don't know if it's possible, but define some way -- you know, make it clear as to what's a false alarm or not, and I think that would give -- it's too arbitrary now, and I think that would give people more ease.

Okay, I'll shut up now. Legislator Fleming, and then Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. FLEMING:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. The independent police departments in my district, I mean, we don't -- we're not serviced by Suffolk County P.D. so much, but the independent police departments do depend on interaction with Suffolk County P.D. for a number of shared initiatives, so wasted police time is -- does have some impact in my district. And as a former Assistant D.A., I, you know, understand the need to make very good use of police time. You never have spare police time when you need it, so I don't want to undermine the effectiveness of this program.

I mean the question of whether it's fair to register every year, or getting fined because an alarm goes off by mistake, especially for seniors who depend on alarms for their piece of mind, are reasonable concerns, but this bill goes much further than that. And I put a lot of faith in what the Chief has said. And you mentioned, Chief Cameron, at committee that these changes -- I think you said it once again today, that they will actually undermine the effectiveness of the program. Can

you explain what specific changes are in this bill that will undermine the effectiveness of the program?

CHIEF CAMERON:

The main -- the main two changes in my mind that will undermine the effectiveness is the fact that if people don't have a permit and they have a false alarm, an unpermitted false alarm, instead of paying the fine, they can retroactively get a permit. In my mind, very few people will then get a permit. They'll roll the dice and wait until they have a false alarm, and then no one -- nobody's premise will be permitted. And virtually every program that we looked at that's been effective has a permitting process, and that to me is one of the best practices for the programs that worked.

Again, as somebody said earlier, we didn't pull this out of the air. This is not an innovative and creative program that I could take credit for. This is a program that municipalities have been using for decades to address a problem. And most police departments have determined that false alarms are a waste of their time and they want to eliminate them through a program like this. That's one.

Number two, reducing the escalating fines. The average person that, you know, doesn't want a police response is going to be probably deterred with the two false alarms that they're enabled to have without incurring a penalty. Reducing the escalating fines on the top end really truly benefits the most egregious offenders, people that have nine, ten false alarms, and those are people that just don't seem to get with the program that are continuing to have false alarms. And despite the fact that this program's in place, we have had some people like that that have not gotten their alarm system fixed to date.

You know, with respect to the rattling of doors, I mean, for a properly operating alarm system, rattling someone's door should not set the alarm off. The alarm should be far more robust than that. And if it does set it off, there's probably something wrong with their alarm system, and this is an incentive to have them have a service call and have their alarm system repaired so it doesn't continue to go off. Prior to this, there was no disincentive for having false alarm after false alarm. This should address a lot of those. And once people get their alarm systems fixed, that will go away.

With respect to the permitting process, we started allowing people to register with our program in April, and in April and May -- in April we saw a 22% reduction in residential false alarms, and in May we saw a 32% reduction. That's before we imposed any fines. That was just by virtue of the fact that people were made aware of the program, they were made aware that false alarms were a concern for the Police Department. In my mind, maybe a few of the people cancelled their central station, but I think most of the people were just more diligent and careful with their alarm systems.

All the thousands of municipalities all across the country that have had programs like this in place for decades have not had their central station providers go out of business. They still have false alarms. People still have alarms, people still sign up for central station. So because of this program, everybody in Suffolk County is not going to abandon their alarm systems and disconnect their central station. I don't believe that's going to occur.

LEG. FLEMING:

I think I have to agree with you. And I could say in my district, we have a similar program, except you only get one bite at the apple. An alarm goes off and it's a false alarm, next time the cops come out and waste their time, you have to pay a fine. And in this, we've added another bite at the apple, so you can do it three times. The first time you get a pass because you can register then, so that's sort of a give-away. It's like not getting health insurance until you need to go to the doctor, right, and then you get the health insurance, and then you get two more shots at it.

Before -- I mean, I appreciated your comment at committee, Chief, that only the very most -- this is -- no one's going to be subject to this, with three freebies, except the very most reckless and egregious offenders.

So I understand there are some issues, but I don't think this is the fix, only because I really have to respect the Chief's concerns that this is going to render the program ineffective, and it's just too important not to waste police personnel time, I believe. Thank you.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you. Chief, how are you?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Good, sir. How are you?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thanks, good. I don't -- I don't mind reducing the fees up front. I understand your point, and you are, in a sense, rewarding the more egregious offender. But, at the same time, you're also protecting people who maybe have one or two false alarms, or one false alarm every three years for some reason, and are really trying to be diligent in not letting that happen and you're letting them off the hook. So there's a trade-off there, you know. And if you're really an egregious offender of false alarms, eventually it will catch up to you, because then the scale increases over -- you know, as each -- as each false alarm occurs. So eventually you will be paying a hefty fine for that.

So, you know, whether you reduce the fees, keep them the same or make them more, I think -- I don't disagree with Legislator Browning in tweaking that, so to speak, because it's just we don't want to discourage people from having these alarms, or scaring them into you're going to pay a heavy fine if the first alarm or second alarm -- you know, I think it's better to err on the side of not charging people for false alarms when they're not an egregious offender.

So I'm going to put that aside, because I've gotten a lot of constituent calls on this as well, and I'm concerned about -- the largest complaint that I get with respect to this is the upfront fee and the recurring fee. And I understand, I think I heard you say in your beginning comments that it's important to have updated information, and I don't disagree with that. I think you need -- if you're going to do your job effectively, I don't care if the alarm company has it on file or doesn't, that's irrelevant. We don't depend on alarm companies for our information, we depend on the Police Department. But I want to ask you why -- why do we need the upfront fee and why does it need to be recurring?

CHIEF CAMERON:

We need -- I believe some fee vests people more in the program than if the registration is fee -- free. And what I'm --

LEG. D'AMARO:

I'm sorry, I didn't hear that. You believe what?

CHIEF CAMERON:

I think it vests people more in the program if they pay some fee. I mean, it doesn't necessarily have to be the fee it's set at now. I mean, the Police Department is open to reducing the fees, and that was the -- contained in the initial bill that Legislator Browning laid on the table. There was fee reductions in that, but I don't believe the structure of that bill damaged the potential success of this program, so I wouldn't have even been here speaking about that bill. Had that bill come to the table, I was 100% fine about that.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay.

CHIEF CAMERON:

And that did reduce the registration fees. When I met with Legislator Browning, I think we met probably four or five times. I met with some of the Legislators, representatives from the alarm industry. One of the representatives from the alarm industry kind of summed it up in what I thought was a -- is a good fashion. If you have concert tickets that someone gave you for free and you missed a concert, you're not that concerned. If you paid some amount of money, even if it's a small amount of money for it, you're a little bit more vested in it, and you're going to be more upset that you missed the concert.

So I think some small, even a small fee for registration is important, and I think regular registration is important, because I believe Legislator Trotta said the alarm companies probably don't update their information for four or five years. They just keep billing you by having contact with the people every year. And with the software system that we have, it allows the citizens of Suffolk County to create an account. They can come in, they can check on their false alarms, they can check on their bills, and they can add updated information if they like.

So I really truly believe, having -- especially for people that are snowbirds. Their alarm goes off, maybe there's a problem with the system and their alarm continues to go off every day and they're down in Florida. Having alternative means of contact, maybe we can get a hold of their son, their daughter, their neighbor, and they can come in and reset the alarm system and make that issue go away faster.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, I agree, you need that information, I think, at the end of the day. We shouldn't depend on anyone else for that information. But the upfront fee, what -- whether it's recurring or not, what's the justification for the fee?

CHIEF CAMERON:

The justification for the fee is that it vests people in the program. They've paid money for the program, it focuses their attention on it. And like I said earlier, when we opened for registrations on the permits, just by virtue of the fact that people registering for the alarm systems reduced residential alarms, the first month, 22%, and the second month, 32%, before any fines were imposed at all, and that is the model that's been successful. That's the best practice that we identified. From other programs, from the other hundreds and thousands of programs that municipalities are operating all across the nation, those are the commonalities, escalating fine structure, regular permitting, in many cases with the fee.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So the upfront fee you feel gives you skin in the game, so to speak?

CHIEF CAMERON:

It does. I mean, it doesn't have to be --

LEG. D'AMARO:

So let me just explore that a little, because I want to agree with you. So if I have this alarm system and I'm paying central station a monthly fee and they're monitoring me, and then the Police Department says, "But we need your information as well," why can't I just send in all that information without the fee? Like why do I need the fee?

CHIEF CAMERON:

That's an alternative. There could be no fee registration. I mean, we -- the County opted for the fee registration and it did seem to be effective in reducing residential false alarms. They dropped dramatically as soon as --

LEG. D'AMARO:

It wasn't effective in getting folks to register, is that what you mean?

CHIEF CAMERON:

People registered and the false alarms dropped immediately, dropped immediately by 22% in the first month before any fines were imposed, and in the second month, 32% before any fines were imposed. We saw that on the residential end. The commercial reduction has been slower to implement, but now we're starting to see dramatic reductions in commercial alarms as well --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

CHIEF CAMERON:

-- for a combined reduction last month of 31%.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. I think there's more awareness of the issue for sure --

CHIEF CAMERON:

Yes, sir.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- right now. And I think people are aware that if they have a false alarm, they can be penalized for that, and I think that would probably account for a reduction in false alarms, and that's the intent in what we're trying to accomplish. Whether it's the right fee structure is another debate, but I'm just trying to understand how the upfront fee is reducing false alarms.

CHIEF CAMERON:

It gives -- it focuses people's attention on the false alarm issue. They're expending money, so it's a concern of theirs, and it --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay.

CHIEF CAMERON:

It's the best practice that we identified as working, and it worked for us as well.

LEG. D'AMARO:

What -- so the law requires that you must register your alarm; is that correct?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Yes. And our fees --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Let me just give you an example.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, you know, maybe it's a bad example. Think about your car, right? So the law requires that you register your car, and that's a recurring fee. The law requires that you get your inspection, that's a recurring fee, along with the permit, so to speak. So if it's the law, would people be less inclined to do it if you had no fee, is that what you're saying?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Not necessarily saying that. I'm saying --

LEG. D'AMARO:

I'm sorry to interrupt, but I just -- I always thought that the fees for registration and all of that were more about, you know, there's an administrative cost in maintaining your database and keeping it up to date.

CHIEF CAMERON:

There is an administrative cost, and I certainly believe that the program should be cost neutral to the Police Department. We did have to hire added staff --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

CHIEF CAMERON:

-- and buy the computer program and computers to administer the program.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

CHIEF CAMERON:

So it certainly should be cost neutral to the Police Department.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, yeah, okay. I mean, some people would argue that the police tax is already, you know, covering that.

CHIEF CAMERON:

And many of the programs I looked at that impose a permit fee, that's the justification for the permit fee, is to pay for the administration of the program.

LEG. D'AMARO:

All right. I appreciate that you're being very candid in saying that, you know, whether the fee that's in place now is the right fee, you're not really sure and that's something that was being examined.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And I am all for that, because, you know, based on the calls that I've received in my office, we -- I think we need to do some type of adjustment to that fee.

CHIEF CAMERON:

I don't disagree with you.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. So I appreciate that very much. And just, you know, keep that in mind as we move this process forward.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Absolutely, sir.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you, sir, I appreciate it. Okay. Thank you, appreciate it.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Martinez.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Chief, first of all, thank you for being here. To the sponsor, you and I have had several conversations, and, you know, it's just similar to what Legislator D'Amaro was just saying, too. And it's just -- you know, it's just those individuals that have a hard time already making it through the day. And, Chief, you and I spoke about this yesterday, and you know that I wasn't a fan about this from day one and -- but I do -- I do know that there are other bills on the table, and I do want to see what the others entail. But, you know what, I also want you to know that I completely agree with you, you know, in terms of we need to really ease the burden on our residents. I mean, we just did plastic bags, and, yes, you know, are we saving the environment? Yes, but again, on taxpayers. Do we want P.D. to focus on things that they need to do? Yes; again, our taxpayers. And I just think that we just really need to come together and find a way and really do come to a compromise where everyone's going to be happy, not that everybody's going to be fully happy.

But I just feel that now that there are other things on the table that maybe we should take a look at the others. You know, it doesn't mean that I disagree with what your bill -- you know, what your bill has, but I think I would like to venture out and see what the other bills have to offer before I make my decision. And even though I -- you know, you and I have had these conversations, but, Chief, I have a district that you very well know is a struggling district to begin with, and I could not bear an additional burden on them. It's not fair, and that's how I feel. And I have received the calls as well. And it's hard for me to say, you know, this is what you have to do. You know, you have your alarm to protect yourselves and now you have to pay additional. And that's what Legislator D'Amaro was talking about in terms of why do with need to reregister if they're already in the system.

You know, it's something that I just feel that we all need to come together and put everybody to the table, not just individual meetings, not just here and there, but everyone really needs to be involved, because it's not just one district, it's all 18 of ours. And I think we really need to look at each individual district and see how it's going to affect each and every single one of us, so -- and, again, I just want to thank you for all the work that you've done. You've done a lot with this and I know you're done, so I do want to thank you for it.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Chief, would you happen to have the number of false alarms by district? Do you have that number?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Legislator Martinez asked me for that, and I tried to -- I told her that I probably couldn't get it per district, but I might be able to get it per hamlet, and I was not able to get that either. But we did call the company that provided the software. They're going to amend the software so that we can get that in the future, but I cannot produce that right now.

P.O. GREGORY:

Do you have it by precinct?

CHIEF CAMERON:

It's all lumped together and we can't separate it out right now. It requires a software adjustment from the company, and we will be able to get that in the future, but right now I can't produce that for you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Spencer.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thank you. I had a chance to ask questions in the Public Safety Committee, and I did want to do some followup with regards to that.

Again, I will state for the record that I support having the alarm bill in place, but I disagree with it in its current form, and I made that clear when I voted for it. And, again, I'll restate for the record that my support for it was on the basis of it being amended, and also on the basis of my support for the -- for you as the Chief. So I think that this is what's difficult, because I've had a lot of conversations with top members of the Department and Administration, but also with my colleagues. And I am really stuck on -- I can support the registration fee as far as an administrative cost. I don't support the re-registration, once you have that information.

So one question I'll ask is that once you get a false alarm, when does it reset? Like if I have a false alarm this year and I get another false alarm, is it every year that it starts over?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Yes, sir. When you get your permit, you're -- there's two excusable false alarms, and then when you get your next permit, it's a year later. So if you get your permit in June, then the following June, when you renew it, you get two more excusable false alarms. So every year you get -- would get two, it would reset.

LEG. SPENCER:

Okay. That makes sense, that it does -- that it does reset. So I think that my concern is I can understand a process and handling fee, I can understand skin in the game. What I don't understand is charging residents, especially vulnerable residents, a re-registration fee, you know, that's the part, like if your information changes or you have to update it. And I don't see how that changes the program. That's the part about Legislator Browning's bill that I like. I mean, I appreciate the willingness to work with us.

So I guess I'll ask specifically. Understanding that, all right, you've got to have skin in the game, I registered my alarm, I got skin in the game, it's rough of trying to make ends meet. I'm already paying 5 cents more to get my bags now, you know, but I'm not going to pay that 5 cents because I'm going to use reusable bags, and so I'm saving that money. But why do I have to pay again, and how does that hurt the program? Because that is something that I do like about that, about Legislator Browning's bill.

CHIEF CAMERON:

We want them to reregister every year so we can get updated information, whether there's a fee involved or not. Most of the programs we looked at, that was the best practice, that there was some fee involved. There doesn't necessarily have to be. Again, we based our program on identified best practices from other programs, and that's a pretty ubiquitous factor in the other programs that work well, is a recurring permit renewal with some fee involved. If we were to eliminate the fee, I'm not sure exactly what effect it would have on the program. I don't think it would be -- dramatically damage the program, like some of the items in this bill that I'm opposed to. So I'm open to discussion on changing the fees. You know, I've met with many of you several times about this, and there were reductions in the fees in the initial bill, and I don't think that would have had any damage to the success of the program whatsoever.

