General Meeting - December 20, 2016

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

(The meeting was called to order at 9:36 a.m.)

09:36AM

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Good morning, Madam Clerk.

MS. ELLIS:
Good morning.

P.O. GREGORY:
Can you please do the roll call.

(*Roll Call by Amy Ellis - Chief Deputy Clerk*)

09:36AM

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Here.

LEG. FLEMING:
(Not Present)

LEG. BROWNING:
Here.

LEG. MURATORE:
(Absent)

LEG. HAHN:
Present.

LEG. ANKER:
Here.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Here.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Here.

LEG. CILMI:
Here.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Here.

LEG. KENNEDY:
(Not Present)

LEG. TROTTO:
Here.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
(Not Present)

* Index Included at End of Transcript
LEG. STERN:
Here.

LEG. D'AMARO:
(Not Present)

09:37AM

LEG. SPENCER:
(Not Present)

09:37AM

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Present.

09:37AM

P.O. GREGORY:
Present.

09:37AM

MS. ELLIS:
Twelve. (Not Present: Legislators Fleming, Kennedy, McCaffrey, D'Amaro, Spencer/Absent: Legislator Muratore)

09:37AM

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Good morning, everyone. Thank you for coming here today. I take it you didn't come here for Barbara's crumb cake recipe, but thank you nonetheless. Would you all please rise for the salute to the flag, to be led by Legislator Tom Cilmi.

(*Salutation*)

Okay. Next, Legislator Cilmi will introduce Kevin Jacobsen, an East Islip High School student, who will play the National Anthem. I think I just did it.

LEG. CILMI:
Right. You just do'd it, Mr. Presiding Officer. Kevin, why don't you come front and center here.

09:38AM

I heard Kevin play the National Anthem at a recent Eagle Scout Court of Honor and I was moved. We always have singers here, and it's important to recognize musicians who aren't vocal musicians, and Kevin did a wonderful job. And I give you Kevin Jacobsen from East Islip High School.

(*Kevin Jacobsen Performed the National Anthem*)

(*Applause*)

LEG. CILMI:
Well done, Kevin. Thank you. It's now my pleasure to introduce to you Father Antony Asir. Father Antony was born in India and has been a naturalized American since 2007. Ordained as a priest in 1982, Father Antony completed his post Masters Degree in Licentiate in Sacred Scripture at the Papal University of Biblicum in Rome, Italy in 1988. He graduated as a Doctor of Ministry from the Biblical Theological Seminary in Manhattan in 1999. He has served as Parochial Vicar of the Diocese of Rockville Centre since 1995, and as a Professor at the Seminary of Immaculate Conception in Huntington. Father Antony is presently the Pastor of Saint Thomas
More Roman Catholic Church in Hauppauge, where he's been since 2012.

On a personal note, it continues to be my great privilege to bring prayer to our meetings every meeting. And every time I have an opportunity to introduce a pastor, it's special to me, because all too often God is removed from our lives here in our country, and I think we all need a little more God in our lives in this country, and throughout the world, really. And so this serves as a reminder to us all that God has forever been or we will always be -- we have forever been and we will always be one nation under God. With that, I give you Father Antony.

(*Applause*)

FATHER ANTONY:

Good morning, all of you. As you know, I am Father Antony, and thank you very much for the good words. And, also, he has put us in the right mood to raise our presence, be a higher presence, all our thinkings and deliberations be in wonderful harmony that is among us.

I am from India, as he said, and with all the Indian Gurus, nothing goes without a story, right? And so bear with me.

This, in that zoo, they brought a wonderful animal from Australia, kangaroo. You know, kangaroo, you know, it leaps and jumps. And so they put ten feet around, kind of protection around her. And the next day, the kangaroo was out, and so they raised the fence to 20 feet. The following day, again, the kangaroo was out. So the third day, they raised it to 30 feet high fence. The fourth day, the kangaroo was out. And they were thinking about it, put the kangaroo inside, and they were discussing. At the time, the next door to the kangaroo was another animal, and it asked the kangaroo, "What do you think? How high they will raise the fence?" And the kangaroo said, "Oh, they will raise the fence up to the sky, as long as they keep open the gate of this fence."

(*Laughter*)

And where our legislation comes. We have our own leaping and jumping capacity. That's what we human are. We cannot simply live with what is given, we always improve, we go forward, we jump and leap. But in our capacity, we also have our own insanity, and we have our own weaknesses, our own shortcomings. We can hurt each other and we need a fence around us. Here, God has given us the wonderful harmony that is the fence, that we can adjust with each other, that we can go along with each other. But even that is not enough, and that's where God send beautiful minds like these Legislators to give us, to set boundaries, to make law, to bring the order, to give us security, to reach that harmony. And above all, lies not simply curbing us, but it's only leading us and indicating us towards the justice, and the compassion, and the mercy, and the adjustment, and above all, the harmony.
So let us raise our hearts and minds now to that wonderful harmony which is existing among us. Some of us, many of us call that one as God, and some of us trying to reach that in different names. So we will raise our hearts this morning.

Heavenly Father, we praise and thank you for everything that happens in our life. At this moment, you have brought all these beautiful minds, both learning and the learned, and those who are striving with the laws, and the legislations, rules and regulations, to reach the harmony that you have given us already, to reach the justice and the compassion as a vision of our life. Enlarge our hearts and minds, that we may understand each other, embrace each other beyond our fears, beyond our limitations, beyond our misunderstanding, beyond our shortcomings, so that we can see that in the loss that we have created for ourselves, a security that can -- we can promise to each other, that safety that we can give each other, the justice and the harmony that we can reach, and always mold words so that the prosperity and the peace can be among us. We ask this always in the name of the one who lives forever and ever. And we all say amen.

(*Amen Said in Unison*)

And before you finish, I want to say, this is the wonderful time of giving. This time, the Christmas and the Hanukkah comes together on the same day. For those who celebrate Christmas, let me say that Santa is coming. Behave well, all right?

(*Laughter*)

And there are a time when we all believed in Santa, and afterwards we all grew up and we said, "Oh, we don't believe in Santa." Then, still, we grew up in our age and we became Santa for each other. And this is the time of becoming Santa for each other. And may Christmas come upon you. May the blessings of Hanukkah be with you. And for those who are going to have their holidays, may the family love fill your hearts. I wish you all a wonderful day today. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Please remain standing for a moment of silence in memory of former Suffolk County Chief Fire Marshal William -- excuse me, Warren Horst, who passed away recently. And as always, let us also remember all those men and women who put themselves in harm's way every day to protect our country.

(*Moment of Silence*)

Okay. The next portion of our agenda is proclamations and presentations. We have several Legislators that have presentations to make, first being Legislator Cilmi.
LEG. CILMI:
Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. I'm joined at the podium by Legislator Tom Barraga. Legislator Barraga and I share portions of East Islip. And if we could ask the East Islip Varsity Football Team to join us in front of the horseshoe. And if I could ask Superintendent of Schools, John Dolan, Steve Restivo, who is the Director of Health, Physical Ed, Athletics and Recreation, and Sal Ciampi, Head Coach, with any Assistant Coaches, Mike Gentile, Joe Taormina or Butch Chamberlain, to join me at the podium. Thank you. Steve's making his way over. Looking good, guys.

So on a cold day in -- was it November, was this County Championships, right? On a cold day in November, Superintendent John Dolan said to this team, or it was probably earlier than November, but he said to his team at some point before the County Championships, "If you guys make it to the County Championships, I will ride my bicycle from home in Oakdale to Stony Brook Stadium." And so on that cold day in November, Superintendent Dolan rode his bicycle from Oakdale to Stony Brook Stadium in hopes for a victory, and he got that victory, Ladies and Gentlemen.

East Islip Football Team finished in third place, with six wins and one loss in their regular season conference. However, on November 5th, East Islip beat Comsewogue 31 to 15 in the qualifying round. On November 11th, they prevailed over Westhampton, 39 to 29, moving on to the County Championships against Sayville. And in that championship against Sayville, who, by the way, for those of you who don't know, the quarterback for Sayville, Coan. Coan, Coan. Jack, Jack Coan, has been -- has been recognized as one of the best high school quarterbacks ever really to come out of Long Island. And so Sayville was, I believe, favored to win in this match. But East Islip, with tough defense and with a really strong offense, ended up winning that game 42 to 35.

It was a great game. It was back and forth all game long. The rut that Superintendent Dolan weared in the artificial turf on the sideline was visible. I had the pleasure of being on the field during the game and it was so exciting, you guys, so exciting. So they finished with an overall record of nine wins and three losses.

And I'd liked to recognize our Team Captains. I'm not going to read the entire roster of the team, but I want to recognize our Team Captains, all seniors. Chris Higgins, Pat Fitzpatrick, Kyle Nunez, Kai Brothers and Bobby Madigan. The team is made up of one 8th grader, five 9th graders, six 10th graders, thirteen 11th graders, and 21 12th graders. Amazing, guys, amazing.