LEG. SPENCER:

Okay. And so -- and that's the similar question as far as what the initial registration, I get that, that makes sense. So I just want, to the sponsor and everything, and I'm just doing everything possible, and I'll say what influences me, because I know that regardless of the -- I have confidence in the administration and in my colleagues, but, Chief, you stand apart as in my mind being someone that has a pure interest in law enforcement, and so that weighs very heavily with me. I think that you have a different ulterior motive. So what happened? There seemed to be meetings. There seemed -- I had representation at some of those meetings and there seemed to be a consensus as to what is acceptable. To the sponsor or also to the Chief, what was the differences from what was agreed upon at those meetings to this final bill? What happened there? Because that's really the crux of, you know, my support of deciding, you know, how I'm going to vote on this.

CHIEF CAMERON:

My -- I did meet with several of the Legislators, including representatives from you, and I believe that we developed a fair compromise bill that was laid on the table and then removed. That reduced -- primarily reduced fees. It reduced some of the escalating fees, it reduced the permit fees. It clarified the fact that fire alarms and carbon monoxide alarms will not be penalized, which it didn't say it would be, but it clearly clarified that there would not be. We're not looking to fine people for fire alarms or carbon monoxide alarms. The difference between that bill and this bill is this bill allows people to get a permit -- to be unpermitted to have a false alarm and then to retroactively get a permit. It also dramatically reduces the escalation of the fines at the higher level. And, again, most law abiding citizens that are diligent with their alarm system are never going to get up to having eight, nine, ten false alarms in a year, it just will never happen. Those are the people that are careless and unconcerned about their alarm system that have repetitive false alarms, and those are the ones that we really want to try and curtail, because we have had in the past people that have had hundreds of false alarms that have required police response perhaps every other day.

LEG. SPENCER:

So to Legislator Browning, if I may through the Chair, that's where I'm lost here. It seemed that there was something that there was an agreement, there was some common ground, and then there was some change. But I'm hearing that the bill was the same bill. So what happened? What was it? Do you feel there was an agreement?

LEG. BROWNING:

No, there was no agreement in that final bill. And bottom line is, you know, having met with the people from the industry that were still not happy with it, and I can tell you that when the other bill got filed, still getting phone calls. My constituents, and many others I'm sure got constituent calls also about that re-registration. Now the one thing I have to say is there's a first time registration, and I said, okay, I can agree to -- I'll agree with the first-time registration because of the administrative costs and the needs of the Police Department to put the program together, but once

you're done, you're done. The bill does not say, and I'm pretty sure, George, we do have still -- you still are required to reregister, there's just not a cost. So if you register your alarm this year, next year you'll reregister, but you don't have to pay, you already -- you already did that. So it's a simple update on your initial information; am I correct, George?

MR. NOLAN:

That's correct. And I would just point out that we asked, or at least I asked Chief Cameron, "If we lose the reregistration fee, do you still want people to register every year?" And the Chief indicated yes, he did, so that's why we left it that way. But we lost the fee on the reregistration. Businesses still have to -- the commercial buildings still have to pay a \$50 reregistration fee every year.

And the only thing I will say, and this came up with Kate, in terms of the escalating schedule of fines or fees, is, you know, it's my -- I believe that the fees have to bear some relation to what it's costing the department to go out there and check. So that's why I recommended to Kate that it's -- you know, the fees were going as high as \$750 per occurrence. And I just -- in my opinion, that doesn't bear any relation to the actual cost that's being incurred, so we -- I did suggest to Kate it would be probably a good idea to reduce the schedule on the fees.

LEG. BROWNING:

And one other thing when you're talking about the registration and the impact on the program. Chief, you know that we have sent you many constituents who were unaware of the registration, and the issue with, you know, waiving the \$100 fine if you register. I think that's what you want, is you want more people to register than continually be fined. So it's an encouragement to them, pay the fine or register, whichever is less, and you have 30 days to make that choice.

And correct me if I'm wrong, but I'm pretty sure that this year, with all of the people who are unaware of the program as it is right now and paying the registration, the department themselves, you have been flexible in not charging that fine because they're not registered. And you have been very flexible in not making them pay that fine, but to register; am I correct?

CHIEF CAMERON:

We've been very lenient, because it's a new program, and we do understand that some people may not have received the notification, and the example cited was people that were in Florida that may not have received the notice that came in the mail. Of course, we've been lenient, because it's a new program. But, eventually, as knowledge of the program becomes more widespread, we can't be as lenient as we have been.

LEG. BROWNING:

Right, and if you have -- if somebody buys -- gets a new alarm system put in their home next year and the alarm company doesn't notify them, you can't -- you know, you can't say to them, "Well, you should have registered." They didn't know. The alarm company may not have let them know, so you have to kind of give them the benefit of the doubt. And I think that we have done that this year. It hasn't impacted the program by waiving that fine and allowing them to register as it stands right now.

CHIEF CAMERON:

I don't know if it's impacted or not. Again, my goal is to reduce false alarms 50 to 70%, because that's the model that we're following. We're down 30%, so we've got to --

LEG. BROWNING:

Right now you're at a thirty-something percent reduction.

CHIEF CAMERON:

We've got a ways to go. I don't know what effect that's having on the program. But I went to an Alarm Association meeting when we were developing the program at the Upsky Hotel, and I did -- one of the things I did ask is the representatives from the Alarm Association to notify their customers. I thought it would be a fair thing for them to do. Most of them said they would do it, some of them said they'd bill on an annual basis. So if they all do it, it will take time for that mechanism to get out. If they bill on an annual basis, obviously, it will take a year for all of their customers to get notice in their bill that this program exists. As they sign up new customers, I think it would be fair for them to let them know you have to get a permit. So that's why we're being lenient in the initial -- in the initial startup stages, to make sure that people are being treated fairly, and those that didn't know that they had to get it had the opportunity to obtain a permit. I think it's just a fair thing to do.

LEG. SPENCER:

I'm going to get the floor back, actually.

LEG. BROWNING:

Sorry.

LEG. SPENCER:

Thanks. That doesn't count towards my time, Mr. Presiding Officer, but I have a lot of questions, but I am just considerate of just the hour and everything. I do have one other thing that I did want to follow up on, Chief, and that was, and probably people are sick of me saying this quote, but I -- you know, again, I'd rather let 100 guilty people go free than to convict one innocent person. And my concern, again, is distinguishing between what is a false alarm and an unsubstantiated alarm. And you can say the vast, vast majority of false alarms are truly false alarms. But I know there's no way to prevent this, but I do know that, for the most part, if you are a bad guy, you're right, I agree with you, that jiggling the window or the door, or if you -- you know, the difference between a tap on the glass and a glass breaking, modern sensors should pick that up. But, on the other hand, if there is a window that can be unlatched or a door that can be jimmed, and without signs of forcing an entry, and someone comes in and see that there is an alarm, I don't want public safety to be jeopardized where someone may have a situation where there is someone that's -- that they do need the alarm for. It looked -- it's looked at as a false alarm.

So there's no way we wouldn't have a program, I get it, but there really should be a standardized protocol that occurs, because sometimes we may have an officer that has two or three different calls, and he gets the false alarm call, or she gets the false alarm call, goes by the residence, quickly checks, and then moves on to the other one, because there seems to be nothing going on at the time, that person gets charged a false alarm. So there should be a standard operating procedure, if I may say, where there is -- the officer exits the vehicle, goes around the premises, checks the door. And even in that particular case, you still have a situation where it's kind of guilty until proven innocent; that if that taxpayer, that registered person shows the department that I went back, I had my alarm inspected, all my sensors are working properly. You know, I don't expect an officer to dust for fingerprints at the time.

But that is my big concern with the program, that somehow we can put this program in place. And to tell me 99%, I'm still talking about that one innocent person being fined. And to say, "Well, that's just the cost of doing business," to me that's not fair. So can you discuss with me, I did ask in advance, what the protocol would be to say this is a false alarm, and if there is any doubt whatsoever, you know, there should be a form, there should be a procedure that has to be followed before this is called a false alarm.

CHIEF CAMERON:

I mean, sir, the training, and we discussed this when we spoke yesterday, the training that our officers receive is to do exactly that. They are to respond to the alarm, that they get out of the car, they're to walk around, they're to check, physically check that all the doors and windows are secure, to look for breaks, and only then would they classify the alarm as a false alarm.

Most alarm systems now are very technologically advanced. Certainly, jiggling a door should not set the alarm system off. The door would need to be physically opened to activate, to open that sensor. Whether it's a read sensor or a pressure switch, the door had to be opened to cause that alarm. If you rapped extremely hard, could you set a shock sensor off on a window? That's possible. But, again, let's remember that people that have permitted their alarm system, that would be one of their excusable false alarms. So in order for them to be fined, the same burglar would have to come back to their house on three occasions and do the same thing to trigger their alarm system. So if that's what triggered their alarm system, it shouldn't recur a second time and they should never be fined.

LEG. SPENCER:

Fair enough. I think that just to that point, I hope for something more formalized, because, in the interim, since we spoke, I did have a constituent that did have a situation where there was a false alarm, charged with a false alarm. But this constituent was fairly irate, that said the officer came by, the officer had two calls, all seemed clear at the time. They said go, the officer went to the second call, but that constituent was charged for a false alarm. And it didn't seem -- you know, because, obviously, the officers are busy, and so they may not have a time for a full clear. And I think that if there isn't a chance for that standard operating procedure to be followed, I think it should come from the top down, that if there is any doubt and there's no time to do the standard procedure, that that person should not be charged.

CHIEF CAMERON:

When -- we do have categories for the officers that respond to alarms, that can categorize them in a way that it will not be a false alarm. For example, if there's a thunderstorm, they'll classify that as a weather event. If there's a power failure, they can classify it as a power made incident. So not every time do they go to a location where the premise is secure isn't a false alarm. There are options for the officer to categorize and so the person is not fined. And I can certainly go back and review the curriculum that we train our officers in on how to handle an alarm, but that's the way I was trained, and, to the best of my knowledge, nothing has changed since then.

One of the issues with that, because your Aide, Liz, sent me an email on that particular one, and I think a lot of the issues with alarm systems now, because they've become better, is operator error. Most of the false alarms now are operator error. That particular alarm, I was able to look the call up, and the zone that was involved that triggered the alarm was front second floor windows. So it's unlikely that anybody would be trying to break in on the second floor. I don't know if the homeowner knew what zone was triggered in his alarm system, but, I mean, that's something else that we're looking at.

And we did put tips on our website on how to prevent false alarms. But I'm all for trying to educate alarm owners on how to better operate their system, and we've actually talked about maybe making videos and putting videos on our website on teaching people how to better their alarm systems to try and further reduce false alarms.

LEG. SPENCER:

Fair enough. I'll yield, Mr. Presiding Officer. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Thank you. Kate, did you want to go again?

LEG. BROWNING:

No.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

You know, what I'm hearing here is that this bill is everything that everyone wants. You know, Chief, you mentioned, you know, in terms of we have to reregister, but we're not going to charge. Your concern was that you're not forcing people to register? I'm missing your concern.

CHIEF CAMERON:

You're familiar with the bill, Legislator?

LEG. TROTТА:

Yeah.

CHIEF CAMERON:

The -- one of the main issues I'm concerned about is if you're unpermitted, if you have not obeyed the law and obtained a permit and you have a false alarm, in its current state, you would be fined.

LEG. TROTТА:

Yes.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Which is an encouragement to, in fact, get a permit, because then your first two alarms would not be fined.

LEG. TROTТА:

Yes.

CHIEF CAMERON:

And the way the bill is written out, instead of being fined, you can retroactively obtain a permit.

LEG. TROTТА:

Okay. So that's a great point, because I would say I got 20 calls and said, "I never got anything in the mail. I never heard about this. I called the Police Department, they told me my alarm company was supposed to tell me. The alarm company never told me." You know, what you got in the mail was like a cheesy little thing, that if you didn't look at it, or your wife threw it away before you got it, and then you'd have no knowledge of it.

So I don't have a problem with if they didn't know about it, now they have to register. So if they pay whatever it is, \$50 to register, whatever it is, now you will know that they didn't register, because there's no -- they would have gotten an alarm before, so now you're forcing them to register. Someone who normally wouldn't know about it would now know about it, because they got a false alarm, and you probably, as you have, waived the \$100 fee, because, legitimately, people didn't know.

And I sort of disagree -- well, I'm not disagreeing, but I think the alarm companies, they're not going to tell people they have to register. They're going to charge the most money, and then they're going to say, "Oh, by the way, you got to pay the County another \$50," thinking that that's the last thing they want to do. You know, they're trying to make a sale. They're going -- they're not going to say, "Oh, yeah, by the way, you got another partner."

So this bill accomplishes everything that we want to do, except, you know, the fine of \$100 on the false -- false alarm, but they don't know about it, so you would waive that anyway. So what we have here is exactly what everyone wants.

CHIEF CAMERON:

You're presuming that everybody that hasn't registered has not registered because they don't know about the program, and I don't see why --

LEG. TROTТА:

Or their alarm doesn't go off.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Why would anyone register if they don't have to registers until after they've had a false alarm? Why would I get a driver's license until I didn't have to get one until after I was caught --

LEG. TROTТА:

I'm so glad you said that. I just pulled out my license. I was looking at my license today, and if -- would you give this to the Chief? My picture is from 1992 on my license. I have a full head of hair.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Most people would appreciate that.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. TROTТА:

But my point is --

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Handsome devil back then.

LEG. TROTТА:

-- is that if you, you know, have a free registration and someone -- you know, you can send them an email or something where they can come up and update it, you know, I think that's -- my bill, if Monica is waiting for my bill, my bill says you don't have to register at all, because the alarm company has your information. The cop goes to the house, he knows the residents, he could write a ticket to the homeowner of the house and leave it there. But, you know, this is a compromise to my bill.

Let's go over what it does. It gives the people a break after they've registered. They still have to register. It reduces the three false alarms. And I agree with the Chief, where if your alarm goes off and it's a false alarm, the odds of you having three, you know, breaks that weren't real, you know, that would be slim to none.

So I think this accomplishes everything that everybody wants, but for some reason, the County Executive sent an email, or was quoted in the paper as saying, "I'm going to veto it," so we're afraid of the County Executive. We put the County Executive's feeling above the taxpayers? I mean, it's mind boggling to me that we're trying to raise revenue again, you know, twice in one meeting, not

to mention the red light cameras, which Bridget doesn't have in her area. You know, that's maybe why we can charge more. You know, it's -- you know, this is what we want. DuWayne wants it, everyone talks about it, but you'll table it.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Yeah, thank you. Chief, thank you for being here and for spending the time, not just this evening, but with so many of us, me included, on answering questions and addressing concerns. I know you've spent a lot of time with Legislator Browning and her staff, and constituents, and members of the industry as well. We certainly know that Legislator Browning has been working very, very hard on this issue. And, you know, there's substance, and then, of course, there is process as well, and I think a big part of the concern and why we continue to receive phone calls is because of process as well. And whether that be rollout of a new program, or notification, or lack of notification, or the need to better perfect a process I think is going to go a long way in helping the success of the program in the future, but those remain concerns.

I do think that there are elements of this bill which are an important move towards making for a better program, but I also believe that there are elements that are not in this legislation that I think need to be considered before coming up with a final version, so I look forward to continuing that conversation with you in particular.

The comment was made before, someone from the public wasn't convinced that we had done enough due diligence in developing this program. But I have every confidence that you utilized your knowledge and background research to develop something that you believe reflects best practices, both from other jurisdictions here locally and from across the country. But, of course, you know that it's not a one-size-fits-all and every jurisdiction is ultimately different. And so I do believe that even though it may be reflective of what cumulatively might be considered best practices isn't necessarily what's best for us.