We look forward to next year, where, hopefully, we'll take home the Suffolk Championship again, and we'll go up to New York State after winning Long Island and we'll win that as well.

So with that, I'm going to say congratulations to you. And I'm going to recognize Legislator Tom Barraga, who would like to say a few words.
LEG. BARRAGA:

Just very quickly, to extend my personal congratulations to all of you. You represent a very proud history in East Islip football. You are the 2016 Suffolk County Champions. The school had a history of other championships. 2014, the school was the Suffolk County Champions, in 2007, Suffolk County Champions. So the history is there and you perpetuate that, you continue to perpetuate that.

And, also, if I'm correct, you have a very unique attribute that will not be duplicated in Suffolk County history, because you have a coach, Coach Ciampi, and his father in tandem. Each have won 100 football games in tandem. That's never been done before in Suffolk County, and probably will never be duplicated again in Suffolk County history. So congratulations to each and every one of you, and good luck in your futures. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

LEG. CILMI:

Thank you, Legislator Barraga. So I have a proclamation here, boys, to commemorate this auspicious occasion, which I will present to your Superintendent, your Coach, Sal Ciampi, and your Athletic Director. And I have certificates for each and every one of you signed by Legislator Barraga and myself, with all the best for your futures. Congratulations to each and every one of you, and good luck in your futures. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

(*Photograph Was Taken*)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. Next, Legislator Trotta will make a presentation.

LEG. TROTTA:

After the boys get out of the way, could I have the Kings Park Girls Soccer Team -- excuse me, Volleyball Team. Maybe in the Fall. I think they're stuck outside. All right. The Kings Park Girls Volleyball Team, please. And I'd like to invite Dr. Timothy Eagen, the Principal.

(*Applause*)

Mr. Tennyson (phonetic). Are the coaches up there? Oh, this is the whole team?

MS. MANLEY:

Well, they're taking tests.

MR. NOLAN:

Oh, they're taking tests.

MS. MANLEY:

They're taking tests, so we're representing.
LEG. TROTTA:
Oh, okay. I was waiting for a whole bunch of girls. First, it
gives me great pleasure to invite them up here. This has been
their sixth year in a row that they were the Long Island Champions.
So this says a lot about the Coaches. Are the Coaches here?

09:58AM

MS. MANLEY:
I am.

09:58AM

LEG. TROTTA:
Oh, you're the Coach. The coach looks like one of the players.
I cannot tell you how proud I am of you. I mean, this is an
indication of not it's just you girls, it's the coaching staff that
have done this, and to do this six years in a row. And,
apparently, you came in second in the state, which is a really
unbelievable fete, considering you're a -- we're a relatively small
school.

09:58AM

I want to congratulate you on behalf of the members of the
Thirteenth Legislative District and the entire Suffolk County.
We're very proud. I have a proclamation for you and a certificate
for each one of you. And, again, congratulations.

(*Applause*)

(*Photograph Was Taken*)

(*Applause*)

10:00AM

P.O. GREGORY:
Next, actually Legislator Trotta and Legislator Kennedy were going
to make a presentation.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes. Good morning. Rob and I are very lucky to have in our town
two volleyball teams who excel in their sport. I'd like to call up
Smithtown West Varsity Volleyball Team. Come on, Rob, get in here.

(*Applause*)

10:00AM

Congratulations, gentlemen. I personally have a little caveat on
this, since I represent both Smithtown and Sachem. Sachem, I'm
sorry for your loss, but we are loyal to Smithtown, and
congratulations. They defeated Sachem to win the Suffolk Class A,
and they continue to maintain their momentum to earn their first
Long Island Championship by defeating Nassau's Plainview JFK team.
Congratulations, guys, excellent work.

10:01AM

From Smithtown, we also have today Superintendent Grossane. Where
are you? Are you here? Principal John Coady and Athletic Director
Pat Smith. Thank you for your hard work, all of you.

10:01AM

LEG. TROTTA:
I'd just like to say, I have no allegiance to Sachem. Great job.

(*Laughter and Applause*)
LEG. KENNEDY:
Do we have Mike Legge, the Varsity Head Coach, the Varsity Assistant, Andrew Sanchez, and the JV Coach, Glenn Roper, up?

(*Photograph Was Taken*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Next, we have Legislators Anker, Browning and Muratore, who has an excused absence, represents this constituent as well.

LEG. ANKER:
Let's see. Is Jim Anson -- Officer Jim Anson and Caleigh, come forward. There she is. Welcome. So nice to see you guys. So -- oh, and, yes, Chief Cameron. Are you -- oh, and there you are. So we're here to proudly recognize constituents, Police Officer James, also known as Jim, Anson and Caleigh Anson, his daughter.

So on the evening of November 12th, both Officer James Anson and his daughter, Caleigh, demonstrated great heroism and selflessness when responding to a neighboring house fire, and that was the Noon Family. On this evening, Caleigh noticed that the fire -- that the house across the street was on fire. She immediately notified her father, James, who retrieved a ladder from their garage to rescue the family from the second story of the burning home. While her father responded to the emergency, Caleigh dialed 911 to notify emergency responders. James, a police officer, who was off duty, used a ladder to rescue the family from the burning home as they were trapped on the second floor. He assisted two children, ages 7 and 9, and the two parents from the home.

Again, we'd like to thank Officer Anson and his daughter for their quick actions. And we have -- Legislator Kate Browning, too, is -- would like to say a few words.

LEG. BROWNING:
So I just want to say -- and I know that Legislator Muratore is not feeling well, and would love to have been here. But, again, I know Officer Anson front the Seventh Precinct. And when I read it, I didn't realize exactly who it was at the time, but I said, "You know what, I'm not surprised," because he is an exemplary officer in the Seventh Precinct. I am very proud and happy to have you in the Seventh Precinct, and a very responsive officer. So, again, congratulations, and congratulations, Caleigh. Thank you for what you've done.

(*Applause*)

CHIEF CAMERON:
I'd just like to start by wishing the Legislature Happy Holidays, and thanking you, again, for honoring the heroic actions of one of our members. And I'm going to be real brief, because I know you have a very long agenda today.

This event highlights two things. Police Officers are never off duty, and when it comes to their children, the apple never falls from the tree. So congratulations to both Jim and his daughter,
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Caleigh, for this heroic action. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

(*Photograph Was Taken*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Next, Legislator Spencer will make a presentation as well.

LEG. SPENCER:
Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. I'd like to ask If William Low and his wife, Peggy Low, will come up. And, also, I'd like to invite Diana Cherry-Holmes to come up with them. And Diana works with us in Suffolk County with our cultural arts, but she also was on the Huntington Arts Council, and is a dear friend of the family.

So I'd like to introduce William Low, who, as you see here, he designs stamps. And the current holiday stamps that we see were designed by this gentleman right here, who I have the privilege of having in my Legislative District. So I just wanted to tell you a little bit about Mr. Low while I display this.

Mr. Low began his career as a young person growing up in a troubled neighborhood. He and his brother both drew starting with imitating figures from comic books. And as a teen, William was accepted into the High School For Art and Design in Manhattan, and contemplated becoming an architect. However, while there, he picked up a paint brush and started illustrating scenes of his native borough, the Bronx. He secured a full scholarship to the Parsons School of Design, and received his first break with the New York Daily News drawing a series of paintings to illustrate a new day for the Bronx piece in 1982.

After his first success, William was commissioned to paint a nighttime subway map for the City's MTA, and illustrate children's books for the first United States Postal Service stamp in 2014. This year he was commissioned to produce the original artworks for the United States Postal Service Holiday Windows Forever stamp, which was issued in October, but also the Hanukkah Forever stamp, which was issued in November.

So the Legislature welcomes the opportunity to pay a well-deserved tribute to individuals for their service to the community. And, therefore, as Legislator of the 18th District, it gives me great pride to present Mr. Low this proclamation in recognition for his artwork. Thank you.

MR. LOW:
Thank you.

(*Applause*)

(*Photograph Was Taken*)
MR. LOW: Thank you.

LEG. SPENCER: Thank you very much.

P.O. GREGORY: Okay. Next, Legislator Spencer, and I believe Legislator Browning as well -- I don't know where she is.

LEG. BROWNING: I'm right here.

P.O. GREGORY: There she is. Are going to make a presentation to Dr. Coyne.

LEG. SPENCER: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. And I'd like to thank my colleague, Legislator Browning. This was her proc, and she has a little congestion and asked me to do the talking. So I appreciate that privilege, because, as a physician, I've worked with Dr. Coyne for a number of years and he's a very impressive individual. So, Dr. Coyne, would you please come and join us?

LEG. BROWNING: He's right over there.

LEG. SPENCER: Thank you.

(*Applause*)

LEG. BROWNING: And there's a few others that are going to join him, Chief Cameron and --

LEG. SPENCER: Chief Cameron, would you please come up again. And --

LEG. BROWNING: And the other officers.

LEG. SPENCER: And the other officers who are -- thank you. And Narcan being so important, I know Legislator Hahn wanted to also -- oh, she's here, too, so great.