And so, again, I think that there is a way to go before we arrive at a final version of this program. One of those things, and one of the questions that I continue to have, Chief, and I agree with you, it's probably difficult, if not impossible to determine with any specificity, but, you know, we talk about the reduction, the percentage, that it's gone down in a relatively short period of time. And my question was is there any way to quantify if that reduction is due to the success of the program, or whether it's because there are those that are just discontinuing their service? Are they just disconnecting? Are they just not activating their system, and has that led to at least part of this reduction? And, again, I agree with you, that it's probably difficult to know that.

My question -- I have plenty of questions, but I do have one question for this evening. Of those that have registered, have you been able to -- do we have the number? Have you been able to quantify that of the number of residents that have registered, what number of those that have registered were also those that had a violation? Because my question would be did they register because they knew that they needed to register? Did they register because they received notice? Did they register because they had heard it in the media someplace and felt that they needed to have this skin in the game, that they knew it was now a requirement by law, and so they chose to take the affirmative step of registering? Or did they register because they had tripped a false alarm and they were cited for that, and chose then to register because they were now certainly notified of the program, but because it was a violation that was served upon them?

And I think that's important for me in making a decision on how best to proceed, because while I would agree, it's important to have skin in the game, it's important to have something invested in a program, in this case, is it meaningful? And I would think that we would have some indication of that based on the answer to the question, were there -- were there more people? Is there a significant number that took the affirmative step of registering, or did they only register ultimately because they were served with a violation?

CHIEF CAMERON:

The vast majority of people that registered registered proactively. There is only a small subset of them that were able to register because they filed an appeal telling us they did not know about the program. And the way I can discern that is from the number of alarms that have been excused on appeal. It's not very large when compared to the number of people that have permits. People were obtaining permits in April and May before fines were even imposed. And as I have mentioned earlier, in April, for residential alarms, we saw a 22% reduction, and in May, we saw a 32% reduction.

So that process of people becoming aware that they needed to be more diligent with their alarm system to the registration process caused a significant reduction immediately in the residential alarms. That did not occur immediately with the commercial alarms, they've been slower to catch up. But we now saw last month a 27% reduction in the commercial alarms and a 35% reduction in the residential alarms, so the commercial alarms are starting to catch up. But most people registered proactively without having an incident with the Police Department.

CHAIRMAN STERN:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Chief, one last question from me. There was someone who contacted my office who did not register, had a false alarm, his window was open, and the blind or the drapes had triggered the alarm. So he wanted to appeal the fine, because he got the -- he had to register, then he had a \$100 fine or \$150 fine, whatever it was. But he had been trying to contact the office, but the -- and I believe I spoke to the Commissioner about it, but I just wanted to make sure, that he was having difficulty getting through. So we had advised him to write a letter to the department, but I'm not sure if he heard anything yet. So I know there were some that were -- that wanted to appeal, but they were having difficulty doing the appeal process.

CHIEF CAMERON:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Has that all been resolved yet? Have you addressed any appeals?

CHIEF CAMERON:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

CHIEF CAMERON:

One of my concerns, sir, was with the customer service aspect of this, because I knew for many people this would be an unpopular program, and I looked at other programs and I knew the customer service aspect was not great. So I wanted the Police Department to be as spot on as we could to provide the best service possible. And when you pointed that out to us, I did speak to the

person in charge of the Alarm Bureau, and every time I go in there, every single employee was on the phone. So we added staff, we added additional phone lines to clear that up.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

CHIEF CAMERON:

If the person has any issue, you can certainly direct them to me and I'll make that sure that it gets addressed.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, okay. All right. So that's all. Oh, Legislator Spencer.

LEG. SPENCER:

So here's where I stand. If I have to vote to -- yes or no on this bill, I'm going to vote yes. But if there's a situation where -- is there anything better that's out there now? Because if there is, if it's a matter of that there is something better that we can do to change this, because I do like what is out there. So is there anything that's competing that's out there? Because if it's a matter of --

LEG. HAHN:

There was a late-starter.

LEG. SPENCER:

I'm not poking --

LEG. HAHN:

There was a late-starter submitted today that meets -- meets the Police Department's -- meets many of the thing that we talked about. I can get it to you. I think -- I think you will be happy. The Police Department is okay with it, and it was submitted today, a late-starter.

LEG. TROTТА:

It still has the fees.

LEG. SPENCER:

So, Chief, from your perspective, you're saying this is working. You want more time. I can't vote against this bill, but you're saying that if we wait, or if this is postponed, that there's something that is coming up that can address my protocol concerns, that can address some of the concerns that you have? That's a different vote for me. So if this bill is not tabled, I will be supporting it, but I need something better to -- I can't vote for the status quo, is what I'm saying. So thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yeah. Just a couple of comments. I will vote for the tabling, and I'll tell you why. This is a lot more complicated, I believe, than just having a discussion in terms of the number of false alarms, and whether or not, you know, we want to charge a fee here or a fee there.

The original bill, the bill in chief, I was vehemently against it, because I didn't like the overall concept, and I debated against it, but it passed. As a result of that passage, \$7.2 million was put in the budget predicated on the revenue coming in from this bill, and I supported the budget, as most of you did. My sense is that, so far, the revenue from the existing bill, the bill in chief, has been disappointing to say the least. But when you pass a budget, either it's going to be certified or it's

balanced. So when we put in 7.2 million on the revenue side, there were programs that all of you wanted that may have been partially funded predicated on that revenue coming in. So there's a problem there that should be discussed between the Administration and the Legislative Branch.

If Kate's bill, on the other hand, goes forward, say they have a meeting and they're going to go forward, then predicated on the revenue coming in, it might be less than half of that 7.2 million. So you have to anticipate programs being cut that were funded this year, because the revenue is not going to be there from the alarm bill.

All I'm saying is that if there's a meeting scheduled between the Legislative Branch and the Administration, have the meeting. Table the bill just for one cycle. Let's see what comes out of the meeting. If in the end it's your bill, so be it. If not, maybe some other alternative can come up where it's amenable to the majority of the members here and they feel comfortable supporting the bill, a new bill.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. So we have two motions, we have a tabling motion and a motion to approve. The tabling motion goes first. Roll call.

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

LEG. HAHN:

Yes to table.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes to table.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes to table.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

No.

LEG. MURATORE:

No.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Absent).

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

No to table.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No to table.

LEG. TROTTA:

No to table.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

No to table.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes to table.

MR. RICHBERG:

Eleven. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. Let's go to Tabled Resolutions for today.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

We have ***I.R. 1180 - A Local Law to prohibit the sale of Kratom in Suffolk County (Stern)***. Motion to table by Legislator Stern, I'll second. All in favor? I'm sorry. Is everyone on Tabled Resolutions? Tabled Resolutions, 1180. Okay. Motion to table and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1242 - 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). Motion to --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Table.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1257 - Appropriating funds in connection with the new Enhanced Suffolk County Water Quality Protection Program - 2014 Referendum - Sewer Improvement Projects (CP 8734.310)(Co. Exec.). Motion to table.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1476 - Establishing County policy to hire former County employees on preferred lists (Browning).

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to table by Legislator Browning.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

BUDGET AND FINANCE

P.O. GREGORY:

Budget and Finance: ***I.R. 1665 - Approving County funding for a contract agency (Middle Country Youth Association)(Muratore).*** Motion to approve by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. HAHN:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1685 - Establishing a Suffolk County Tax Act Study Committee (Cilmi). Motion to approve by Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

I.R. 1697 - Amending the 2016 Operating Budget and appropriating funds in connection with bonding for a settlement for a liability case against the County (Co. Exec.). Do I have a motion?

LEG. FLEMING:

Motion.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator D'Amaro, second by Legislator Fleming. On the motion, anyone? Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

Yeah. Just briefly, can I -- generically, which one was this?

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. We have one of the County Attorneys here, Lynne Bizzarro.

MS. BIZZARRO:

Good evening. Thank you. This one, 1697, this was a motor vehicle accident. It was a rear-end car accident involving a police vehicle that we were settled -- that we settled for \$200,000. Ways and Means approved it on June 16th, and then Budget and Finance approved it on August 30th.

LEG. TROTТА:

I voted for it?

MS. BIZZARRO:

You voted -- you did not. I believe that you voted against this.

P.O. GREGORY:

Are you good?

LEG. TROTТА:

I'm good.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. So anyone else on I.R. 1697? Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Opposed.

LEG. TROTTA:

Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

J.R. 1697A, bond resolution. Same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes to -- yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Absent).

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. I got a request from Legislator Cilmi to take I.R. 1725 out of order, it's Government Ops. It's ***Authorizing a two-year extension for the development of fifteen parcels of land transferred pursuant to the 72-h Affordable Housing Program to the Town of Islip (Co. Exec.)***.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second.

LEG. CILMI:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Lindsay)

P.O. GREGORY:

We have some folks here from Islip and Brookhaven; we're going to try to get them out. So the --

LEG. CILMI:

Motion to approve.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to approve I.R. 1725 by Legislator Cilmi.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Calarco. On the motion?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Is this on out of order motion?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes, it -- no. We approved out of order, it's before us.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:

1725, Page 9.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes, I actually do have a couple of questions on this bill. If I can have Alison come up, if she's here.

MS. KARPPI:

Good evening.

LEG. CILMI:

State your name for the record, Alison.

MS. KARPPI:

Alison Karppi, Town of Islip Community Development Agency.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Hi, Alison. Thank you for being here. I just have a couple of questions.

P.O. GREGORY:

I know that I spoke with Amy and Jason yesterday, and thank you for the information, but this specific bill really covers a lot of my district. I believe there are 15 parcels.

MS. KARPPI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

So my question really is what happened prior to today, and the extension, as to why you need, you know, this extension?

MS. KARPPI:

Well, on the properties that we're talking about this evening, I don't know if you guys have a list in front of you of all the parcels that we're looking for an extension on.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

I do, yes.

MS. KARPPI:

Okay. So I'm just going to go down through each one of them and I'm going to let you know where we are at that point, so that may help you.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

You're focusing on the Islip one, right?

MS. KARPPI:

That's correct.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Okay.

MS. KARPPI:

Oh, yeah. No, definitely in Islip. So 29 Church Street, right now, that is currently -- we have a permit on it through the Town of Islip. We are -- tomorrow night is our board meeting, and we are doing a subrecipient agreement with the United Way of Long Island, and their YouthBuild Program will be building that parcel.

Crooked Hill, 142 McNair, Grant, Grant, Fletcher, Fletcher, 531 Suffolk Avenue, regular Suffolk Avenue, and one of the Hyde Parks, all of those parcels are being built in partnership with the Long Island Housing Partnership. We're in various stages right now. 142 McNair and one of the Grant parcels, 095, those are currently being built, and we're probably about 45 to 50% complete on those, and we're anticipating getting a CO on those properties by November 1st.

Six of the lots, which is the Grants and the Adams and -- or the Fletchers, those right now, we are going through the County to do TD&Rs on those properties, so we have a major subdivision. And on the Grant and Harrison, we have a minor subdivision. So we need TDRs on those, and we're currently working with the County on those. And I believe, Amy, if I'm not mistaken, those are going to be coming up for approval in October.

All of those properties that we're doing with the Long Island Housing Partnership, we are giving them home funds from HUD. They all have to be completed in two years. So we're in different stages of Hyde Park parcel. Right now, that has been with the Board of Health since December. Our application has been in since December, so we're hoping. We've been contacting them, and we're asking -- we should have a turnaround, hopefully, within the next couple of weeks on that Hyde Park.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Do you --

MS. KARPPI:

So it's a combination of different things.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Sorry. Do you know what the delay has been with the Department of Health on this one?

MS. KARPPI:

Jennifer, do we really know?

MS. APPEL:

No.

MS. KARPPI:

No. It's just -- I think, from my understanding, a couple of people have retired, and they've just been going through the process and it's just taking a long time. A lot of the problems that we do have is with the Board of Health.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Okay.

MS. KARPPI:

I'm sorry. Moving forward on 34 Cypress Street, that parcel was deeded over to the Central Islip Civic Council and construction has begun, and that will be -- they have a homeowner, so they're anticipating to have that completed by the end of the year. The two --

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Do you know who was helping them in the development?

MS. KARPPI:

They are -- they're doing that themselves.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Okay.

MS. KARPPI:

Yes, they're doing that themselves. Ron Parr is the developer. The two Savoy properties, those properties, from my understanding, when they came to the agency two-and-a-half years ago, those properties were going to be given to Habitat for Humanity. But because both of those parcels require roadway, about 250 feet of roadway, at this time they're not going to be able to have that project done in the two-year time. So I will be discussing with Amy and Jason to see, you know, as far as what we're doing with that. The other --

LEG. MARTINEZ:

The Savoy ones, I'm not sure. It may be -- Legislator Barraga, is that yours, Savoy?

MS. KARPPI:

They're more the borderline of North Bay Shore.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Sorry. Continue.

MS. KARPPI:

Okay.

LEG. CILMI:

Maybe Stern.

MS. KARPPI:

The other Hyde Park, which is 019, the Town of Islip Community Development Agency will be building that, and we already have our plans done and they're in right now for planning and engineering, so we're just waiting for approval on that.

The last one is 15 Holbrook Street. From my understanding, the CDA acquired that property back in 2011. We -- there was some roof damage to the home, so we were going to go in and rehab it. So what we did is we fixed the roof on it. We have been maintaining it ever since then. We were getting ready to demo the home, because we found out that there was just too much asbestos in there and it just really needed to be knocked down. So we were getting ready to build that, and then, all of a sudden, someone came out of the woodwork and said, "We would like the keys to Aunt Tilly's house." So there was a title issue, so we stopped, and right now it's in Supreme Court so that we can acquire it properly.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Well, first of all, thank you. That clears up a lot. But my other concern is, which I've discussed with Amy and Jason, is I know that these have been backlogged for a very long time, and I believe seven years tops or more?

MS. KARPPI:

Some of them have been more.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

You know, my -- just my concern is, you know, again, these areas are blighted areas. They are areas that really just bring the neighborhood down, and the neighbors are obviously complaining. They would just like to see this fixed --

MS. KARPPI:

Correct.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

-- in other words. So do you anticipate every single one of these locations to be completed in the two-year extension that you're being granted today, if so?

MS. KARPPI:

Absolutely, other than the two Savoy, which will be -- like I said, we'll be dating back.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

And the Holbrook one, which is currently in the Supreme Court.

MS. KARPPI:

And the Holbrook one, which I guess we're currently in the court with that right now. The CDA is planning on building that. So if we can get something done within the next six months, then yes, I will -- I can assure you that that will be part of our 2017 project.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

And with each location, was the soil tested? Was everything gone through the environmentalists?

MS. KARPPI:

Oh, absolutely. All of the properties at Long Island Housing Partnership, they've done a Phase I and a Phase II on them.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

And who has that paperwork, you or the Town?

MS. KARPPI:

The Long Island Housing Partnership.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Long Island Housing. Okay. Well, I don't have any further questions. You know, you really cleared up each of my parcels that are in question, so I do appreciate you coming up.

MS. KARPPI:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

I have a question for you.

MS. KARPPI:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Is it Ms. Karppi?

MS. KARPPI:

Karppi.

P.O. GREGORY:

Karppi. Thank you for coming today. So can you tell me what the process is for when the Town of Islip seeks to acquire a property through the 72-h Program? Are you required to submit a development plan? Do you say, "Okay, we want property on 9 Cypress Street"? "We have been working with, you know, Habitat for Humanity, we're looking to" -- you know, "This is the timeline"? Is there a plan, or just is -- or is it more like, "Well, we would like to acquire this property, we have some intentions, but we really don't know how it's going to play out"?

MS. KARPPI:

Well, in the past two-and-a-half years that I've been with the CDA, I have worked with the County, and the County has said to us, "Oh, we have this property, are you interesting in purchasing it?" So what we do is we go out, we take a look at the property, we see where it's located, and it looks good, everything, then what we do is we run title on it. And the two properties that -- since I've been there in the two years, the two properties that we were asked to take over, we've had title issues on them. They're spending nights on them. They're just -- it's not clear title and we can't -- so we haven't taken those. The --

P.O. GREGORY:

So the County has asked you to take over properties?

MS. KARPPI:

They've -- yeah, they've come to us and said, "Okay, we've got this property, you go take a look at it." Then when it comes time, we run the title on the property, then there's issues. That's where we have problems and that's why we can't take them.

P.O. GREGORY:

But in a situation where the Town is interested in the property, do you have some type of plan in place before you approach the County? Do you reach out to a not-for-profit partner before you make that initial request, so when you make that request, you can, you know, inform the department that, "Look, we would like to acquire this property, we already have an agreement in" -- "a verbal agreement to work with, you know, Habitat for Humanity," whoever?

MS. KARPPI:

Yes. If it's a single -- if it's a single and separate parcel --

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

MS. KARPPI:

-- what we will do -- like I said, we're asked if we're interested in purchasing it. Let's just say it's clear title, everything is good. We'll take the parcel, we'll look at it, we look at our funding, and we see whether or not, yes, we can build it. A lot of times we like to work with United Way because they have their YouthBuild Program, they have their VetsBuild Program. We go to a lot of our CHDOs, which is the Central Islip Civic Council, Long Island Housing Partnership. We need to partner up with other people, because the funding just can't come from the Community Development Agency. So we do reach out to people like the Long Island Housing Partnership and ask them, "Okay, let's get some State funding in there, we'll give you some home funding or CDBG funding," and that's how we partner up and that's how we're able to do it. I mean, since the '80s, we've built over 500 homes through the 72-h Parcel Project. So it's a great program, it does work.

P.O. GREGORY:

You know, I'm just, for myself, I'm just trying to get a -- develop a better understanding as to when the planning aspect of it comes into place, because, you know, if you don't have a plan when you approach the County, and I'm not specifically talking about the Town of Islip, I'm just talking in general, you know, that may account for the large delay, the time in delay, and that seeks, you know, resolutions like this where we need to extend and --

MS. KARPPI:

Keep extending, exactly.

P.O. GREGORY:

Right, right.

MS. KARPPI:

I agree with you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. Legislator Krupski has a question for you.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Well, I think you've answered a lot of my questions, because you're really very knowledgeable about these parcels, where I think a lot of us are very impressed. So the parcels that we talked about, will they all go back on the tax rolls once it --

MS. KARPPI:

Yes. Oh, yes, they all will.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Full assessment?

MS. KARPPI:

Full assessment, yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Okay. Now you talked about title, and the Presiding Officer mentioned title. That was one of my questions. How can the County transfer parcels if there isn't clear title? Or maybe that's not a question -- fair question for you.

MS. KARPPI:

Well, they're not supposed to. We do work with the Real Estate section, and, like I said, we're offered the parcels. We go out and we take a look at them. But one of our due diligence that we do before we take them is to make sure that there is clear title. A lot of times things get through the cracks and --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And I understand these have been parcels that have been transferred years ago. So could I -- and if I could ask a question of the Administration. Thank you. Thank you, ma'am.

So thank you. So what safeguards do you have to make sure that you have clear title when the County takes a parcel?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

So the transfers that Jason and I have overseen over the last year, we've done the due diligence, run title searches within Real Estate prior to transferring to make sure the titles are as clean as possible. They're not necessarily pristine, but the properties that Alison is referring to, which were severe title issues, those were properties that were transferred long before we were here, so those weren't -- those wouldn't be properties we would recommend to the Legislature to transfer in the future.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

If they're not -- if they don't have clear title, what is their fate, then?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Well, in -- they would -- in all likelihood, they would probably go to auction. There are people, there are people with the expertise to resolve those title issues, people who have the funds that would be willing to invest that to overcome those title issues, not a nonprofit agency looking to develop affordable housing.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And then the last question is who makes that decision to send them to auction or try to develop them with the help of -- cooperation with the Town for affordable housing?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Well, we make the recommendation to the Legislature either through a resolution that's seeking to transfer it via 72-h for affordable housing, or by putting it on the auction list, which we bring to you for approval.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

But what makes you make that recommendation?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Well, like I -- so, if it's a -- with these specific properties, if it had an unresolvable title issue or a severe title issue, that wouldn't be something we would recommend to be transferred for affordable housing.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

But, I mean, there's other parameters that you're using to make that decision.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Right. Okay. I thought we were just talking about properties that have title issues.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No, no, no.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

You're saying in general, what --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

In general.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

A property that has a lower County investment. And Jason and I are trying -- I mean, right now, because we -- there is this backlog of properties that exist that are outside the seven years to be developed, I don't think it would be -- there's 150 properties out there right now, either beyond the

seven years or within the allowable, they're -- you know, they've been transferred recently and they're within their legal time frame to be built, that were waiting to be built, that aren't built and occupied. So that's a large number of properties that this Legislature has transferred for affordable housing that have yet to be built. So I wouldn't foresee coming forward with a large number of affordable housing transfers any time soon. I would think that our efforts would be better spent on focusing on getting those 150 parcels developed.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And there's no automatic reverter after the time period they're --

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

No.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Should there be?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

That's a policy question. I don't -- as it is right now, we come to you, so that's --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I mean, if there was an automatic reverter, I think it would put pressure on the municipalities. When you went to them and say, "Would you like to develop this as affordable housing," they would actually have to make a real decision and say, "We're not just going to have it in our inventory for a long time, we're going to" -- "We're serious about making a commitment."

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:

Oh, that's -- in the past, that's not how the program was run with the automatic reversion that you speak to. We had spoken to the County Attorney's Office in regards to that. How the statute lays it out is we receive annual parts regarding these parcels when any are in violation of any of these deed restrictions. The County Attorney's Office is supposed to work with the Legislator in deciding the fate of those parcels. So here we are doing our due diligence in making sure that everything is, whether -- if it is above the seven years, we're getting it put into either an extension through the Legislator, or having it come back to the County. And every property that's going forward, we are going to make sure that those deed restrictions are followed, or we'll be coming to you guys.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

LEG. CILMI:

Can I interrupt for a second? I want to quickly address it, just very quickly. Just very quickly, also, Al, the types of issues that Alison described might have really been beyond the scope of what they could have foreseen, you know, at the time of transfer. You know, they couldn't have known some of the things that they know now at the time of transfer, so that might not be applying a reverter clause at that -- you know, with a certain -- a date certain might not be a good idea.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Well, I mean you could do a reverter clause with a date certain with the ability to put in a -- you know, make a decision for an extension, sure.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay. Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you, though.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I really appreciate you guys trying to get a handle on this and get the program to where it should be. I have a bunch of questions. But just to continue on the point that you had, this gentleman had.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Jason Smagin.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Jason. Or maybe to the Town, if you could chime also. I appreciate you being here tonight. I know it's late. I'm exhausted, so, you know, bear with me. The deed that you have now to some of these properties has a reverter clause, correct? Is it in the deed, or is it a covenant against the property? How do you -- how is that done?

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:

Yeah, it's a covenant and restriction within the deed.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It is?

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:

Yeah.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So you, the Town of Islip, cannot develop that property with that defect.

MS. KARPPI:

Correct.

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:

In any of those cases, where it hasn't been -- during this year, you have seen us come to you with certain properties that --

LEG. D'AMARO:

No, no, I got all that.

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:

Okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I understand that.

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:

Okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I was asking the Town of Islip.

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:

Okay.

MS. KARPPI:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So when you go to work and you look at these properties and you're moving on them, like were you concerned that you have this defect in title before -- like I would think you would contact the County and say, "Look, we're past our time. I have defective title now. I can't possibly develop this property without the extension." How does your office handle that?

MS. KARPPI:

Okay. Well, most of these properties that we're talking about this evening I guess were deeded back in 2008, or 2005, 2008. I mean, every year we would send a -- our spread sheet over to the County when Jill Rosen-Nikoloff was there. And like I said, I've been there for two-and-a-half years. We'd send it over to her and say, "Okay, this is where we're at, and we just did what we had to do.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So have you -- and you don't have to answer this, but has the Town of Islip ever developed affordable housing without correcting the defect in title? Because if you have reversion in that deed, eventually -- are these forever workforce housing units? They get freed up from that restriction at some point.

MS. KARPPI:

Yeah, when -- yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

How do you sell that property? Because if -- a title company is going to look at that and say this deed restriction was violated. They're not going to insure that title.

MS. KARPPI:

You know, I'm not really sure I could answer that.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Just a point. Let me go more to policy, okay? So what's the oldest property we're considering tonight? Not oldest. You know, what's the one you've had the longest? And, Jason, what is it, seven years from transfer of title?

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:

Yeah. So the statute states that it has to be constructed and occupied within seven years.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Within seven years.

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:

It's three years, and then two two-year extensions through the Director of Real Estate.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right, okay, got it. So how many -- these are all past the seven year?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Yeah. The oldest of Islip's was -- that you're considering tonight was transferred in 2003.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay, so 2003. Obviously, you weren't there. Okay. And I appreciate your trying to rectify this. Since 2003, do you know, how many affordable houses has the Town of Islip developed?

MS. KARPPI:

Not off the top of my head, but I can tell you that when I was at the Long Island Housing Partnership for six years, I worked on projects in 2000 -- it was considered the Islip 6 Project, the Islip 7 Project, which was scattered sites throughout the town, and then we did the Cortland Square project. So I do know that we have done numerous amounts of projects. I know that we've done over -- at least 500 homes since the 1980s, when the 72-h Program came out.

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

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, I mean, since the 1980's is 35 years.

MS. KARPPI:

Well, I'm just saying.

LEG. D'AMARO:

To me it feels like yesterday because I'm just getting old.

MS. KARPPI:

I know *(laughter)*.

LEG. D'AMARO:

The 80s is like -- you know, when we thought about the 40's and the 50's is now the 80's.

MS. KARPPI:

I do know -- as I said, I was trying to put the pieces of the puzzle together.

LEG. D'AMARO:

When I, not we; when I thought that.

LEG. FLEMING:

Me, too; you're not alone.

MS. KARPPI:

And I was just told this little bit of information today, and I know it's late and I'm sure you don't want to hear this.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No, it's okay.

MS. KARPPI:

But anyway, back on December 30th of 1988, the County transferred over to the town 80 parcels just in one day, 80 parcels. So back then, from my understanding, there were so many parcels that the County just wanted to, I guess, get off their thing and give out to the town and stuff.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MS. KARPPI:

So I know that they have just been building affordable housing ever since then. So here we are today, these are the properties that we have. Again, I don't know what happened in the past and I just think that we should move forward and let's try to figure out what will be the best way to maybe set up a policy, implement procedures, I don't know. But this is where we are today and these are the last of the parcels that we have. The Town, after these are done in two years, we will have no more County property unless we're, you know, given the property or we purchase it.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So in your tenure, how many affordable homes have been successfully completed?

MS. KARPPI:

Well, we just got done doing our NSP program which is through the State and we just did seven homes through that. And we have just sold -- we sell -- we have direct sales and we do rent with the option, and in the two-and-a-half years that I've been there we've done over 20 homes already.

LEG. D'AMARO:

That's good. Twenty homes?

MS. KARPPI:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Uh-huh. Okay. So when you were at the committee; right, you were at the committee?

MS. KARPPI:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Legislator Lindsay asked you if you feel comfortable that everything will be completed, Legislator Martinez asked you the same thing tonight, in those two years and you are --

MS. KARPPI:

Absolutely.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Absolutely sure.

MS. KARPPI:

I am absolutely, positively sure.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And how did you learn that you had this issue with reverta back to the County, on these properties?

MS. KARPPI:

To be honest with you, when we came in and we found out you were given a one-year extension, a two-year extension and a seven-year, or vice versa; if it starts seven, two and one, is that --

MR. SMAGIN:

It's three, two and two.

MS. KARPPI:

Three, two and two? You know, I knew about these properties. I knew we had them, I knew that

the Long Island Housing Partnership was building a majority of them. Jill, I had spoken with Jill and we just moved forward on this.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No, I mean how did you learn now that you had these 15 properties that were beyond the reverts period?

MS. KARPPI:

Just on the list, I guess. I don't --

LEG. D'AMARO:

On the list?

MS. KARPPI:

I'm not really sure what you're --

LEG. D'AMARO:

No. Well, did the County contact you and tell you --

MS. KARPPI:

Oh, yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MS. KARPPI:

Yes, we've been working with -- yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So I'm really glad you're here, because you're the counterpart to this program.

MS. KARPPI:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You know, we can have our dialogue all day, but without you here, it really -- when you're here, it completes. So what can we do as a County to avoid this problem in the future? Are we giving you too many properties? Is there -- is there some other vetting process we need to come up with in order to assure that our timelines are met? Because I want an effective program, too, as you do.

MS. KARPPI:

Absolutely.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But we can't have, you know, every five years towns coming back and they have 75 properties that have been sitting for 20 years.

MS. KARPPI:

I guess what I would do is go to the municipality and ask them what can they handle in that timeframe.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So in the past maybe it was just the municipalities, with an open arm, said *Yes, send it in*, but there was never really any assurance -- not even assurance, that's the wrong word. Never -- it was an accomodation to the County to take these properties, but when it gets into your program, it's not like you feel any sense of being driven by the reverta period at all, right?

MS. KARPPI:

(Nodded head yes).

LEG. D'AMARO:

Because we have the policy -- the 72-h Program is policy-driven; it's to create affordable housing.

MS. KARPPI:

Affordable housing, that's exactly right.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So our policy, when it's going down to the town level, is not being effectively implemented from our perspective; I'm not saying your office doesn't do a great job.

MS. KARPPI:

I think it's -- like I said, I think it's a combination of -- not that I'm pointing fingers at anyone, but I think it's just a combination of the time that it takes -- like I said, when we get properties -- to clear the title. The one property, the 15 Holbrook, since we got it in 2011, I mean, that's cost us over \$45,000.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I appreciate that. Let me fell you my solution that I'm thinking of.

MS. KARPPI:

Uh-huh.

LEG. D'AMARO:

My solution would be no town gets any property in this program unless you submit a written proposal within certain parameters and commitments that you've already secured to develop the property in two years.

MS. KARPPI:

Well, the problem with that is like you can't -- then you can't partner up with your not-for-profits.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Why?

MS. KARPPI:

Because it takes time to get money. You know, you have to go to the State, that could take two years. You know, when you go -- they have to submit a grant for that.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MS. KARPPI:

Then we have to make sure how our grant funding is.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But if we had a procedure that, let's say, put those properties -- like you can identify the properties to the County --

MS. KARPPI:

Uh-huh.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- and then you can be off and running, secure in knowing that those properties are banked for you and you have, you know, a year-and-a-half to line up the commitments you need to say, *Okay, now convey the title to us.* So I'm not saying that that's -- all I'm saying is that I think that would keep more focus on timelines at that point. So, you know, you might come back in a year and say, *Well, we identified that property, but we just can't get the right commitments for it,* but then at least we would know.

MS. KARPPI:

Uh-huh.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You know, instead of immediately having our policy goal here in the County to convey these properties to you, and we just take a vote here and we wash our hands and we're like, that's it. *Oh, look, we're building workforce housing,* but we're really -- you know, without those commitments in place, we're putting all the onus on you, the towns, to do this, and there's no report back to us as to what are we really accomplishing. So I'm just trying to avoid this going forward. I'm not looking to hold you or anyone accountable for what's happened in the past, I am just very happy that this is being addressed right now because we talk this talk all the time about workforce housing --

MS. KARPPI:

Yep.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- and then we're finding out that properties have sat for 30 years, and that's just not appropriate. It's not -- it's a misrepresentation to the public as to what we're doing with these properties, and I know you appreciate that.