10:13AM

Dr. Scott Coyne, Chief Surgeon, Medical Director for the Suffolk County Police, he has been named the New York State EMS Physician of Excellence for 2016. Let's give him a big hand. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

Dr. Coyne played a key role in developing the County's Narcan program, addressing the epidemic of heroin and opioid overdoses. Police said that since the implementation of the Narcan program,
officers have administered more than 650 times to reverse the
effects of opioid overdoses. So 650 lives have been potentially
saved as a result of this program. Unbelievable, truly
unbelievable.

(*Applause*)

Dr. Coyne has trained thousands of officers, fire and EMS
personnel and procedures for response to high risk operations.

Dr. Coyne also introduced the public education program called The
Ugly Truth, which is presented in school districts and community
meetings throughout Suffolk County. He was selected for the honor
from a field of physicians from all 67 counties in New York and he
came out on top. But if you look at what he's done, he's probably
responsible for his efforts for saving thousands of lives. So this
is really an honor.

Kate, thank you for allowing me to be a part of this. I know,
Legislator Hahn, if you would come up, too, who introduced the
Narcan legislation. But it gives me great honor to pay a well
deserved tribute and present this proclamation to Dr. Coyne on
behalf of all 18 Legislators for a job well done. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

LEG. BROWNING:
You should say something, save me talking.

DR. COYNE:
I didn’t expect to speak this morning, but I want to thank the
Legislature, and particularly these Legislators for the honor of
this presentation. It means a lot to me. Suffolk County is my
home, and the Police Department is my mission. But I receive this
award with humility, because every day I realize this is a team
effort. And, you know, we have over 1,000 officers out there every
day, hundreds of times a day, who save lives. And from the Medical
Crisis Action Team to every sector car, they do a fantastic job in
delivering emergency medical care. And I receive -- and I want to
recognize all of them as part of this award, because without them,
there would be no award. So thank you very much.

(*Applause*)

CHIEF CAMERON:
I think you can see, I think it's readily apparent from the turnout
from the Department how much Scott Coyne means to all of us. I
mean, he's done a spectacular job. And as Dr. Spencer said,
there's literally hundreds of people walking around Suffolk County
alive today that would not be with us without the actions of Scott
Coyne. His actions are so extraordinary, some of his programs have
been modeled by New York State and across the country. So we're
extremely proud to be here to honor him today. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

(*Photograph Was Taken*)
P.O. GREGORY: Okay. Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING: Okay. I'd like to bring up our New York State Troopers, Senior Investigator Simon Campo -- Ocampo, Investigator Charles Knapp, Jr., and New York State Trooper Hua Chang -- Chan, sorry.

I have to say this is definitely an honor for me to be able to stand here with you. On the morning of Friday, November 25th -- and I'm not sure what Legislator covers this area, yet, so, please, join me if it's your district. Excuse me. The New York State Police received a call about a woman preparing to jump from the Southern State Parkway overpass. Senior Investigator Simon Ocampo and Investigator Charles Knapp, Jr. arrived at the scene and quickly cut away the protective fence between the overpass and the traffic below. Both Investigator Knapp and Senior Investigator Ocampo, along with the help of New York State Trooper Hua Chan, convinced the woman back to safety. After securing her well-being, she was taken to Southside Hospital for a full evaluation.

And, you know, we know in these days, with the holidays, suicide rates can go up. And I want to say thank you. So I want to say thank you for your work in helping that woman. We had an incident recently with a Suffolk County Police Officer saving someone. You know, I lost a brother to suicide, and I have to say, that during the holidays, it's the hardest time, but, also, not only did you save this woman, you also saved a family. And Lord knows what could have happened if she had jumped off that bridge onto the South State Parkway. So there might have been many lives that you have saved because of our actions.

So I do have proclamations, as the Chair of Public Safety, to say a thank you for everything you do, and I wish you all a Merry Christmas.

(*Applause*)

Leslie, you want to join me with this one? Okay. So next, last, but not least for me, Brett Martinez, Fire Marshal, if you'd like to come forward. And he has his -- both of his dogs. This is his new dog. What's the dog's name?

FIRE MARSHAL MARTINEZ: Sasha.

LEG. BROWNING: Sasha is his new canine. And we're here to congratulate Brett. Brett is -- and Brett and his first canine, Ember, was considered the first Accelerant Detection Team in Suffolk County. Brett is known nationwide for his dedication and commitment to the ATF Accelerant Detection Program, and has been a canine handler for 25 years. So that's why he's here, his 25th anniversary. His canines have assisted in a multitude of law enforcement agencies in
major arson cases over the career together. The arrest and conviction of a serial arsonist in Sayville. The arrest and conviction of an individual in which the arson fire had set and killed five children in Riverhead. An investigation of a hotel fire that led to the arrest and conviction of an individual for murder and arson. And the investigation of a lumber mill fire that was determined to be arson.

Brett is on now his fourth canine, which is Ember right here. And he had Ember, Cinder, Jewel, which is the one that's with him right now who is now retired, just recently retired. Congratulations, Jewel. I know you -- I know Brett's daughter is very excited that now Jewel is a pet and not a working dog anymore, and now Sasha.

So, Brett, we'd like to say congratulations on your 25th anniversary. And thank you for your service to Suffolk County, and also to the nation, because no one really realizes how much you guys really do. So thank you. And, Leslie, do you want to --

LEG. KENNEDY:
I'll just make it quick. Brett, it is always wonderful when we get to honor excellence in service. And I am so thankful for this -- for your 25 years. May they continue. And for this lovely new dog, finally.

MR. MARTINEZ:
Thank you.

(*Applause*)

LEG. BROWNING:
I do apologize. John Jordan is here on behalf of FRES for representing the Commissioner. Thank you, John, for coming.

(*Applause*)

(*Photograph Was Taken*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Next, Legislator Stern will make a presentation.

LEG. STERN:
Good morning, everyone. In addition to representing my Legislative District, it's been my great privilege to serve as the Chairman of the Veterans Committee in the Legislature. And with my colleagues, we have the opportunity to work with and for so many of our brave men and women who have fought and continue to fight for our freedoms here and around the world. And Suffolk County is home and very proud to be the home of the largest number of Veterans in all of New York State. And as we all know in all of our communities, our Veterans, whether they are serving in uniform or not, continue to be the heroes of our community. They are the ones who are our volunteers, they are the ones that are in many ways the backbone of all of our communities throughout Suffolk County. And so it is really a personal privilege to recognize one of our very special Veterans here with us today.

* Index Included at End of Transcript
Many of my colleagues know John Rago, who is the Outreach Coordinator for Supportive Services for Veterans. That's SSVF, Families in Suffolk County United Veterans. John is a Navy Veteran who served aboard a nuclear submarine as a sonar technician on the USS Francis Scott Key, and the USS Grayling. He has had a very distinguished career in serving our overall community, but particularly our Veterans in need, whether they are returning from Iraq, Afghanistan, having served more recently, or even going back decades ago.

John is one of those very special individuals that leads by example, and is really one of those special people in our community who really sets an example for all of us to follow.

John, it is really great to have you with us today to recognize all of your very special work on behalf, particularly of our Veterans throughout Suffolk County. You've done such a great job for them and their families. And so on behalf of my colleagues in the Legislature, and all 1.5 million residents of Suffolk County, again, it's a personal pleasure to present you with this proclamation to recognize all of your service in its many capacities to the people of Suffolk County and to our great nation, but most importantly to say thank you.

(*Applause*)

(*Photograph Was Taken*)

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Next, Legislator Fleming will make a presentation.

LEG. FLEMING:
Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. I'm glad we ladies all got the memo and wore our red jackets.

(*Laughter*)

I have three members of the East Hampton Village Police Department here today. I am very fortunate to represent a district that includes a number of local police departments. I know our Suffolk County Police Department is a fine department with many, many fine officers, but I hope you all recognize that we have some really fine local Police Officers as well that are doing really hard work in small departments out east, and the East Hampton Village Department is certainly one of them. And Chief Larsen is just a fantastic leader, and we're very, very happy to be able to work with him.

And I know Commissioner Sini and Chief Cameron are also very proud of everything that you fellows do, and we are working hard to keep that coordination. And I know Al appreciates it as well in terms of supporting our local departments.

* Index Included at End of Transcript
So I want to honor these guys for saving a life. And I'm just going to read to you the facts, because it is remarkable. It was in September that a 911 call came over for an adult male collapsed on the grounds of the -- actually, on the course of the Maidstone Golf Club. And Sergeant Richard Mamay, Police Officer Steven Niggles, and Police Officer Matthew Kochanasz responded. When they arrived at the club, the victim was unresponsive and not breathing at all. So Police Officer Kochanasz delivered three cycles of CPR, while Sergeant Mamay administered oxygen, and Officer Niggles connected the AED pads. One shock was delivered from the AED and the man started breathing again and regained a pulse. He was transported to Southampton Hospital by the members of the East Hampton Village Ambulance Association, another group that we are very, very grateful for. And as a result of these officers' actions, Police Officer Matthew Kochanasz, Sergeant Richard Mamay -- is Mamay right?