So I think we should take a look at the towns. We can still have a list of properties, we can still describe and do everything we do now except not convey title until you, the town, have said, *Yes, we're ready to take title because we have the commitments that we need to develop the property.* It just would be another way to do it to make sure that, you know, we don't get into the situation where they just kind of go down to the town level and we just don't know what's happening anymore.

MS. KARPPI:

Right.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Just kind of thinking out loud on that.

MS. KARPPI:

Okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Last question is do you want more properties from the County?

MS. KARPPI:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You do. So you'll continue to work?

MS. KARPPI:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay, great. All right, thanks. I really appreciate it. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

You have -- how long have you had these houses? Or properties?

MS. KARPPI:

Some of them go back to 2005, 2003. The ones that the Long Island Housing Partnership is doing right now, they were 2003, one of them is 2007; they're different times.

LEG. TROTТА:

You've had them a long time. When I say you, I don't mean you, I mean the government.

MS. KARPPI:

Right.

LEG. TROTТА:

And you've done nothing in over a decade, and then you're standing there saying you want more. You can't -- not you, the government -- clearly can't handle this. This is why people have no faith in the government. I mean, for 10, 15 years these sat here and did nothing, and now you're saying two more years. Well, how can you give Islip another -- I wouldn't give them anything. And we should -- these are off the tax rolls, which if we sold them at auction ten years ago we would have been -- you know, had all that revenue for all those years. And we put no one in housing, zero, not one person.

MS. KARPPI:

In defense, it took time, and it takes time.

LEG. TROTТА:

What happens?

MS. KARPPI:

I was back in Long Island Housing Partnership, so I was the person who was actually working with the surveyor and getting the builder while we were --

LEG. TROTТА:

They built the Empire State Building in eleven months.

MS. KARPPI:

I feel like I'm in the firing squad.

LEG. TROTTA:

And you should be in the firing -- or somebody should be. Someone's responsible for this. I mean, these people weren't there, they're trying to figure -- you weren't there.

MS. KARPPI:

I wasn't there either.

LEG. TROTTA:

But what troubles me the most is you stood there and said you want more. You can't handle what you have now.

MS. KARPPI:

I will be done with my properties in two years.

LEG. TROTTA:

That's what someone probably said a decade ago.

MS. KARPPI:

I wasn't there back then.

LEG. TROTTA:

There's no way I could support any extension for any of these. You've got to send a message that this has to be done right away, and unless we do that, we're just all sitting here like bobble heads, *Okay, do it*, and then it just goes on and on and on. How many do you have going to Islip now?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Oh, we don't have any out -- we don't have any new transfers coming up. I just want to make clear, this is a small -- the list you have in front of you is what Islip has, it's outside of seven years, it's a small portion of what Islip has been given since the program was tracked, which is 2000. Since 2000, which is what our records go to, that's when the Legislature adopted the program as we know it now, there have been 403 homes completed out of the total 554 transfers. So by and large, of the properties that the Legislature --

LEG. TROTTA:

Say that again? Give me that number again, please?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Of the 555 properties that have been transferred --

LEG. TROTTA:

To who?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

To the different municipalities in Suffolk County.

LEG. TROTTA:

All the towns, okay.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Right, and villages, 403 are completed. So by and large, the housing has been built, it is occupied. I just want to make clear that Islip CDA is an organization that the County has partnered with very successfully with on this program. This is one -- this is a small number of properties that they have that we're trying to just get them into compliance with the code. Alison has testified repetitively

that she will have them built and occupied within two years, that's her testimony. I just don't think it's fair. We invited her here to speak to you just for her to -- I just want to take my share of the beating, I guess.

LEG. TROTТА:

I'm not beating -- it's not -- you understand how this looks; it looks like government's incompetent. You know, I feel better that at least we had some built; you know, 80%, 70% of them were built. How many -- out of those 420, how many were in Islip?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

So it's 403 total were built.

LEG. TROTТА:

This is since 2000

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Right. Of that, for Islip there was a total of 83 transfers; and of their 83 transfers, 59 have been completed since 2000.

LEG. TROTТА:

Since 2000.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

That's right.

LEG. TROTТА:

So that's not a very good -- how much have we given the past three years?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I'm sorry, what?

LEG. TROTТА:

How many have we given in the past three years?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I don't have that off the top of my head. I can get that for you. I don't have that --

MS. KARPPI:

How many properties in the --

LEG. TROTТА:

Yeah, in the past three years.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I don't know.

MS. KARPPI:

None.

LEG. TROTТА:

None, that's troubling. So you've been working on these --

MS. KARPPI:

No. In defense, it's not troubling because the two properties that we were asked to take over in the past two years both had title issues.

LEG. TROTТА:

So you didn't take them.

MS. KARPPI:

No, we didn't take them. We couldn't take them.

LEG. TROTТА:

Okay. So you've been working on getting the other one, the backlog, let's say --

MS. KARPPI:

Yes.

LEG. TROTТА:

-- cleared up a little bit.

Okay. I agree with Legislator D'Amaro, there should be some kind of you don't take them until you do it. It's crazy. We lost millions of dollars in tax revenue from these places.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Legislator Martinez.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Just a couple of more questions, and I'm not sure if it was answered; I'm sorry if I'm going to repeat myself again. But the oldest was in 2003, and I know that there were issues as to why, but 2003 is a long time. What was the reason? Was there a specific reason, reason or reasons, as to why these parcels were never built?

MS. KARPPI:

I can't answer that because I wasn't at the CDA in 2003. All I can tell you, and I worked at the Long Island Housing Partnership, I do know that it did take us some time to get the grant funding; that's all I know. They were working on having the grant funding, they were, I guess, the -- we built the Cortland Square Project with the CDA, that was an \$8 million project. So I think a lot of the funds got shifted. We've lost a lot of funds over the years to do that. So I think they were kind of waiting for the State to give us approval, then we were able to get our home funds, and that's how we were able to start the project.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

It just surprises me that the parcels in question, the location of the parcel is where they're located, you know. So 13 years is a long time to be waiting for a grant and shuffling monies for other areas to be built, you know.

So my other question was you said that they're going to be built in two years; what happens -- let's say, for example, Long Island Housing Partnership does not finish within two years and just leaves and does not complete it?

MS. KARPPI:

Well, in order for them to receive the home funds, which we're putting \$265,000 into it, they have to be done. So we just had a meeting this morning to see where we are, and like I said, we're doing a major subdivision which is requiring us to get some TDRs, so we have to go in front of the County

for that. And then we have a minor which is two houses on a minor subdivision, we need a TDR on that. One of the other parcels has been in the Health Department since December, so that's where the time is.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

And these are the last of the 83 for Islip?

MS. KARPPI:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

But isn't there another bill that we are getting some back as well from Islip? I know it's a completely different bill, but why can't they keep them?

MS. KARPPI:

The one that is being returned, 550 New Hampshire Avenue in Bay Shore, is not a buildable lot, and that's why it's being returned.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

What does that mean, not buildable?

MS. KARPPI:

That it's not a substantial amount of parcel in order for us to build a house on it. They have to -- I think the town is 75 x100, so it doesn't meet that requirement.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

What's with that, Jason, Amy?

MR. SMAGIN:

On any of the properties coming back to the County, they're evaluated for any other County purposes and if it's surplus to the County's needs, then it could then be auctioned off in the surplus County auction.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Okay. Alison, I want to thank you again. Please, if there's anything I can do to help you, you know, in moving forward, please let me know.

MS. KARPPI:

Thank you. I appreciate it. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. I've got a couple of questions. You mentioned TDRs; they're coming from the County? Is it density or is it sewer credits?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

It's a sewer credit. It's a Workforce Housing Development Right, it's for a sewer credit. It was laid on the table tonight to go through the next committee cycle.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So these are something that the County gets when we retire the sewer credits from open space

purchases. And more of the question to the Town; does the Town accept these from outside of your township?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

This one is in the same groundwater management zone, and I think it's within Town of Islip. So I don't know the answer, if you accept it if it wasn't, but it is and --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I mean, that's the question; would they accept it if it wasn't.

MR. SMAGIN:

We can only do the transfer if it's the same groundwater management zone. And when we do these transfers for the Workforce Housing Transfer of Development Rights, the property becomes affordable in perpetuity, so that's the other interest that goes into these parcels. And it's one of the only programs of the County that has properties be affordable in perpetuity.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Okay. How are these -- well, going back to the TDR, because I do have a question about the affordable in perpetuity. Is it -- could the town refuse to take the sewer credit even if it's in the same groundwater zone?

MR. SMAGIN:

Yeah, we wouldn't bring it forward to the Town to -- you know, they're requesting it, so it's not like they're not requesting this. So if they didn't request it, we wouldn't put anything in motion.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

But if weren't the town, if it were a private developer, can they --

MR. SMAGIN:

We've had private developers come forward and have the Workforce Housing Transfer of Developments Rights transferred to them.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

But could the Town then reject that?

MR. SMAGIN:

I believe this goes through the Suffolk Health Department and not through the town.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

But it would be a density issue at that point. It would be an increase in density, so at that point the town would have some control, right?

MR. SMAGIN:

No, I believe this is through the Suffolk County Department of Health.

MS. KARPPI:

That's right.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

All right. So I'm not sure -- I don't know, at 10:30 I'm not making myself clear.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Even with a density credit or a sewer credit, it still has to comply with whatever zoning is in place there.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

So I think that's what you're asking.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

We can't supercede the zoning by getting a development credit.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Okay, so how are these homes kept perpetually affordable?

MR. SMAGIN:

Yeah, so it's actually a deed. What we do is we do a deed which transfers the development right, and within the deed it actually has the restriction within it. Then beyond that, we actually enter into an agreement with the individual who is applying, and then we also do a covenant and restriction that they have filed with the County Clerk's Office on the property as well.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So when they go to sell it -- how is that appraised, then? And who vets the new -- someone has to vet the new seller to make sure they're compliant with the affordable housing program.

MS. KARPPI:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Who does that?

MS. KARPPI:

The Long Island Housing Partnership will do that.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Do they get paid to do that?

MS. KARPPI:

They will get -- they do get a portion, they get a construction fee. So yes, they do get paid.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Who pays them?

MS. KARPPI:

It comes out of the portion of the budget to build the home.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No. I mean, not to build a home, I mean when it's transferred to the second owner, the second person who owns it. So the home's already built, someone's living there, they decide for whatever

reason in two years they're going to move on, they want to sell it. Mechanically what happens?

MS. KARPPI:

It'll just go back to the Long Island Housing Partnership, the person will have to -- Jennifer, why don't you get up here?

MS. PELL:

Good evening again. Jennifer Pell, Long Island Housing Partnership. Generally on resales of affordable homes, it's a fee that the seller pays us; it's usually 1% or a quarter -- a half of percent of the sales price.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And what do you do for that fee?

MS. PELL:

We generally help them find a buyer, we vet them, they come in for counseling, we usually help their new buyer get a mortgage as well.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And who sets the value of the sale?

MS. PELL:

That's usually set by the County in conjunction with the municipality.

MS. KARPPI:

Right.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

How do you set the value -- I'm going to finally get the answer; how do you set the value of the sale?

MR. SMAGIN:

Through the program, it actually lists within the code the value of the home that it could be sold for and the income restrictions; it states it within the code.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. So how many parcels -- going back to the broader question. How many parcels are in the pipeline? Because we're talking about -- you know, there are a lot of questions surrounding these homes shouldn't be -- I mean the parcels shouldn't be given to a municipality unless they're ready to build the affordable housing, and those are all valid concerns. But how many parcels does the County have in the pipeline? You know, the young lady from Islip said she's taken zero the last three years, right?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

When you say pipeline, like how many new transfers are we looking at?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

How many parcels does the County have that could be transferred.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Okay. So that's a -- I mean --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Well, ballpark, I'm not looking for an exact number.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

We don't have anything right now we would recommend be transferred for affordable housing. Because like I -- and that's not because there's nothing that would fit the parameters of a low investment, you know, a buildable lot, etcetera, etcetera. That's because, as I said before, there are 150 properties out there right now that need to be built and occupied as affordable units.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Are they spread out throughout the County?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

Yes. So from our perspective, it's most prudent to focus on making sure those get built.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So the parcels that you might otherwise have transferred to the towns are going to be auctioned off?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

I mean, some would be --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I mean, how long would you hold a parcel for before you decided to move it?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

They're held for the legally required time. I wouldn't say that everything is auctioned. Every property is looked at individually and evaluated. There are some that are most appropriate to be transferred to DPW for highway purposes or drainage purposes, there are other 72-h -- 72-h doesn't necessarily mean affordable housing. There are other -- there's two 72 -- there were to 72-h's for open space laid on tonight, there are other types of municipal transfers that might be appropriate for some of the parcels, some that may be appropriate to be transferred to County parks and, yeah, some of them may be auctioned. So they'll just be looked at on an individual basis as they time out. We have to hold them legally for a certain amount of time, so we would still do that.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Calarco.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Thank you. You know, I have been listening to the debate and I think we are missing a part of the other portion of what these programs do in the 72-h Program and creating the affordable housing. And it's not just about creating affordable housing options, it's about helping to stabilize some of the communities where these housing options are.

You know, what we don't normally see -- and I know we had a debate about one in Smithtown and it was one property that we had in Smithtown, I think in the existence of the entire program. Meanwhile, there are, in this resolution alone, a number that are in the Central Islip, Brentwood area. In the next resolution there's going to be over 20 that are in the North Bellport community. And these are communities that have their own particular challenges, and we are looking to stabilize those communities. And I'll give you a story of what happened in one of my communities that I now represent, that Legislator Browning had represented before in Gordon Heights, where you had

properties that the County put up for auction that were bought up by speculators, that were bought up by people like Mary Dotson who just created slum housing in that community and completely brought that community down, that were bought up by slumlords who just don't care what kind of people they're putting into those houses and into those communities, and they just have a detrimental effect on them.

So at the end of the day, what we can do with these programs, even if it takes us a little longer than we anticipated, is we could help stabilize the community by making sure we get good home ownership in these communities by people who are going to be vested in those properties, they're going to care about their properties, they're going to maintain those properties and be good neighbors in the community and help make sure that their community is moving forward in a positive direction. And sometimes that means we have to wait a little bit longer to get that done, especially in some of these communities because it's a little bit harder. In the next property -- in the next resolution when we get into the North Bellport community, we're going to be dealing with a number of properties that are all adjacent to each other.

And in fact, it's better that we did wait because it's going to allow the town to work with -- I believe we're going to work with Long Island Housing Partnership on this comprehensive project that's going to incorporate many of them all at one time and do a real project that's going to have a real impact on that community. And so sometimes we have to wait a little longer. And yes, it may have been preventing us from selling it and putting it on the auction block, but then again, if we put it on the auction block we could have had another slum house that would have been filled with 30 renters who are probably going to get some sort of Social Services check that's only going to make the problem more pronounced for the County and that's going to have detrimental impacts on the community.

And so there's a dual purpose to these sometimes. Even though it may not be the stated goal, and waiting a little bit longer isn't necessarily a bad thing. And in this particular instance, what we're seeing is Real Estate has been working very diligently with all of the different municipalities -- whether it's Islip on this resolution or the next one in Brookhaven or the one that's prior to this on the agenda in Babylon -- to identify the properties that are out there, make sure they have a real identifiable plan to move forward on and then each one of these lines they're saying, *Yes, we do*. And the ones where they're say, *No, we don't*, they're transferring those properties back to us. They're trying to clean up the process.

And Legislator D'Amaro could remember this, there was a time when Brookhaven alone had over 200 parcels. So we are actually making some substantial progress on this issue in terms of reducing the backlog while still making sure that in those particular instances where it's important to move forward, we're trying to create the housing, where there's a path to move forward that we're doing so. So I actually applaud the Real Estate Department for trying to move forward on this issue and the towns for being realistic about it. As Alison said, they haven't taken any in three years because they want to make sure they can deal with what's on their inventory now before they start looking for new ones. So I think everyone's trying to be reasonable and responsible here and I know -- and this is a chance for us to give them a chance to do that. So we're going to give them another two years, she says she has a plan, she says she has the money identified, she has the agencies to work with and they're going to get these properties developed. And if they don't, they're going to give them back to us, and I think that's a reasonable thing to do.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So just to ask, Legislator Calarco, if I could, a question. You said that people are going to -- if they go to auction, people are going to buy them and create these slum houses. Where are all these people coming from that are going to occupy all these slum houses? Where are they today if they don't have a -- where are they today that now they're waiting for the slum house somewhere?

D.P.O. CALARCO:

I could tell you, I have a whole bunch in Gordon Heights where Parole would like to put those people into. I have over 60 sex offenders who live in Gordon Heights right now and a big vast majority of those people are brought in by New York State Parole who owned a house where someone was overtaken and they put three, four, five move into the house at one time.

LEG. BROWNING:

It's a fact.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I just had a quick question. When -- and maybe -- I don't know who knows the answer, if at all. But when the town -- when the County owns a property we take by default, tax deed, we pay the taxes; we the County pay the taxes, we make the other jurisdictions whole. When we transfer the properties in this program down to a town, who pays the tax?

MS. KARPPI:

They're tax exempt.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I'm sorry?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

They're tax exempt.

LEG. D'AMARO:

They become tax exempt by virtue of the program?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

By virtue of being held by the town, right.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. So we don't -- that's not included in our calculations anymore, we don't pay that.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

That's right.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And the town certainly doesn't pay it. So they're just completely off the tax rolls, even for school districts and all of that.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

(Nodded head yes).

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, okay. Thanks. All right.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right, so we have a motion and a second on IR 1725.

MR. RICHBERG:

Yes, we do.

P.O. GREGORY:

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen (*AMENDED VOTE: Seventeen - Absent: Legislator Lindsay*).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1726-16 - Authorizing a two-year extension for the development of twenty-nine parcels of land transferred pursuant to the 72-h Affordable Housing Program to the Town of Brookhaven (County Executive).

D.P.O. CALARCO:

I'll make the motion to take it out of order.

P.O. GREGORY:

I make a motion to take it out of order.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

LEG. HAHN:

IR 1726, motion to approve by Legislator Calarco. Second by Legislator Browning. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. TROTTA:

Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen (Opposed: Legislator Trotta - Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. And I apologize, there was another resolution I wanted to take out of order earlier, one of the liability cases. We're going to go back to page eight. IR 16 --

MR. NOLAN:

No, it's in order.

P.O. GREGORY:

Actually it's in order, not out of order. ***IR 1698-16 - Amending the 2016 Operating Budget and appropriating funds in connection with bonding for a settlement for a liability case against the County (County Executive).***

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion to approve.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to approve by Legislator D'Amaro. Second by Legislator Fleming. 1698, page eight, Budget & Finance. I apologize for going back and forth. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen (Opposed: Legislator Barraga - Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right, same motion, same second on ***IR 1698A, Bond Resolution (Amending the 2016 Operating Budget and appropriating funds in connection with bonding for a settlement for a liability case against the County)***. Roll call.

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

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

I'm sorry; where are we?

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1698A.

LEG. FLEMING:

Oh, this is the bond on the \$90,000. Yes, I'm a yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Absent).

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen (Opposed: Legislators Barraga & Trotta - Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right, I have another request from Legislator Fleming to take **IR 1750(-16)** out of order. It's in the CN folder, it's **authorizing planning steps for implementation of Suffolk County Workforce Housing Program (Sandy Hollow Cove) (County Executive)**. Motion by Legislator Fleming. I'll second to take out of order. Everyone got it? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions to take 1750 out of order?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen.

LEG. TROTTA:

Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen (Opposed: Legislator Trotta - Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Motion to approve by Legislator Fleming. I'll second. On the motion?

LEG. McCAFFREY:

I'll second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator McCaffrey, I'm sorry.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So the question is how much would -- Jason, how much would the County be subsidizing this for? Sandy Hollow.

MR. SMAGIN:

Well, right now all this is doing is giving us the ability to move forward with appraising the parcel. And then the next step would be, after appraising the parcel, since they put an application in for Land Acquisition Funds, we would then come before the Legislature with that amount to then enter into a development agreement with them.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Do you have a formula? I mean, you're going to make a recommendation on the amount. Is it a percentage or is it -- how would you arrive at a number that we would be paying them?

MR. SMAGIN:

When it comes to the normal subsidy in the request, I mean, the program itself ranges between, you know, 10,000 and about 30 to 35,000 per unit. So depending on the project itself, we look at the project, evaluate the performer of the project and through that we come up with a recommended amount that we bring forward before the Legislature.

When it comes to Land Acquisition Funds, one of the things we have to do is get an appraisal of the property because if we're doing land acquisition, we'd have to come to before you to show what the property is actually worth, so.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Who makes the application?

MR. SMAGIN:

The developer.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So where does the money come from that we would be paying the developer?

MR. SMAGIN:

Well, these come from the two -- it comes from 8704, the Land Acquisition Funds, and from 6411 infrastructure, both in Capital.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Oh, so it's borrowed money; we're going to borrow money to pay the developer.

MR. SMAGIN:

Well, we subsidize the developer to create the affordable housing here instead of having market rentals coming into the area, especially areas that really need affordable housing.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And so he's going to the Town to get his density.

MR. SMAGIN:

I have the developer here if you're looking on specific questions with regards to him.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Sure.

MR. SMAGIN:

Okay. I have Dave Gallo here from Georgica Green who is the developer on this project.

MR. GALLO:

Thank you, Jason. Good evening. I'm David Gallo, President of Georgica Green Ventures. Just, Legislator, to answer your question very quickly. We have obtained, through the process -- and I'll take a step back and tell you about Georgica Green, but first to answer your question.

We have gotten an appraisal, the bank has gotten an appraisal. The County, within their acquisition fund, also needs to get an appraisal to make sure that there's an agreement upon land value. So this is not -- the appraisal itself is not something for our benefit, but it's just to confirm what the actual cost of the land is. And if possible -- a lot of you, you know, we've met, some of you know me, some of you don't, but Georgica Green Ventures is an affordable housing development company based in Jericho. We build affordable workforce senior supportive housing, we're as far north as the Fort Drum regional area where we have been working with the U.S. Army with creating 50 units of much needed housing for the troops that have come back and are in the Fort Drum Army Base. We have also purchased land and are building affordable housing in Bushwick from the Brooklyn Diocese and creating much needed affordable workforce housing in Brooklyn. We're also in Nassau County where we are developing 52 units in Manhasset, much needed workforce housing.

So these two projects that we're here and sharing, we need your support, we've been working hard on them. Southampton is -- you know, there is a huge deficit for the workforce there and the affordable housing need. The stats are somewhat startling. There is no rental apartments there, this would be the first and we're excited that we've been able to get as far as we have. I'm happy to talk more about the two projects or answer any questions that you have, but I felt like it was necessary to introduce Georgica Green and our firm.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Where else do you get funding from?

MR. GALLO:

So the primary financing source for affordable housing comes out of the 1986 Tax Reform Act created while Ronald Reagan was in Presidency. There is Section 42 of the IRS Code that stipulates exactly how affordable housing is built and we have to meet that criteria. The Federal governmental allocates tax credits to every State based upon population and need and a variety of other factors. The State then, with this allocation of tax credits, this annual allocation of tax credits, has to decide who and where gets these projects. So developers like myself, other not-for-profits, other towns and municipalities compete very, very hard for these tax credits, which is the main source of funding to build the affordable housing.

As a developer, we submit annually about a seven, 800 page application to the State that describes the project. It says everything about us, who we are. They look to past projects, completed on time, on budget, what we've committed to, what we've done, current projects that are being operated, and then they look to the entire development team, the construction, are we energy

efficient;; these two projects are, we're exceeding enterprise green communities, NYSERDA, LEED for homes, all of the standards for energy efficiency housing we're meeting. In order to get these tax credits we compete, right. We compete every year. Hundreds of applications go in, 25 get awarded; it's about as simple as that. It is a very, very tough process to get them and I'm happy to announce that these two projects have been awarded those tax credits and hopefully we'll have an opportunity to build the two projects.

In this past funding year, there was well over 125 applications, somewhere around 25 were awarded. We were, as the developer and our codeveloper, the Town of Southampton Housing Authority, were not only awarded the tax credits, we were awarded the largest award in the entire State, where the State really has come and said the need for housing in Suffolk, the need for housing more closely in Southampton is a dire situation and here are the funds allocated for the project.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So you're in private business.

MR. GALLO:

I am.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So you're looking at, you know, your fixed costs of getting permits and land acquisition and construction costs and whatnot.

MR. GALLO:

Uh-huh.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So at what point -- so the County is going to do an appraisal.

MR. GALLO:

Uh-huh.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

We're going to authorize an appraisal tonight and you're going to -- and the value's going to be here, whatever it is, and it's going to be a fair appraisal. And the County is going to make an offer to subsidize a cost per unit?

MR. GALLO:

So the County -- typically the way it works is the County acts as a source of funds in the project. In this particular case, you know, we have roughly \$18 million in tax credits, we have another \$7 million in other State-generated grants in order to support the project. Often what the State does is when they look at affordable housing developers and they look at the need, one of the scoring criteria in the application is what is the local community doing for these dollars? So typically what happens is the -- and then they ask you to actually in the application state how much is being contributed by the local community, because they want the local community also to have an investment in the project.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

But you're considering the County to be the local community here, or the Town?

MR. GALLO:

No, both. I mean, we're in Suffolk County and we're in --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

But my question is -- we didn't actually get to my question.

MR. GALLO:

Sure.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

The County is going to make an offer based on the appraisal? Suppose -- and yeah, Jason, I'd like an answer, but suppose that offer and you're in business and you don't think that's fair because your costs are up here or your expectations of profit are up here, so you don't think that their offer is going to be -- you know, give you that -- make you reach that expectation. Do you walk away from a project if you don't think you're going to make enough money?

MR. GALLO:

We could never -- the State underwrites the project; it's either black or it's white. Either you meet -- the IRS Code is very simple in terms of what's a feasible project. If we believe it's a feasible project and the State, under the IRS regulations, says it's not, we don't have the choice to disagree and just provide it.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So you don't make the decision based on the County's offer?

MR. GALLO:

No. I mean, if the County grant came in less, right, we would then have to try to fill that gap with another source of funds. So then we'd have to go back to the State and say *We anticipated X from the County, we got Y; we're short X, you know, we're at Z and we'd like to request additional dollars from the State.* The State most likely in this situation will say, *We've given you the largest award in the entire State. I mean, we're unfortunately not going to be able to give you additional dollars.* So then we'd have to search for other grants. And if we couldn't find another grant to fill that gap, then yes, it's quite possible that the State will say, *You have an infeasible, not a financially viable project, we take all of the money back.*

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thanks. So Jason, I guess the question to you, how do you make that offer?

MR. SMAGIN:

So when it comes to, you know --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

That's a pretty wide range of, you know, what he's described.

MR. SMAGIN:

Yeah, I'm just describing, you know, all the projects that have come through the program. So each project is analyzed, and really we try to sit there, you know, we evaluate these projects and try to discover what the gap is to get this project off the ground and try to be that gap-filler. We're not going to be purchasing this land outright -- I think there's some confusion -- so we can be just a contributor to the purchase of the land. That's why --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

You're just part of equation, right.

MR. SMAGIN:

Exactly. So they had brought in an application amount, we're going to be -- you know, we're coming here just to ask the authority to do the appraisal to move forward with those steps to then be able to come forward with the presentation on the amount requested, to enter into the development agreement with them for the land acquisition.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And that's why -- thank you. That's why I asked the developer. At some point in time we're going to say, *Well, because of whatever fiscal reasons, we're not in a position to borrow any more money for different things.* And that's why I was asking what happens to the development at that point.

MR. SMAGIN:

We have the money. I mean, you know, as we come to you and appropriate the money and everything else, we have these, you know, kind of applications that we receive and every time we've come forward, you know, we've been in the position that we have more applications than we have funds to supply. You know, here in this stage, if this project moved forward and they're looking to move forward and be able to close by the end of the year, we already have the funds to be able to -- you know, if you guys decide -- to be able to fund this project.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

But we have to authorize it.

MR. SMAGIN:

Yes, you guys would have to authorize it, but I'm talking --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So that's my point. People might say, *Well, you know, we're not going to borrow for X, Y and Z anymore.* That's why I asked him the question, what happens to the project if the County doesn't contribute.

MR. SMAGIN:

Okay.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER KEYES:

With 8704 and 6411, it's absolutely correct that we need the authorization to fund on a project-by-project basis. But the Legislature actually authorizes the bond for this Capital Program each year when we appropriate. So for 2015 we appropriated, I think it was 2.5 million for 6411 and another million in 8704. So right now there's a bonded balance in land acquisition money that exists. So I just want -- it's not -- this wouldn't -- if this comes forward, when this comes forward as a funding request to the Legislature, it wouldn't come with a bond because we would be drawing down on monies that were already bonded. So I just want to make that clear.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

So to the developer; what's your name again? I'm sorry.

MR. GALLO:

David Gallo.

LEG. TROTTA:

So do we purchase the land outright? The County purchases the land; does the Town buy any of this or into this?

MR. GALLO:

So I don't know the exact process of how the County acquisition program works; Jason could probably answer that and then I can jump in and add a little bit.

MR. SMAGIN:

Yeah, so we would come to the closing table. After we get the authority to enter into the development agreement, we would come to the closing table with the amount that we would be putting into the projects for the purchase of the land, so.

LEG. TROTTA:

That's our skin in the game is -- okay, now, how many units is this going to be?

MR. GALLO:

It's 28 units at Sandy Hollow, 51 units at Speonk Commons.

LEG. TROTTA:

How much is Speonk?

MR. GALLO:

Fifty-one units. And just to -- at the closing table, when we look to close on our construction financing, it'll be the following entities. Most likely TD Bank who would be the purchaser of the tax credits; Raymond James who is the syndicator of the tax credits; State of New York Mortgage Agency; New York State Homes and Community Renewal; obviously us and Suffolk County. So all of the sources would have to close at one time, but the State does not allow us to close with various sources of funds.

LEG. TROTTA:

Who ends up owning this?

MR. GALLO:

The property is owned by the Town of Southampton Housing Authority who will create a housing development fund company along with my office, Georgica Green Ventures.

LEG. TROTTA:

Who has title to the -- who are you paying -- who are these people paying the rent to?

MR. GALLO:

The Housing Development Fund Company.

LEG. TROTTA:

And are you the owner of that?

MR. GALLO:

We are the co-owners along with the Southampton Housing Authority. So in every new project, in order for their issuance to be tax credits, there has to be a new entity. The new entity that gets formed in most instances is a not-for-profit Housing Development Fund Corporation which along with the Southampton Housing Authority and an affiliate of my office --

LEG. TROTТА:

Who determines who gets the profit?

MR. GALLO:

So the profit is a mechanism that every developer or any developer or owner has to meet the guidelines that the State and the IRS have. So in this instance, there's \$35 per unit per year of profit that gets underwritten to.

LEG. TROTТА:

I'm sorry; say that again?

MR. GALLO:

Thirty-five dollars per unit per year is the underwriting -- the maximum underwriting cash flow profit for the proposed projects. So everything that there exists here, there's a formula for it. So the contractor is allowed to make between 10 and 14%; the architect's allowed to make 4%; the cash flow to the developer and the owner is \$35 per unit per year. In order to comply with the State programs, there is a Capital Program manual that is, quite frankly, thousands of pages. And the reason why many developers and many owners actually never obtain the tax credits necessary is because it's a pretty convoluted process and there's a lot of rules and restrictions. So if you submitted a budget to the State during that annual funding round and your cash flow is in excess of \$35 per unit per year, they would say that you're ineligible because you do not meet the standards of the State.

LEG. TROTТА:

So you're only going to make \$35 per unit per year.