SERGEANT MAMAY:
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:
Thank you. And Police Officer Steven Niggles are credited with saving the man's life. And Sergeant Mamay tells me that the week after this incident, the gentleman actually attended his daughter's wedding. So congratulations, gentlemen. Thank you for everything you do.

I would like to note that we, as you all know, had a very difficult Friday, a 16-alarm fire in Sag Harbor, and every single member of our local departments came through. Not a single person was injured, despite the fact that it was 20 degrees, the water was freezing as soon as it came out of the hoses, the smoke was thicker than you could imagine. And every single member of our local departments worked together and no one was injured and no lives were lost. So I want to thank you guys also for supporting that effort.

(*Applause*)

(*Photograph Was Taken*)

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. That's all that we have for public presentations. Next, we do have a Public Hearing that was published for 9:30. It is for I.R. 2055 - Improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 – Southwest (Ronkonkoma Hub Project (CP 8156). I do have several cards, first being John DaSilva. Are you still here, John?

MR. DaSILVA:
Good morning, Members of the Suffolk County Legislators Committee. My name is John DaSilva, I'm a resident of Islip, and I've lived in Suffolk County for 43 years. I'm here today to humbly --
P.O. GREGORY:
Could you, please, talk into the mic?

MR. DaSILVA:
Into the mic?

P.O. GREGORY:
Oh, yeah, there you go. It's much better.

MR. DaSILVA:
Good morning. My name is John DaSilva. I am an Islip resident. I've been a Suffolk community resident for 43 years. I'm here today to express my strong support for the approval of the two resolutions before you today. The allocation of sewer funds is one of the most important steps in opening the entire area to new economic development. The Ronkonkoma Hub Project will be the centerpiece of a revitalized central Suffolk -- central Suffolk County. Additionally, this project will provide thousands of jobs and tax revenue for Suffolk County.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion today, and I hope you will support the resolutions and the project. Happy Holidays.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you.

(*Applause*)

And before we proceed, I just want to make sure, Mr. Clerk, that you marked down Legislator Muratore as an excused absence.

Okay. Harris Boshak. Did I pronounce that right?

MR. BOSHAK:
Yes, sir. Good morning, Members of the Suffolk County Legislature. My name is Harris Boshak, and I've been a resident of Suffolk County for 50 years. I'm here today to express my support for the approval of the two resolutions before you today for the Ronkonkoma Hub Project. It will offer many economic and community benefits for both the surrounding community and Suffolk County. The project will be a shining example of how our downtown and transit communities can be transformed into vibrant hubs of economic activity.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion today, and I hope you will support the resolutions and the project. And a Happy Holidays to all.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, sir. Okay. Keith McNamara.
MR. McNAMARA:
Good morning, Members of the Suffolk County Legislature. My name is Keith McNamara. I've been a resident of Suffolk County for over 30 years. I grew up in Ronkonkoma, graduated Connetquot High School. My family and friends, many of them still live in Ronkonkoma.

I'm here today to express my strong support for the approval of the two resolutions before you today. The Ronkonkoma Long Island Railroad Station is the largest on Long Island. Approval of the resolution is essential to creating thousands of construction jobs, millions in new tax revenue for the local community and Suffolk County. This type of transit-oriented development has been proven to spur tremendous economic development in numerous other Long Island towns and communities.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion today, and I hope you will support the resolution to the project. Happy Holidays.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Very polite speakers, I like that.

(*Laughter*)

Dennis Pedra.

MR. PEDRA:
Good morning, Legislators. I'm here to also support the resolutions for the Ronkonkoma Hub. I also grew up in Ronkonkoma, not too far away from the proposed project. I believe the area needs revitalization. I've been following this project probably like ten years now. So I hope you support the resolutions and the project can actually get started. Thank you. Happy Holidays.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. William Hubbs.

MR. HUBBS:
Good morning, Members of the Suffolk Legislature. My name is William Hubbs and I've been a resident of Suffolk County for 60-plus years. I'm here today to express my strong support for the approval of the resolution before you today. The Ronkonkoma Hub Project will be a turning point for the Suffolk County economy and the local community.

Recently, the economic outlook for the majority of small businesses in Patchogue has become much brighter because of the development of New Village. That project revitalized a broad spectrum of small businesses in the area. The Ronkonkoma Hub Project will do the same thing for an even wider portion of Long Island.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion today, and I hope you will support the resolution and the project.
P. O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Kevin Moran.

MR. MORAN:
Good afternoon. My name is Kevin Moran. I am a representative of the Long Island Builders Institute, and I'm going to read off a statement.

The Long Island Builders Institute, New York's largest residential trade organization, wishes to express its strong support for the approval of Resolution 2055, relating to sewer connections for the Ronkonkoma Hub Project, and the allocations of Suffolk County's portions of the necessary funds to participate in the funding mechanisms provided by the private developer for the project.

The Ronkonkoma Transit-Oriented Hub Project will provide a variety of new housing, retail, office and hotel opportunities for a designated area around the Ronkonkoma Long Island Railroad Station, which is a gateway to Eastern Long Island. The target would be to provide a new community focus to development on Long Island, creating a sense of place in which all of the various needs of our residents will be within walking distance of each other. It will provide thousands of construction jobs, millions of new tax revenues for all of our local governments, and will add a new dimension to the area around the Long Island Rail Station.

The allocation of sewer funds from Suffolk County for this project will provide benefits to the Town of Brookhaven, the Town of Islip, the Town of Islandia -- the Village of Islandia, and all of Suffolk County. It will allow for a comprehensive planning process for the installation of a new sewer line to connect this project to the Southwest Sewer District, allow for properties along the line to connect to this much needed sewer program, and do so without incurring any costs upon the current users of the Southwest Sewer District. It will open up this entire area to a new type of economic development, one in which a sewer system can provide necessary environmental protections to our groundwater, and allow companies to locate in the area which -- where they were not permitted before because of lack of sewers.

The Ronkonkoma Hub Transit-Oriented Development has already received substantial support from the New York State Regional Economic Development Council through the appropriation of 4 million for the creation of a regional sewage treatment plant, which will allow for development on both the Brookhaven and Islip sides of the rail tracks. In addition, Suffolk County has provided additional funds for the development of the sewage treatment plant and additional highway improvements in the surrounding areas.

These resolutions, the final stages of pre-- these resolutions -- this resolution, sorry, is one of the final stages of pre-development activity. The Ronkonkoma Hub Project is the next step in redeveloping -- redevelopment of this portion of Long Island, and this resolution is necessary to make it happen. The
project deserves unanimous support from all parties, and we urge you to support the resolution. Thank you much for your time and consideration.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Okay. Kim Filardi.

10:43AM

MS. FILARDI:
Good morning, and Happy Holidays to the Suffolk County Legislators Committee. I first want to say the trumpet player and the Priest were fantastic, so that added a nice point. And congratulations to everybody so far.

10:43AM

My name is Kim Filardi and I am a resident of Suffolk County for 40 years, and I am also here today to express my strong support for the approval of the two resolutions before you today.

10:44AM

The allocation of the sewer funding is a vital part of any major transformation of an underutilized economic area. While the funding is necessary for the Ronkonkoma Hub to move forward, the funding will also benefit dozens of additional economic opportunities in the local area. Suffolk County has a terrific opportunity to demonstrate the foresight needed to benefit all of our residents.

10:44AM

On a separate note, I also want to mention, as a top realtor in the Town of Huntington, I want to express my disapproval of the mortgage recording fees that will negatively affect our real estate market for purchasing and refinancing.

10:44AM

And on a third more personal note, I want to say thank you and congratulations to recognizing the East Islip Football Team. I wanted to congratulate our high school, Half Hollow Hills West Varsity Football Players for winning the Suffolk County Championship on November 19th. And an even more personal note, congratulate my son, Gerald Filardi, who was the sophomore who led that team to victory. So congratulations to them, and also the Freeport team, which we got see in Nassau County as well.

10:45AM

So thank you. Happy Holidays, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you.

(*Applause*)

10:45AM

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Bud Cipoletti.

10:45AM

MR. CIFOLETTI:
Good morning, Legislators. Thank you for allowing me to speak. I do want to start off by apologizing about my hat. It's just a good alternative to a bad hair day in winter.

(*Laughter*)

10:45AM

* Index Included at End of Transcript
So with that, I am here in support of the Ronkonkoma Hub Project. And I'm honored to be up here, because I get to say a metaphor that this project sort of represents. And to me it's the vena cava of Long Island, meaning without sewers, you're bringing deoxygenated blood to a currently blighted area. And with the sewers, not only does it open up this prospect of this project, but it opens up the rest of Long Island to where -- to which where I'm currently house hunting, and having to deal with places that are non-sewer-friendly.

So I'm very happy to be here in support of this, and I'm excited for others like me, the Millenial Generation coming up, that needs support and needs life here in Long Island to continue to thrive and raise our next generations here. And so I'm in support of the two resolutions.