MR. GALLO:

In cash flow, yes. That would be the maximum.

LEG. TROTТА:

And --

MR. GALLO:

Because the rents are affordable.

LEG. TROTТА:

So how do you make money, in the construction costs? You're building it?

MR. GALLO:

We're not the builder, we're the developer. So the developer is allowed, along with the not-for-profit, to make between 10 and 12% of eligible costs.

LEG. TROTТА:

And the eligible costs are 15 million? I'm sorry.

MR. GALLO:

Eligible costs range from tax credit basis eligible items which are things like acqui -- I'm sorry, not acquisition. Are construction related, not marketing, a lot of the soft costs, architect -- I'm sorry, architect and engineering are, marketing is not, title is not, contingencies are not. So we don't actually, you know, as the developer get to -- you know, the formula and the profit is the same for everyone in the 50 states, right? If you're a developer and you build this, here's the criteria that you build upon. In the State, when we underwrite the project and we submit it, we're underwriting using New York State Homes and Community Renewals modules. So we have to go on-line and we

input everything, and as we input everything it says that your fee developer is X, your fee for the contractor cannot exceed this. And if you are in error because you've increased the fee, it does not allow you to submit the application.

Now, as the developer, you're still liable for cost overruns. So the State says, *Okay, developer, you can make a million dollars if you develop this project.* The million dollars doesn't come in until after you've completed the project successfully, on time and on budget, and any cost overruns you bore. So in the event that you've somehow miscalculated the construction numbers, your feet is held to the fire. That's the public/private relationship here where the State and the government is saying, *We want a private developer to take the risk of the affordable housing and build it on time and on budget, and if you don't then you're at risk.*

As the developer, we also have to sign personally on construction loan guarantees, so much of the tax credit money doesn't come in till the end. So we will sign a construction loan with TD Bank, Bank of America, Citi, Capital one, whoever it is that we end up negotiating the deal with, and we will have to sign an 18 to \$20 million personal guarantee on the construction loan over the two years for the project. If we are in default of the construction loan and we bring it in in excess of dollars or not upon schedule, we're penalized by the bank.

LEG. TROTТА:

You're building 79 units. What's the rent on these, approximately?

MR. GALLO:

The rents range from 900 to, say, 1500. I don't have it directly in front of me, but the area median income is between 60 and 90% of the AMI.

LEG. TROTТА:

So are these rents going to be subsidized also?

MR. GALLO:

No. So the rents are the rents, right? So every -- there's the -- the rents are affordable to 60 and 90% of the area median income. So for instance, a studio apartment is approximately, under this scenario, \$930; the resident would be responsible for paying their \$930 in rent.

LEG. TROTТА:

Now if they weren't part of that, they could also get subsidies from Social Service to pay part of the rent?

MR. GALLO:

Perhaps. I mean, any resident could be eligible to --

LEG. TROTТА:

Receive other benefits.

MR. GALLO:

Well, to receive other benefits or to apply. I mean, there's any range of -- any range of --

LEG. TROTТА:

How long is the agreement for with this? I mean, at some point do you become the owner of this property?

MR. GALLO:

So the State, when it started the program, had a 15-year requirement, then they increased it to 30 years, then they increased it to 50 years. So right now the minimum requirement is a 50-year regulatory agreement with the State that is recorded -- which is a recorded document. Our partnership with the Housing Authority and the creation of the not-for-profit will, in all likelihood, keep this in perpetuity. In fact, Sandy Hollow will be in perpetuity; the jury is still out on Speonk-Commons. But from the State's perspective, in order to be awarded their dollars, you have to guarantee there's a minimum 50-year regulatory.

LEG. TROTТА:

Which means that you're partners with this housing agency for at least fifty years.

MR. GALLO:

Correct.

LEG. TROTТА:

And then afterwards you gain ownership of it.

MR. GALLO:

No, not quite. So if the Housing Authority decided we wanted to purchase their portion of their interest we could do that. We don't just receive it by not purchasing their equity.

LEG. TROTТА:

I don't want to waste -- do you have a card? I'll call you on it.

MR. GALLO:

Yeah, I do. Yes, thank you.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Thank you. That's great.

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

This is just an appraisal, so we want to remind everyone.

LEG. CILMI:

You should have just asked that option first.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I'll try to keep it brief. Will the -- when this unit's built and you have tenants in it, it's all considered -- right, everything worked out fine, everybody's happy.

MR. GALLO:

Right.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

There's 26 units?

MR. GALLO:

Twenty-eight.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Twenty-eight units. Will they pay property taxes?

MR. GALLO:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

At what rate?

MR. GALLO:

So, I can't --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I mean roughly how is it appraised; like as a condo?

MR. GALLO:

So I can't -- when we received approval from the Town on Speonk, we backed into --

MR. SMAGIN:

Sandy.

MR. GALLO:

I'm sorry, Sandy Hollow, we had backed in what the assessed value was. It's been probably about two years, but I remember that we were right in par with the value of the school taxes and the County and everything. So one of the things that we do need is -- which we received was a pilot on that property so that we understand the ongoing tax implications, but it was set at what the tax value was.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

By who, the town?

MR. GALLO:

By the town. And it grows, I think, at two or 3%, or I just can't remember the exact, but we do pay taxes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

One more quick question; who vets the new tenants?

MR. GALLO:

My office along with the Southampton Housing Authority.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

MR. GALLO:

Thank you very much.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

MR. GALLO:

I appreciate everyone's time tonight.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you. So we have a motion and a second on IR 1750. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen (Not Present: Legislator Barraga - Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. There is another resolution, ***IR 1751(-16), Authorizing planning steps for implementation of Suffolk County Workforce Housing Program (Speonk Commons)(County Executive)***. Motion by Legislator Fleming to take out of order. Second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, IR 1751, motion to approve by Legislator Fleming.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

MR. GALLO:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right, let's see if we can get through this.

Budget & Finance (Cont'd)

IR 1699-16 - Tax Anticipation Note Resolution No. -2016, Resolution delegating to the County Comptroller the powers to authorize the issuance of not to exceed \$110,000,000 Tax Anticipation Notes of the County of Suffolk, New York, in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied for County purposes or returned to the County for collection for the fiscal years commencing January 1, 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016, and to prescribe the terms, form and contents, and provide for the sale and credit enhancement of such notes (County Executive).

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1734-16 - Amending the 2016 Adopted Operating Budget to appropriate additional revenue within the Suffolk County Clerk's 2016 Operating Budget (County Executive).

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

Economic Development

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1398-16 - Authorizing Suffolk County to enter into an agreement with New York State Environmental Agencies and Suffolk County Landbank Corporation (County Executive).

LEG. CILMI:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Cilmi. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Please list me as cosponsor.

Education & Human Services

IR 1664-16 - Amending Resolution No. 920-2015, to establish a Community College Budget Committee to develop a long-term budget plan (Presiding Officer Gregory).

I'll make a motion.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Martinez.

LEG. D'AMARO:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

On the motion.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Just to the Presiding Officer, the sponsor. The college budget, we don't -- we just have the up or down, yes or no vote.

P.O. GREGORY:

Right.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So I'm just curious what -- you know, what you're trying to accomplish with this committee.

P.O. GREGORY:

Well, it's really more of a framework to look in a longer term fashion as to how we anticipate or want to anticipate funding the community college. Because my opinion is that if we look on a long-term basis, and obviously there's no commitment, Legislative commitment or budgetary commitment to do so, at least we're thinking in the context of longer-term planning. They can -- you know, the County -- the college, excuse me, comes to the County asking for their contribution, they also get a contribution from the State. They can make long-term planning once we set up this framework and make a, quote/unquote, commitment to them. They can go to the State and say, *This is what the County's looking to do potentially in the next few years. What is the State looking to do?* They can have better projections of what their college costs are going to be. So it's really just to establish a framework and to start discussions on a long-term basis.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So this committee, when it meets, is going to look at the college budget over the next long-term, several years let's say.

P.O. GREGORY:

Well --

LEG. D'AMARO:

And then make recommendations as to, you know, what -- how much more funding is needed, or -- our vote is about --

P.O. GREGORY:

No, the committee is already set up. What this is is actually just an extension to February of next year to finish the work that's already been done.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. So that committee that's already set up is going to make recommendations to us?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

About?

P.O. GREGORY:

About, you know, a --

LEG. D'AMARO:

How much funding to provide?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yeah, and that could be zero, it could be 2%, it could be, you know -- instead of going through that now.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But how can we know that without knowing the budget?

P.O. GREGORY:

Well, that's the thing. I mean, there is projections on what their costs are going to be, and it really is stating, you know, what our preference is or if we want to make it a priority, what we're looking to do and commit to, you know. If we feel that -- because we have the historical funding levels that we've contributed to the County, if we want to keep on that same path, do we want to, you know, make it a 1% increase or a 0% increase. I mean, we're having those discussions now, but we're looking at different aspects of what the college is looking for from the State. So it's really trying to set, you know, what's our priority and if we have -- you know, obviously funding is a challenge. But I think at any rate, whatever that number is, there should be a better understanding from the College's perspective of what they can anticipate, or look to anticipate from us.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:

And that's really all it is.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right, so we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. BROWNING:

Jason, I'm back here.

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1664-16 - amending -- Oh, I'm sorry, I just did that. Sorry.

IR 1666-16 - Reappointing member to the Suffolk County Community College Board of Trustees (James Morgo) (Martinez). Motion by Legislator Martinez. Second by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Just on the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

On the motion.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Was Mr. Morgo at committee?

P.O. GREGORY:

He's a reappointment.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So there's no show on that? You know, we don't require. I'm just curious what his position was on returning the unspent funds on the meal plan; if anybody knows.

P.O. GREGORY:

From the what?

LEG. D'AMARO:

The meal plan.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Because we've had that discussion here several times and we keep getting told that, you know, they're looking at it, they're planning for it but, you know -- I mean, talk about windfalls. So he's unfortunately not here to answer that question.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1687-16 - Amending membership and terms of Suffolk County Women's Advisory Commission (Martinez). Motion by Legislator Martinez. Second by Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1753-16 - Appoint member to the Suffolk County Community College Board of Trustees (Gemma Deleon-Lopresti) (Presiding Officer Gregory).

LEG. FLEMING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Gemma. What did I say; Gemma? All right. I'll make a motion to approve. Second by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Just for the record; again, I would like to have an answer to the question as to what this particular person believes should be done with the excess or unspent funds in that college meal plan.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So I know they're not here, but for the record, the question's been asked.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you.

LEG. CILMI:

Why don't we call the Board to our next Environment -- Education Committee meeting.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, that's probably a great idea.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

They're actually -- they're coming. They're doing a presentation on what they're currently doing.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Oh, they're going to the next committee meeting?

LEG. MARTINEZ:

They'll be at the next committee. They are actually going to speak about the outreach that they're doing to different schools on how to increase enrollment and, therefore, help tuition maintain affordable. So those are questions that can definitely be asked the next committee.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, I'm going to distribute to all of you, there was a recent article about this issue, I think in the Sunday Times a week or two ago, that this is becoming a widespread issue across the country, where colleges are charging for meal plans and they're making a profit on it, and the kids are paying for it. The reason why we had the debate, I don't remember the exact numbers, but when we had this whole debate about how much the County contribution is going up, the meal plan went up twice as much. And so, you know, we talked about how difficult it was for struggling students to meet the \$100 increase -- I'm just making up the number but just for example a \$100 increase -- but then we told them in that same year you had to pay a \$200 mandatory fee for food and, by the way, if you don't use the credit, we get to keep it. So to me, I think that these board members should at least come in and tell us what their position is on something like that.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

DuWayne, if you don't mind. Legislator D'Amato --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

-- I'm also going to see if some of the Trustees can also attend, since they're the ones who have

been creating the policy.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. That's great. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

Environment, Planning & Agriculture

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. ***IR 1605-16 - Authorizing the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (effective December 1, 2007) – open space component - for the George Georgoussis Property – Pine Barrens Core - Town of Southampton (SCTM Nos. 0900-215.02-01.00-023.000) – Hampton Hills and 0900-306.00-02.00-028.000 – Dwarf Pine Plains) (County Executive).*** Motion by Legislator Fleming.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

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

LEG. TROTTA:

Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1683-16 - Making a SEQRA determination in connection with the Proposed Pre-Engineered Storage Buildings for Sheriff's Office Riverhead Correctional Facility, CP 3014, Town of Southampton (Presiding Officer Gregory).

LEG. FLEMING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Fleming. Second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1684-16 - Making a SEQRA determination in connection with the Proposed Improvements to Suffolk County Farm – Education Center – CP 1796, Town of Brookhaven (Presiding Officer Gregory).

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Muratore. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1690-16 - Appointing member to the Council on Environmental Quality (Constance M. Kepert)(Anker). Motion by Legislator Anker. Second by Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1691-16 - Appointing member to the Council on Environmental Quality (Frank De Rubeis)(Calarco). Motion by Legislator Calarco. Second by Legislator Kennedy. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1703-13 - 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 a Living Shoreline Demonstration Project within the Town of Southold (CP 8710.417) (County Executive).

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Krupski. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1740-16 - To appoint member of the Suffolk County Planning Commission (Rodney Anderson)(County Executive).

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1757, authorizing appraisal -- oh, I'm sorry.

IR 1763-16 - Making a SEORA determination in connection with the Proposed Improvements to CR 21, Middle Island – Yaphank Road, from Longwood Middle School to New York State 25, CP 5138, Town of Brookhaven (Presiding Officer Gregory). Motion by Legislator Browning. Second by Legislator Anker. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1766-16 - Appointing member to the Council on Environmental Quality (Michael Doall) (Krupski). Motion by Legislator Krupski. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

Government Operations, Personnel, Information Technology & Housing

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1712-16 - Authorizing the sale of County-owned real property pursuant to section 72-h of the General Municipal Law to the Incorporated Village of Patchogue for Affordable Housing purposes. (SCTM No. 0204-009.00-07.00-002.000) (County Executive).

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Calarco. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1724-16 - Authorizing a two-year extension for the development of ten parcels of land transferred pursuant to the 72-h Affordable Housing Program to the Town of Babylon (County Executive). I'll make a motion.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

LEG. TROTТА:

Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen (Opposed: Legislator Trotta - Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1727-16 - Authorizing a two-year extension for the development of seven parcels of land transferred pursuant to the 72-h Affordable Housing Program to the Town of Southampton (County Executive).

LEG. FLEMING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

LEG. TROTТА:

Opposed (*Raised hand*).

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen (Opposed: Legislator Trotta - Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1729-16 - Returning to the County a parcel of land previously transferred pursuant to the 72-h Affordable Housing Program to the Town of Islip (County Executive).

LEG. CILMI:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1730-16 - Returning to the County a parcel of land previously transferred pursuant to the 72-h Affordable Housing Program to the Town of East Hampton (County Executive).

Motion by Legislator Fleming. I'll second -- second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1731-16 - Returning to the County a parcel of land previously transferred pursuant to the 72-h Affordable Housing Program to the Town of Brookhaven (County Executive).

LEG. CILMI:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1732-16 - Returning to the County parcels of land previously transferred pursuant to the 72-h Affordable Housing Program to the Town of Babylon (County Executive). I make a motion.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, IR 1754 we did. IR 1649, adopting --

MR. NOLAN:

The next one.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, right, right. I'm sorry.

Parks & Recreation

IR 1589-16 - Appointing Kathleen Giamo as a member of the Suffolk County Vanderbilt Museum Commission (Trustee No. 13) (Presiding Officer Gregory).

LEG. HAHN:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Hahn.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1663-16 - Authorizing the use of Smith Point County Park, Cathedral Pines County Park and Smith Point Marina by the Long Island 2 Day Walk to Fight Breast Cancer, Inc., for Breast Cancer Walk in 2017 (Browning).

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Browning.

LEG. HAHN:
(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1682-16 - Authorizing use of Cedar Beach County Park for Cornell Cooperative Extension Marine Program Taste and Tour Fundraiser (Krupski). Motion by Legislator Krupski. Second by Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1689-16 - Authorizing Navy SEAL Museum at West Sayville (Lindsay). Motion by -- who was that? Legislator Hahn.

LEG. CILMI:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

LEG. MURATORE:
Cosponsor.

Public Safety

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1692-16 - Appoint member to the Child Fatality Review Team (Jamie Ryan Atkinson)(Lindsay). Motion by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. MURATORE:
(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:
Did I see another hand? Second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1710-16 - Accepting and appropriating federal funding in the amount of \$6,000 from the Department of Homeland Security, United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), for the Suffolk County Police Department's participation in the ICE El Dorado Task Force with 79.4% support (County Executive).

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Browning. Did someone else -- second by Legislator Trotta. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1748-16- Accepting and appropriating a grant in the amount of \$66,745 in federal pass-through funding from the State of New York Division of Criminal Justice Services for the Suffolk County Police Department's Stop Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program with 75% support (County Executive).

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Browning. Second by Legislator Kennedy. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1493 we did.

Public Works, Transportation & Energy

IR 1668-16 - Re-establishing the Tick Control Advisory Committee (Fleming). Motion by Legislator Fleming. Second by Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1669-16 - A resolution making certain findings and determinations and issuing an order in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 16 – Yaphank Municipal (CP 8158). (County Executive). Who is that? Motion by Legislator Browning?

LEG. BROWNING:

Sure.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1670-16 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the planning improvements for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 5 – Strathmore Huntington (CP 8115) (County Executive).

LEG. STERN:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Stern.

LEG. SPENCER:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

LEG. BARRAGA:

Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen (Opposed: Legislator Barraga - Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1670A, Bond Resolution (of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$100,000 in bonds to finance planning costs associated with improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 5- Strathmore Huntington, Planning Design and Supervision (CP 8115.112), same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Absent).

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen (Opposed: Legislators Barraga & Trotta Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1671-16 - Appropriating funds in connection with Complete Streets (CP 3313)

(County Executive). Motion by Legislator Calarco. Second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor?

Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen (Opposed: Legislator Barraga - Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1671A, Pending Bond Resolution (of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$250,000 in bonds to finance the Complete Streets (CP 3313.310), same

motion, same second. Roll call.

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

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Absent).

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen (Opposed: Legislators Barraga & Trotta - Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1672-16 - Amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Construction of Sidewalks on Various County Roads (CP 5497) (County Executive).

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

LEG. BARRAGA:

Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen (Opposed: Legislator Barraga - Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1672A, Bond Resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Absent).

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yep.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen (Opposed: Legislator Barraga - Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1673-16 - Authorizing execution of a road maintenance agreement with the Town of East Hampton (County Executive).

LEG. FLEMING:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1688-16 - Amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Installation of Guide Rail and Safety Upgrades at Various Locations (CP 5180) (Fleming).

LEG. FLEMING:

Motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion to table by Legislator Fleming. Second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, ***IR 1711-16 - Authorizing execution of an agreement by the Administrative Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 – Southwest and 575 Broadhollow Rd. (HU-1208.1) (County Executive).***

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Second

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

Seniors & Consumer Protection

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1743-16 - To approve the lease of two (2) replacement fifteen (15) passenger vans for the Suffolk Works Employment Program in the Suffolk County Department of Labor, Licensing and Consumer Affairs in compliance with Local Law No. 20-2003 (County Executive).

LEG. ANKER:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

Ways & Means

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1622-16 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to cap tax map verification fees (Lindsay). Motion by Legislator Anker. Second by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Can someone explain how the fees affected these communities and the fiscal impact that changing this now is going to have on our budget?

MR. NOLAN:

It goes into effect next year, January 1st, so it won't have any impact on this year's budget.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

What was the effect on this year's budget?

MR. NOLAN:

I'd have to defer to Budget Review on that, I don't know.

MR. LIPP:

It doesn't take effect until next year, so it doesn't have an impact on this year's budget.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No, no, what was the change? We made a change last year to increase the fees, and I think this legislation is based on that, the fee increase. So this would be -- so it had to have changed 16's budget.

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah, this Legislature more than tripled the fees.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So that was --

LEG. CILMI:

At the County Executive's request, I think.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So that was a bad thing.

MR. NOLAN:

Well, the problem was -- well, you know, it depends how you look at it. It wasn't so much raising the fee, but with these homeowners associations that come in and have to record for the various units in their developments, you know, a change of the rules, they'd have to pay for each unit. So a homeowners association could end up paying 50 or \$60,000 worth of fees, according to the testimony we received at committee. Up until a couple of years ago, there was a cap of, you know, \$1,500 to prevent that from happening. But when the law was changed several years back the cap was dropped out, maybe inadvertently, I don't know. So this is putting a new cap in place so that it will cap the expenses when people come in and have to, you know, record multiple -- for multiple units in a homeowners association.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

LEG. FLEMING:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

I already said my peace. I just wanted it put on the record that, you know, we tripled these fees this year and now we're capping them. More than tripled and now we're capping them. It's like, *Thanks. After you tripled the fees, you're capping them now.* It's ridiculous.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Do you think the cap is fair? The proposed cap is fair?

LEG. CILMI:

I'm going to support this bill, but we should have never tripled the fees to begin with.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

LEG. CILMI:

I guess this will prevent us from tripling the fees again. Although I don't know, I suppose we could just ignore this bill, I don't know.

P.O. GREGORY:

Anybody?

LEG. D'AMARO:

I think -- if I could. I think that this is not exactly the point of this bill.

LEG. HAHN:

No, it's not.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I think the point of this bill was that there were these larger complexes, right, that had to reverify for some reason, and an unintended consequence was that they were getting hit on a per parcel charge when really they were just one larger complex. I think the intent of this bill was to put back in place -- they've always had a cap and then the cap got dropped out. Whether the fees went up or not, I think we still need to do the cap either way. George, is that where we're coming from here?

MR. NOLAN:

This is really to reimpose a cap, more than anything.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Legislator Cilmi, if you want to put a bill in to lower the fee --

LEG. CILMI:

Right.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- I would entertain that.

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah, except then you have to find an offset.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, hey, you know. You can't complain about a resolution --

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah, we've already raised it. That's the problem with already raising it. We already raised it, so now the revenue is there, now in order to get rid of it, now you have to find an offset for it. So it's like the alarm fee; you already put the fee increase in there, so in order to get rid of it, now you have to find an offset. And it's like -- I mean, obviously everything that we do is the same.

So, but George, the -- this would prevent us from doing that in the future, or no? Would it prevent us from raising -- and that's the whole idea of a cap, right?

LEG. HAHN:

No.

LEG. CILMI:

I know it's late, but am I missing the point here?

LEG. HAHN:

Yes, you are missing the point.

LEG. CILMI:

So this would not prevent us from --

MR. NOLAN:

It's still \$200 per parcel. But if you're coming in, like a homeowners association, to record for something that effects 50 or 60 or a hundred parcels --

LEG. CILMI:

Oh.

MR. NOLAN:

-- then there's a cap. You won't be --

LEG. CILMI:

Well, it doesn't cap the per parcel rate.

MR. NOLAN:

No, it's still 200 bucks per parcel.

LEG. CILMI:

And it doesn't cap it at 200, we could still raise it if we wanted to.

MR. NOLAN:

You can raise it, you could decrease it if you wanted to. But again, you would have to deal with those other issues.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Are you proposing to raise it?

LEG. CILMI:

I am not proposing to raise it (*laughter*)..

LEG. D'AMARO:

So just to --

LEG. CILMI:

But we could. I'm not.

MR. LIPP:

Just to clarify Legislator Krupski's question from before, I looked it up. So what happened, if you remember in the deliberations for the 2016 adopted budget, there were a bunch of various fee increases, this was one of them. And Resolution 1992 -- 992 of last year did the increase, but it was already implicit in the recommended 2016 budget which we adopted, including the increase from 60 to \$200.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

How much?

MR. LIPP:

From \$60 to 200.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It's about what you'll pay for your plastic bags now.

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right, we're almost there, we're almost there. All right, so we have a motion, we have a second on IR 1622. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1660-16 - Establishing a vibrant communities policy in Suffolk County (Lindsay).

Motion by Legislator Hahn. Second by Legislator Fleming.

LEG. CILMI:

On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

On the motion, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah. I abstained on this in committee. I just -- could I get an explanation of this, please? I mean, I read the bill, but just real quick.

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah, no, more than -- that I can't do. I mean, it's all in the first RESOLVED clause, it establishes a County policy where if the County is going out and searching for space to lease, the County will, in the first instance, try to secure space at transit-oriented development areas. And it goes on to state what a transit-oriented development area is considered; approximate to a main public transportation hub such as a railroad station that features a walkable downtown and retail space in close proximity to each other. So it just enunciates and states a policy, this is where we'd like to lease space going forward.

LEG. CILMI:

What does that mean, try? I'm not quite sure I understand. What if there's a space available by the train station that's going to cost, you know, \$40 a square foot and there's a place away from the train station that's going to cost \$25 a square foot; does this require that we lease the \$40 per square foot place?

MR. NOLAN:

I don't think it means that. It says you can endeavor in the first instance, and if you look at a place in a transportation hub that the County determines is just way more expensive than a suitable area someplace else, we're not locked in to going to the transportation hub in my opinion. It's -- we're going to try.

LEG. CILMI:

All right, we don't have to get into a long conversation.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I could explain it a little bit further, I think. So if you have two locations, one is in a transit-oriented development area and another is not but the cost is very close, but the transit area is slightly higher, it gives a little guidance and says go with the transit area. You know, it gives a little policy direction.

LEG. SPENCER:

All things being considered.

LEG. D'AMARO:

All things being considered, right. Right.

LEG. CILMI:

At some point you risk the transit areas being really congested. If you keep piling stuff into the transit areas --

LEG. D'AMARO:

That would be another factor --

LEG. CILMI:

It would be.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- in deciding that.

LEG. CILMI:

Right. Thanks.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

LEG. CILMI:

Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen (Opposed: Legislator Cilmi - Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1696-16 - Authorizing the acquisition of a portion of a certain parcel of real property having a Suffolk County Tax Map Identification Number of District 0200 Section 341.00 Block 01.00 Lot 030.000 for Sewer District purposes and requesting conveyance of same from the Town of Brookhaven, Suffolk County, New York pursuant to General Municipal Law §72-h (County Executive). Motion by Legislator Muratore. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. In the **manilla folder**, we have some resolutions.

Procedural Motion 18-2016 - Setting land acquisition priorities in accordance with "AAA Program" requirements (2016 - Phase II)(Hahn).

LEG. HAHN:

Motion to approve.

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Hahn. Second by Legislator Muratore. So this is just the second phase, right?

MR. NOLAN:

For this year.

P.O. GREGORY:

Or is this the approval? Wait a minute.

MR. NOLAN:

This is what authorizes the Division of Real Estate to go in and make offers on these particular parcels as determined by the EPA Committee.

P.O. GREGORY:

Gotcha, okay. All right, so we have a motion and a second.

LEG. TROTTA:

Locked in as one, I am assuming. You don't vote on them individually.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right, a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Procedural Resolution apportioning -- I'm sorry.

Procedural Motion No. 19-2016 - Procedural resolution apportioning mortgage tax by: County Comptroller (Presiding Officer Gregory).

I make a motion.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, ***IR 1838-16 - Accepting and appropriating a grant sub-award from the Research Foundation for the State University of New York for the project entitled, "Constructive Convergences", 100% reimbursed by State funds at Suffolk County Community College (County Executive).***

LEG. MURATORE:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1845-16 - Accepting and appropriating a grant award from the U.S. Department of Labor -- excuse me, the resolutions weren't in order.

IR 1844-16 - Accepting and appropriating a grant award from the State University of New York (SUNY), for an Innovative Instruction Technology Grant (IITG) entitled, "Expanding Mobile Markerspaces to Enhance Learning throughout Suffolk County Community College" --

LEG. HAHN:

Makerspaces.

P.O. GREGORY:

Makerspaces, excuse me, I had an extra R in there -- **100% reimbursed by State funds at Suffolk County Community College (County Executive)**. Motion by Legislator Hahn. I'll second.

LEG. HAHN:

Cosponsor.

P.O. GREGORY:

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1845-16 - Accepting and appropriating a grant award from the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration (DOL/ETA), for the H-1B TechHire Partnership grant, 100% reimbursed by Federal funds at Suffolk County Community College (County Executive).

LEG. MURATORE:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Muratore. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1846-16 - Accepting and appropriating a grant award amendment from the State University of New York for an Educational Opportunity Program, 100% reimbursed by state funds at Suffolk County Community College (County Executive).

LEG. HAHN:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1847-16 - Accepting and appropriating a grant sub-award amendment from the research foundation for the State University of New York, Stony Brook University, the prime recipient of a grant award from the National Institute of General Medical Sciences, for a project entitled, "BioPREP: Biology Partnership in Research and Education Programs", 100% reimbursed by federal funds at Suffolk County Community College (County Executive).

LEG. HAHN:

(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:

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

LEG. HAHN:

Cosponsor.

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, IR 1866. It's a Bond.

MR. NOLAN:

It's a technical correction to an earlier Bond Resolution.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, 1866-16 - Amending Bond Resolution No. 710-2016, adopted on July 26, 2016, relating to the authorization of the issuance of \$150,000 bonds to finance a portion of the planning and surveying costs associated with the Port Jefferson-Wading River Rails to Trails Pedestrian and Bicycle Path (CP 5903.112 PIN 075816)(County Executive).

MR. NOLAN:

It's a technical correction to an earlier Bond Resolution.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

LEG. TROTТА:

Opposed.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Is that a Bond?

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah.

P.O. GREGORY:

Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry, my fault. We have to do a roll call. So we have a motion and a second. Roll call.

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

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

LEG. ANKER:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

(Absent).

LEG. MARTINEZ:

Yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. TROTTA:

No.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:

Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Fifteen (Opposed: Legislators Kennedy & Trotta - Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, Red Folder, CN's:

IR 1750, 51 we did.

IR 1781-16 - Authorizing an appraisal for the purchase of Development Rights of Farmland under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 – Little Bing LLC and Big Bing LLC Farm property – Town of Southold (SCTM No. 1000-095.00-01.00-007.002 p/o and 1000-095.00-01.00-008.003 p/o) (County Executive).

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Krupski. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Someone's got to say *badda bing*. All right, whatever, I'm too tired.

IR 1814-16 - Designating the week of September 5th through September 11th as "Suicide Prevention Week" in Suffolk County (Hahn). Motion by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

Second by Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. HAHN:

That's why you guys are all wearing these. *(Held up purple and turquoise Suicide Prevention Ribbon).*

P.O. GREGORY:

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1868-16 - Authorizing use of the Suffolk County Environmental Center by the Rotary Club of Bay Shore for its Fall Kick-Off Gala Fundraiser (County Executive).

LEG. CILMI:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1869-16 - Authorizing use of the Suffolk County Environmental Center by the Islip Chamber of Commerce for it's A Taste of the South Shore Fundraiser (County Executive).
Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, **Late Starters:**

I would like to waive the rules and lay the following resolutions on the table:

IR 1854 to EPA; IR 1855 to Public Works; IR 1856 to Budget & Finance; IR 1857 to Budget & Finance; IR 1858 to Budget & Finance; IR 1859 to EPA; IR 1860 to EPA; IR 1861 to EPA; IR 1862 to EPA; IR 1863 to EPA; IR 1864 to EPA; IR 1865 to EPA; IR 1867 to Public Works; IR 1870 to Public Works; IR 1871 to Public Works; IR 1872 to Public Works; IR 1873 to Budget & Finance; IR 1874 to EPA; IR 1875 to Public Safety and set the Public Hearing for October 5th at 2:30 PM in Hauppauge.

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Lindsay).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, that's our agenda. We stand adjourned. Please make it home safe.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 11:34 P.M. *)