I'd like to say thank you for allowing me to speak, and have great Holidays, everybody.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY: Okay. Thank you, Mario Mattera. Where's Mario? There you are, okay.

MR. MATTERA: Boy, oh, boy, but I wish I could talk about bad hair days, you know what I'm saying?

(*Laughter*)

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, I do.

MR. MATTERA: Easy there. Hi, everybody. Good morning, Presiding Officer Gregory and all Legislators. And thank you very, very much for letting me speak today. And Happy Holidays to everybody, all of your families, safe and healthy. And one thing I got to say is I love this horseshoe, I love everybody here. I know we have different views on certain things, but, you know what, compared to Nassau County, I can't even -- there's no comparison. Everybody listens and everybody understands what we need to do for Suffolk County, how important it is. So, first of all, I want to thank you very much.

My name is Mario Mattera. I'm the Business Agent with Plumbers Local 200, and I represent approximately 1100 members. Eighty percent of our membership lives in Suffolk County, the great place to live in Suffolk County. I am here also, too, representing the Building Trades Council, 60,000 large. We have a great membership. We have our membership here today to support this Ronkonkoma Hub Project, that's very, very important, to speak on Resolution 2055 for the Ronkonkoma Hub.
You know, I sit on Suffolk County Water also, which I'm very, very 
pride of that. You know, it was unanimous that everybody picked me 
to sit on this Board. Had a meeting last night and to talk about 
how precious our water supply -- how it means to us. And I know 
with these sewers, we're not -- still 70% not sewer. We need to 
do better. We need to move forward. We need to move forward with 
what we're going to be doing in Riverhead. But this force main 
right now will hold up progress if we don't do this.

I just saw Mayor Pontieri inside before. That man, what a vision. 
I'm going to tell you something, I commend him. I commend him for 
what he did in Patchogue Village to get that going. He put the 
infrastructure in first, not the cart before the horse. He made 
sure that it was all in line, and look what Patchogue Village looks 
like.

I live in the Town of Smithtown, great Town of Smithtown. No 
sewers downtown Main Street. That's terrible. No sewers downtown 
Lake Avenue. Guess what, Mayor Pontieri made sure that that 
infrastructure was put in place, and look at Patchogue Village. My 
children, I actually have to take them to Patchogue from Smithtown. 
That is a sin. But you know what's not a sin? We're going to get 
this force main to pass. It needs to passed -- well, I wish it was 
going to be passed today. I know in February we're going to be 
voting on this. But, you know, we need to move forward.

You know, this project is called progress. Ronkonkoma Hub, you got 
a builder, local guys, Tritec spending money on infrastructure that 
they shouldn't have to. They shouldn't have to. They won an RFP 
in the Town of Brookhaven. That's all they needed to do was build 
it to buy the building, because guess what, look what Ronkonkoma 
Train Station looks like. I do not even go there, I drive in. I 
want to take the train, mass transit. Look where it's located.

We need this project for the future of Suffolk County. And if 
everybody doesn't think so -- because I want to make sure that we 
keep our young, our middle age, and our seniors here. When 
everybody just says our young, no. Everybody needs to say here, 
because, you know what, we need growth. Without growth, we don't 
have progress. So, please, we need two-seventy -- 2073 to be 
passed today to transfer those monies.

That outflow pipe, how important that is. We got to make sure to 
say, you know, we don't have the money in the budget, no. This 
infrastructure is the most important thing for our future. Without 
the infrastructure we have nothing. But listen to me. I know I 
get excited.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes, Mario.

(*Laughter*)

MR. MATTER:
I just want to wish everybody again a Merry Christmas and a Happy 
New Year. Happy Holidays, Kwanzaa, Happy Hanukkah. All the best
to everybody, and I thank you so much. You guys are a great group of people, and you know what the best is for Suffolk County. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thanks, Mario.

(*Applause*)


MR. NORTON:
I just got to fix my hair.

(*Laughter*)

Hi. My name is Matt Norton. I'm a Business Agent with Local 638 Steamfitters Union. I know a few of you up there. I appreciate the opportunity to speak today to the Suffolk Leg. And, of course, I rise in support of this motion to fund the Ronkonkoma Hub, the sewer pipe for Ronkonkoma Hub. And what it does, as Mario said, and so many before me have said, is what it does is it inspires -- it inspires growth. It makes it able -- it makes the -- it makes the area able to be -- to be built.

Tritec is doing a lot of work on it right now. They're -- they've done their homework on it. And without this pipeline, the project can't happen. So I implore you to vote yes on the pipeline on the sewer treatment -- on the sewer pipe.

And I have about 2000 members that live here in -- about 1200 members that live in Suffolk County, and, believe me, every single one of them want this. And they'd like to stay -- they'd like to stay and work, not just live, in Suffolk County. They'd like to work right where they live, and it's very difficult, so this will -- this will help that. And I appreciate the time to speak to you, and wish you all a Merry Christmas. Thanks.

(*Applause*)

Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. That's all the cards that I have for I.R. 2055. Is there anyone else like that would like to speak on this specific Public Hearing? Please come forward. Okay. I'm going make a motion to recess this public hearing to 2:30, second by Legislator Calarco.

MR. RICHBERG:
Hold on, DuWayne.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:
I wanted to speak.

P.O. GREGORY:
You want to speak?
AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Yeah.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

I don't know where my card disappeared to. I've been sitting here so long.

P.O. GREGORY:

We have one. I have a card for you for the Public Portion.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

For Public Portion?

P.O. GREGORY:

Yes. Do you want to speak on the Ronkonkoma Hub?

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

No.

P.O. GREGORY:

Yeah, this -- yeah, this is a Public Hearing. You have to speak on the subject, that specific subject matter.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Okay, that's fine.

P.O. GREGORY:

Public Portion, we'll get to your card -- to the Public Portion right after this. We're going a little bit out of order today.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Thanks.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. So we have a motion -- about the Ronkonkoma Hub?

MR. MALAGA:

No.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. Just wait. We're getting to you. We'll get to you.

We have a motion and a second to recess I.R. 2055 to 2:30. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:

Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Browning and McCaffrey/Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. Now to the Public Portion. All right. I have Lori Murphy. Are you here? Representing Supervisor Romaine.
MS. MURPHY:
Hi. My name is Lori Murphy. I'm here representing Supervisor Romaine and Councilwoman Jane Bonner. I'm the Legislative Aide for Councilwoman Jane Bonner, and I have a letter to read into the record.

"Dear Members of the Suffolk County Legislature,

The Ridge Motel East has been a blight on the community, vacant and abandoned for more than 15 years. It is not only an eyesore, but it has been the subject of illegal activities, including drug sales, drug use, among other nefarious activities. The motel has been a blight for several years, becoming a home to a large number of squatters, and creating hardship for nearby residents and business owners.

In 2010, the Town of Brookhaven condemned these buildings. Almost three years ago, the County took ownership for failure to pay taxes. However, the County did nothing to secure the site, such as board up the buildings and fence the perimeter, nor have they cleaned up the property, which is strewn with debris. To add insult to injury, the County has allowed a private reality firm to post "For Sale" signs and another sign announcing it is under contract.

There is currently an attempt to redeem this property, despite the fact that several extensions for redemption were granted in the past, as well as submission of incomplete 215 redemption applications. As this Legislature knows full well, redemption at this point is not mandated at, but, rather, one that is optional.

We urge the Legislature to use their discretion and reject any redemption effort at this late date. Instead, we implore you to eliminate this eyesore and demolish this blight that affects the quality of life of the residents of Ridge. The Town has indicated that it will waive fees of the demolished materials that would be transferred to the landfill.

We ask that you do the right thing for the citizens of Ridge and the surrounding community."


P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Okay. We have several elected officials that are here today. I want to get them in and out. I have Mayor Paul Pontieri.

(*Applause*)

Do you walk with your own support? What is that?

MAYOR PONTIERI:
You got to sometimes, you know.

(*Laughter*)

* Index Included at End of Transcript
I'll start out saying Happy Holidays, Merry Christmas to everybody. I hope everybody has a great Holiday. And before I get started on what I'm here for, I support the Ronkonkoma Hub Project also. Get that out of order.

We're here -- I'm here to support the resolution for the jumpstart funds for the reconstruction of the spur, the Waverly Avenue spur, which goes behind -- which is now Briarcliff College, soon to be Blue Point Brewery. It has many, many benefits to the Village, not just to the brewery itself, access to that, but access to the community itself.

Those of you, and I suspect most of you, have been along that spur. When it comes along the lake, it splits up, you have a median in the middle. What the goal is here is to bring the lanes from the north, bring them south, to have two lanes to the south, and to open up the space as green space, open up the lake, and make it, some into parkland. But, also, to create a better flow into the Village, which is as important as anything else.

With the approval and the signing between Brookhaven Hospital and the County, the Dialysis Center, which is at the end of that spur, hopefully, when that moves, we'll be able to get a hotel there. So it's also access to a number of things, and really creating a different entrance into the Village. It's economic development. It's about the whole idea of how do we present ourselves as a community.

For those of you that have been on that, as I indicated, right now it's -- you can't even see the lake from the road. This will open it up, it will open up the views to what is soon to be a brewery.

I've asked Mark Burford, who is one of the founders of Blue Point, and also working with the Blue Point group now, to speak to you a little bit about how it affects them. The biggest piece about this is, is its access to the entire Village, just not access to Blue Point. It is about economic development, it's about growth, it's about creating a safer -- and those of you that know about the intersection on the East End, it's a very convoluted one, we're going back to a traffic circle. It will make access and egress. Fire services now have to come all the way along the spur to go south. This way, with this traffic circle, they'd be able to come south, down into the southern part of the Village and down on to Main Street a lot easier.

So it has many, many benefits, well beyond the one that we're going to speak about for a moment with the Blue Point Brewery. But the Blue Point Brewery itself is an exciting project to the Village. Mark.

MR. BURFORD:
Good morning, everybody. Happy Holidays. I hope you hydrate well over the Holidays.
So Blue Point Brewery, we're down in -- down on River Avenue in Patchogue currently, right? We started in 1998; a couple of years ago acquired by Anheuser-Busch. And so we're going to build a new facility at the Briarcliff property up on the -- in Patchogue, right? It's an exciting facility. It will be the largest brewery between here and the AB facility in Newark, right? It's going to be a tremendous place for people to come visit.

Right now, Toasted Lager, one of our largest brands, the largest brand is available in all 50 states now, and about 12, 15 other countries, right? You can go to Germany, Europe, U.K., South Korea, China, you can drink it. Every one of those bottles says Patchogue, New York on it, every one of those bottles says Long Island on it. So what that does, is it creates a tremendous tourist business for us from all over the world, people come and visit us. We don't currently take big advantage of that because of the small place we are. When we move to the new facility, we're going to have a large tasting room on the second floor, glass windows that look out over that lake. And to see a park there and have people visit us from all over the world really puts a nice positive spin on Long Island.

It's going to be a beautiful spot. People in the beer garden outside are going to be able to look out over the lake, see people, you know, a real beautiful place for them to view Long Island. Long Island always doesn't -- doesn't always get the best vibe around the world. We've done some things in the past, right? So when you bring people in from all over and you give them this experience, it's a real positive thing.

The brewery loves always -- breweries are parts of communities, right, as businesses, they always are connected. We do a lot of marketing, the "Pride of Patchogue" campaign. We do a lot. We're very proud of what we do locally, and so this will be a big piece, an addition, and another addition to the project that will be very positive.

And I welcome any questions from anybody that might have it. And if not, stay hydrated, have a Happy Holiday, and thank you very much.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

So we are past 11. I'm going to make a motion to extend the Public Portion.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Second.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Second.
P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

11:00AM
MS. ELLIS:
Fourteen. (Not Present: Legislators Browning, Trotta, McCaffrey/ Absent: Legislator Muratore)

11:00AM
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I see -- Councilman Cochrane, is he -- there he is, still here. There we go.

11:01AM
COUNCILMAN COCHRANE:
Good morning, Presiding Officer, Legislators. Boy, this is great. This is a lot different than our Town Board meetings. I'm excited to be here. Happy Holidays. I’m here to talk about the customs facility at MacArthur Airport. We need your support.

11:01AM
Five years ago, Supervisor Croci and myself went to Kennedy Airport and met with the Customs facility or Customs agents, because we were having problems getting their agents to meet our international flights at the airport. We've always had international flights, which are considered general aviation flights. We're all familiar with Southwest, which is our commercial side of the house. So when we met with them, they said, "We have some requirements. You have to have a separate area for biometrics, you have to have a retaining room, certain facilities for our customs officers," which we met. And for all of us old people from the airport, their facility is in "The Egg", which is the original terminal for Long Island MacArthur Airport.

11:01AM
Of course, Customs has changed the regulations and now we're out of compliance. So with the Governor, and with you, and with us and the Town, we need your support to build the Customs Phase I facility. And actually today, the Supervisor and Shelley, our Commissioner at the airport, are actually meeting with the stakeholders to find out where the design is.

11:02AM
This, our airport not just benefits Islip, it benefits Long Island, especially Suffolk County. These flights that are coming here are the business flights, or they're the international travelers going out to the Hamptons. They're a Learjet crowd, if they're not business flights. So we -- once we instituted this, we -- all of a sudden, our flights went up to 200 flights internationally a year. We were averaging about 75 before we implemented this Customs facility at the airport. It's worked out for customs, it's worked out for our flights, and now we're taking it to the next level, because we see the pattern of our business, as well as our international flights, coming out to the East End.

11:02AM
So I need your support for funding for helping us with the Governor and the Town to build a new facility. I'm here to answer any questions, if anybody has questions about the airport. Thank you. Merry Christmas, Happy Hanukkah.
P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Thank you very much. Same to you. Supervisor Schaffer. Is he in the room? Okay. All right.

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

SUPERVISOR SCHAFFER:
Thank you very much for the opportunity. I will be very brief. My name is Rich Schaeffer. I'm the Supervisor of the Town of Babylon, 200 East Sunrise Highway, Lindenhurst, New York. I'm here to address and in support of the resolution which would allocate $1,250,000 for the Hall of Fame at the Wyandanch Rising Project. Why that is important is whether or not you agree with the concept of the Hall of Fame, put that aside for a second, but the money that you've all invested into the Wyandanch Rising Project has been a terrific boon not just to the Wyandanch area in terms of coming up with money for building and construction, but also the economics of -- the economic improvements that it's made for a community that's been struggling for many years.

This will allow us to build Building C. There's already two buildings there. The rental is all filled out. The commercial we're halfway done with in terms of commercial retail space on the first floor, but Building C is the critical piece because that links the train station to the transit plaza. We opened the ice skating rink, which you provided money for, last weekend. The Rinx out of Port Jefferson is operating that so we've got a professional operator there, and this third building now will have the Hall of Fame.

But my important part in that is in, the Presiding Officer knows that because he's been intimately involved in our discussions with HRH, and this will allow us to leverage HRH, whose currently in a dilapidated building across the street just south of the railroad tracks. The lease with the County after 30 years has finally expired and I would tell you that I would do anything to get them out of that current space. Since you've gone to the concept of HRH managing your health centers and being able to leverage and move them across the street to this plaza, so this money will be kind of the seed money that we need in order to move and hopefully convince HRH to move. You'll be dedicating eight million dollars on your end for capital improvements. The State's got the eight million dollars as part of the Federal Program, and then we're in talks with several other entities that would bring private money to constructing Building C.

So I'd ask you to support this for the Hall of Fame, but if you disagree or agree with the concept of the whole thing, put that aside and know that you'll actually be accomplishing much more based on what we'll be able to do potentially with the health center through HRH and bringing additional private money into the building. So I'd respectfully ask for your support for that and thank you for your consideration.

Applause
P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you.

SUPERVISOR SCHAEFFER:
Any questions?

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Not allowed.

SUPERVISOR SCHAEFFER:
Oh, you're not allowed? That's a good rule.

(*Laughter*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Village Trustee Bruce D'Abramo.

MR. D'ABRAMO:
Thank you, Legislators. Good morning and Happy Holidays to you all. I'm here to speak in support of the resolution to approve the JumpStart money. The Village of Port Jefferson, where I've been a Trustee since 2011, is very anxious to change the area around our railroad station. It's been a multifaceted thing trying to develop this. We started with a comprehensive plan. We have some housing units that are under construction there as I speak. The Gitto's have built 38 of the 76 units where the old car wash used to be. So if you come to Port Jefferson, I know everybody was there recently for the Dickens Festival, but as you come in through the railroad station it's kind of a blighted area. The Village is in the middle of a blight study. We've put dollar after dollar after dollar into this area trying to get it turned around. It's beginning to move and the 250,000, which your committee has planned, will actually help in the construction.

I brought along a map, which I'm sure all of you can see very closely, but this area here is where the $250,000 from the Suffolk County Legislative JumpStart Program is, you know, going to be used. This economic development -- it's a transit-oriented development. We have the railroad station. We think of Port Jefferson as a regional, you know, jewel in eastern Suffolk County because of, you know, transportation that we offer to Connecticut and, you know, to some of the other roads. So this is a vitally important thing. We thank the Legislature. We encourage you to vote yes this afternoon on that resolution. But we hope that this is the beginning of Suffolk County's involvement. This is a little too big a bite for a small village to take care of, so any help that we can get from the County Legislature is welcome. Thank you very much.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. D'Abramo. Okay, moving into our cards. Our first speaker is David Zere followed by Bill Pearson.

MR. ZERE:
Good morning. Merry Christmas, Happy Holidays. I'm here to speak once again about the tax map verification fees and the proposed
increases. Please do not increase these fees. On the national level, houses are still below 2006 values nationwide by 16% when adjusted for inflation. According to the Long Island Business News, Long Island lost 900 construction jobs last year. The average American has less than $1,000 in savings. There's a need for 100,000 rental apartments on Long Island, which I'm not opposed to, but the young people -- it's because young people can't buy here.

The average buyer has to make a $150,000 a year to buy a $350,000 house. The taxes are probably 10 to 15 grand a year on average on those houses. Housing starts are down 18.7% in November nationwide. Financing is very difficult. Single family home construction nationwide is 828,000 units of housing this year. At a seasonally adjusted annual rate it was 1.8 million in 2006.

Twenty-eight year-olds, according to the Wall Street Journal, make half of what 28-year olds made 20 years ago. Young people aren't qualifying for mortgages. Local building restrictions have increased construction costs and we can't afford to scare more people off of Long Island for both investing and building and buying homes here. Residential building code changes have cost home builders tens of thousands of dollars, in many cases per house, which just get passed on to the consumer.

Recent Health Department changes, take 360,000 septic systems and all of these homeowners on Long Island in those regions may have to at some point upgrade their individual septic systems, and the costs are double of what the old systems cost. The average home builder only makes 9.6% profit nationwide. New York State is 49th in job creation nationwide, and we're 50th when it comes to seniors being able to retire here.

The average income for a Long Islander has not gone up in 15 years, stuck at about $50,000 with minimal benefits, while the average government employee, I'm not knocking anybody here, makes 70 plus thousand with 30,000 in benefits associated with it. Approximately one-third of Long Island of the million-one in the workforce work for Federal, State or local government. We're very top heavy. We have to change direction.

I urge you, please do not vote for these tax map verification increases. It can cost people a thousand or $2,000 extra to try to satisfy a mortgage. You can get hit for another grand or two. It's terrible and I would beg you to next year cut the budget and don't place the burden of making the budget shortfalls on the young people, the senior citizens and the middle class, who bears the burden as the sandwich generation for everybody on Long Island. Thank you very much for your time and again, Happy Holidays.

Applause

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. Zere. Our next speaker is Bill Pearson followed by Denis Noncarrow.
MR. PEARSON:
Good morning. Happy Holidays, Merry Christmas. I'm here to
discuss or explain -- complain about the Legislature giving
themselves a cost of living increase, when I, myself, got a cost of
living increase in my Social Security of .3%. And I believe the
Legislature was making between eight -- about 89,000 a year as of
this year. Next year they're going to be making a $100,885. That
is not a 3% increase. So if the cost of living is an excuse for
giving yourselves a raise, why don't you take a .3% raise.

Number two, you're raising fees on beaches, parks, everything,
right? To make money, I guess, to pay for your raises. That's not
right. I think that people that want to use the parks in the
summer or in the winter for recreational things they should be able
to do it within a reasonable price; $18 for a beach? Come on. And
also the mortgage fees that you intend to do. That's not right,
either. As the gentleman just said, it's not a good idea. It's
not going to bring people here. And there's one more -- no, that's
it pretty much.

There's more to it, but I don't understand how you guys could look
at yourselves when you want to give yourselves a raise like that.
You're part-time employees according to Suffolk. Even if you say
to yourselves I work hard; I did, too. Everybody else here works
hard. They don't give themselves a big raise of 32% and then
complain to the newspaper that they, whatchamacallit, they shouldn't
have told anybody about it. In other words, shouldn't have spoke
out about it. That's not right, either. You guys must have felt
guilty or ashamed.

Mr. Calarco was the Chairman, I believe, or the Committee Chairman
of that -- of that board, and he's the one that made a statement
like that. That's not right. So I believe that you guys should
forgo your raises and turn them over to the other public needs that
we need. In other words, the County's $100 million in debt and you
guys can find money to do that? That's not right. It's not right
at all, not right at all. Thank you. Merry Christmas.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
That you, Mr. Pearson. And just for a point of clarification, we
did check with Budget Review. The cost of living increase for all
elected officials this year .58%.

MR. PEARSON:
Point five-eight percent.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Point five-eight percent, correct. That is not a correct, accurate
number.

MR. PEARSON:
I added up --

D.P.O. CALARCO:
It was .58% and this is a Public Portion and we're going to move on
and we're not having a debate here. Our next speaker is Denis
Noncarrow followed by Michael Collins.

MR. NONCARROW:
Very good. Thank you. Merry Christmas. Thank you all for all you
do. I know you guys work hard and do a good job and you have
difficult times. I'm here from Southold Town. I'm the Government
Liaison Officer. I wanted to thank you for considering the Love
Lane Traffic Study. It's just $25,000 out of quite a bit of money
I know, but it means a lot to us in Southold. Love Lane intersects
with 25. It connects to a lot of roads in that area. There's a
lot of businesses that are connected to that curve that's right
there, and what happens is we are so busy now with, you know, we've
been discovered out there so there's tons of people that come out
and it makes it almost impossible getting into that curve to get to
the businesses that are surrounding that area.

There's about 40 businesses connected to that curve now and they're
doing well, but what happens is when it's a busy weekend the
traffic locks up there. What you hear is tire squealing and stuff
like that because nobody knows which way to go when they entered
into that turn there because there's parking lots, there's a
one-way street. Love Lane comes off that. So we need help to put
together a traffic study so we know what's the right thing to do.
Then we could apply for some other funds to get it repaired. But
right now it's a sticky situation and the civic associations and
the chambers and everybody are asking for help. So if you could
help with that amount of money, that 25,000, to get that study
going, let me tell you, it would really help us out on the North
Fork. So thank you. God bless.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you. Our next speaker is Michael Collins followed by John
Bogack.

MR. COLLINS:
Good afternoon. Michael Collins, Southold Town engineer. I'd also
like to speak in favor of the Love Lane Traffic Study. As Denis
said, Love Lane is a growing business district in the Hamlet of
Mattituck in the Town of Southold. It's a really narrow, local
road that connects State Road 25 with County 48 and a current
intersection with State Road 25. It's located on a wide curve, has
no traffic light, no roundabout and limited pedestrian access.

In addition, heavy truck traffic is prohibited on Love Lane, but
because of the nature of this intersection it's very difficult for
us to install signage, so many of the drivers aren't alerted to
this and inadvertently turn down this narrow street, blocking off
traffic.

So this study will identify solutions in conjunction with New York
State DOT, Suffolk County Department of Public Works and ultimately
will lead to a preliminary engineering plan and drawings, which
will be produced in support of a final project, which will be
designed to include a safe flow of traffic and pedestrians through
the area. Thank you.
D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. Collins. Next speaker is John Gogack followed Tony Aloisio.

11:19AM
MR. BOGACK:
Good morning, all. This is my fourth appearance about the Sayville Ferry license reapplication which is on the agenda for later today.

11:19AM
MR. RICHBERG:
Speak into the mike, please.

11:19AM
MR. BOGACK:
Sure. Can you hear me now? Okay. So when I was here last week at the Public Works Committee, there was supposed to be a subcommittee set up to evaluate the late season schedule, because that seems to be the issue with a number of customers, 600 of them actually. I was wondering if anything's actually happened because I never heard anything formally about the work of the subcommittee and whether they met with the Sayville Ferry on this issue.

11:19AM
LEG. LINDSAY:
Can I say something? Good afternoon, sir. Unfortunately --

11:20AM
MR. BOGACK:
You can't answer? Oh, I'm sorry.

11:20AM
LEG. LINDSAY:
Yeah, I can't answer but I'll grab you off-line. I did have a meeting with the ferry company along with Legislator Calarco's office. I'll speak to you off-line after the Public Hearing.

11:20AM
MR. BOGACK:
After the Public Hearing.

11:20AM
LEG. LINDSAY:
I can go to the back of the chamber with you as soon as you're done speaking. How about that?

11:20AM
MR. BOGACK:
Fine. Then I'll make my comments pretty brief. I think the resolution should be tabled. I don't believe there's been enough public participation in the process. Whatever meetings has occurred between one Legislator and the Sayville Ferry, I'm not sure that it included anyone else besides Sayville Ferry. There are five civic and business organizations in Cherry Grove and Fire Island Pines. Unless all of them were present, I'm not sure any meeting will be valid. Certainly any representations made by the Sayville Ferry to the Legislator would also require some public examination as well for any facts made in reference to their application. I'm sorry you can't comment further, but that's my point of view. Thank you very much. Oh, and one other thing, Mayor Pontiere is quite correct; give him the money he wants. Thank you.

11:21AM
D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. Bogack, and Bill will grab you shortly to kind of go
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over what has occurred. Our next speaker is Tony Aloisio followed by Fran Cohen.

MR. ALOISIO:

Good morning, Legislators, and Happy Holidays to all. My name is Tony Aloisio and I'm the Director of Planning for the Town of Huntington. I'm here this morning on behalf of Supervisor Frank Petrone, who very much wanted to be here, but he just had knee replacement surgery and unfortunately is unavailable. I'm here to speak in support of resolution 2117, which would provide 1.1 million 250,000 dollars for a feasibility and engineering study for sewers in Huntington Station.

Just to be brief, I'm sure that many of you are aware for a number of years the town has done and spent a lot of money on planning studies to help benefit both the economic well-being and social well-being of Huntington Station. We have placed in that corridor, which is basically south of the railroad tracks, the appropriate zoning that would support mixed use development with retail development, commercial and some residential development on top. We have entered into a contract with a master developer for that entire area, which includes also the north end, north of the railroad tracks, which does have sewers and now we're trying to really complete the picture by having the sewers south of the railroad tracks for about a half mile stretch.

I can tell you as Director of Planning I've worked and had many discussions with property owners and developers who are interested in doing something south of the railroad tracks in Huntington Station. The zoning, again, is appropriate. Again, near one of the best and most active train stations in Suffolk County, Huntington Station of course, but the one main component that really keeps on coming up and that is preventing development and bringing through a lot of the desired objectives that we've had over the years is the lack of sewers. This study -- and just to note, where we do have sewers north of the station in Huntington Station we are having interest and we are breaking ground on new projects for this coming year.

So, again, I'm just asking again on behalf of the Supervisor that you provide this study money so that we can move forward and reach our objectives in Huntington Station. Thank you very much.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Thank you. Our next speaker is Fran Cohen followed by Joe Jankowski.

MS. COHEN:

Good morning, everyone. I'm here today to speak about the affects of our current Tethering Law. I would like you all to imagine for a moment spending the day in your own yard, it's summertime, the kids are playing, maybe you're gardening. But imagine on the other side of your fence sits a dog within arm's reach chained within a few feet to a doghouse by his neck, never let in the house or even to run around his own yard. You can hear it barking and crying and you know it's most likely suffering. It's out there all day and
night in all kinds of weather. No one plays with it, and the
neighbors barely go in the yard. You know it's suffering; how
could it not be?

You call the authorities because you know this can't be right.
They tell you there's nothing they can do. They can't possibly sit
for two hours to witness the dog under the current two-hour No
Tethering Law. Most Police Departments never even heard of this
law so they tell the average citizen there's nothing they can do.

Weeks and months go by, it's now freezing and winter. Maybe you
don't live in a neighborhood where your neighbors do this, but they
are in your neighborhood, they are everywhere. This is one dog.
She lives at 48 -- she lives in Wyandanch. She's a beautiful dog
that craves the same attention your dogs do. She sits 24-hours a
day chained to a doghouse slowly, slowly going insane. There are
other dogs on the property she cannot play with, not stretch her
legs, not cuddle together for warmth. Never goes to the vet. She
sits in her feces, in her urine and garbage and most likely is
surrounding by rats. She can't get away from anything because she
is bound by the neck. They even have puppies in these conditions.

This is the reality of thousands of dogs here on Long Island. Two
years ago we passed a two-hour limit on tethering dogs. To date
not one ticket has been written, not one dog has been removed from
its chains. Our local authorities refuse to get involved. Excuse
me. Sorry, I'm upset. I believe these horrible owners would not
even own these dogs if they weren't allowed to be chained outside
because they probably would not take them in. We pay the highest
taxes in the County -- in the country. We can do better than this.

Tonight I would like you all to think about these sweet, beautiful
dogs that crave the same attention our dogs do. Think about her
when you go to sleep at night and it's 10 degrees and it's too cold
to even take out your garbage. Remember this dog, freezing and
lonely for companionship and someone to sit with, virtually going
insane because she can't move. Maybe she's tangled around a tree,
maybe she is ill. Maybe her house is wet because the snow and rain
is blowing in. They slowly die on the end of these chins, slowly,
horribly over years, maybe months. And think about how easily this
can be changed with a 100% No Tethering Law. This is antiquated,
it's barbaric and it's unacceptable. Thank you.

Applause

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Ms. Cohen. Our next speaker is Joe Jankowski followed
by David Flynn.

MR. JANKOWSKI:
Good afternoon. On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Long
Island Music Hall of Fame, I would like to thank the Suffolk County
Legislature for this exciting opportunity and potential funding
through the JumpStart Program. As you may know, we have been in
discussion with Suffolk County and the Town of Babylon for
approximately two years about establishing a Long Island Music Hall
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of Fame Museum in Wyandanch and this potential funding, which will help support the infrastructure and build-out of the museum, will have a significant impact on our efforts.

Our plans are to build a museum that will showcase exhibits honoring our fellow Long Islanders and inductees, highlighting educational initiatives for students of all ages, focusing on community outreach with free and open to the public concerts, speaker series, visits and tours by Long Island schools, visits by our inductees and so much more.

We anticipate the museum attracting visitors from throughout the tri-state area, with the majority from Suffolk and Nassau Counties as well as Brookhaven and Queens. In addition, we plan to partner with New York State and Suffolk County tourism initiatives to bring in visitors from across the country, and the world, to learn about the exceptional music history the region has to offer. Within the museum will be interactive exhibits honoring the history of Long Island music, classroom facilities, a state-of-the-art performance and lecture space and a variety of historical artifacts on display. Beyond our walls we intend to continue to bring music to surrounding communities, as we did this past summer with our first free summer concert series held in Bay Shore and Wyandanch, and for which we received support from Suffolk County through the Cultural Competitive Grant process.

In addition to this, we have completed numerous education initiatives across Long Island over the past two years, including an educational speaker series focusing on music education, music business, music composition and other specialized topics. We also awarded scholarships to several graduating high school students, providing support as they embark on their journey towards higher education.

For 2017 we have budgeted additional money to expand this scholarship initiative and plan to open the application process in early 2017. We also honor and respect the efforts of our music educators throughout Long Island by presenting an annual Educator of Note Award to educators who go above and beyond for their students, schools and surrounding communities. In the upcoming months we will also announce the first recipients of our High School Recognition Program, designed to highlight the exceptional work that is being done at the level to support young musicians who have aspirations of becoming the next Billy Joel, Aaron Copland or George Gershwin.

The history of music on Long Island lends so much to the cultural fabric of the committee. From the late 1800's through today every genre of music, from early jazz, blues, classical, rock, pop, rap and hip-hop has found its home only miles from this building. With your support we hope to move this project closer to reality in order to execute our mission, to celebrate, recognize and preserve the exceptional music heritage of the Long Island region. Thank you all for your time and I look forward to your support.
D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. Jankowski. Our next speaker is David Flynn followed by Jeff Ehrhardt.

11:30AM
MR. FLYNN:
Good morning, Mr. Presiding Officer and members of the County Legislature. My name is David Flynn. Thank you for the opportunity to speak this morning. I'm the Town Planning Director for the Town of Smithtown and the Town Supervisor, Patrick Vecchio, asked me to speak on his behalf in support of the resolution for the County to invest $200,000 to complete a plan for the downtown of Kings Park.
Kings Park has a downtown that has suffered over the years. The Town and the County have spent money on an ad hoc basis to try to make the business district better. A few years ago the County started a plan for Downtown Smithtown and Kings Park. While that plan was underway, local civic organizations and the Chamber of Commerce engaged in their own plan. A few weeks ago they asked the Town Board to adopt the plan. However, the Town Board could not really adopt it because SEQRA needs to be complied with and the plan does not address some areas of concern that need to be addressed.
The Town believes that the $200,000 would help create a plan that would result in a better downtown and ultimately a better Town and a better County. Thank you for the opportunity to talk. If there are any questions you can either ask me now or later. Thank you.

11:32AM
D.P.O. CALARCO:
There are no questions during the Public Portion. If it's a point of reference I could let you go quick, but no questions.

LEG. KENNEDY:
(Inaudible)

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Our next speaker is Jeff Ehrhardt followed by Faud Faruque. Go ahead, Jeff.

11:32AM
MR. EHRHARDT:
Good morning, everyone. Very grateful to be here in this chamber before you all. I'm Jeff Ehrhardt, a 21-year-old college student at Stony Brook University right now. I'm a junior and I'm here to speak in opposition to any resolutions or legislation that pertain to increasing fees on mortgages, applications and transactions.
I'll give some perspective, maybe it's a slightly different perspective from what you're used to hearing. We've all heard of the brain drain, we read about it, hear about it. Perhaps you have a family member who is experiencing difficulties that are stemming from the brain drain issue. I'll tell you that I'm a very active student on the Stony Brook University Campus, heavily involved with many different groups, and the conversations that we have on campus are very real. It's not just when or it's not just if we're moving off of this Island after we get our degree, it's when we're moving
and where we're moving to.

I have a friend who just got offered an internship, a paid internship with GE, not here, right, down in Florida. I have plenty of friends who it's a serious conversation. It's -- we look around and we see, you know, prices for rent for apartments that are completely, you know, exorbitant prices. No young person is paying it. And then you're here to introduce new, you know, Legislators who want to introduce new fees and taxes on something like a mortgage, which is going to negatively affect first-time home buyers. In five or six years the peers that I'm referring to on campus, we're going to be looking to buy a home and these fees that we're talking about introducing are going to harm -- they're not conducive to keeping young people on this Island, which is what we hear about all the time.

I understand that we need infrastructure projects and we heard earlier sewage projects to revitalize downtowns and the funds -- and we need money to fund those projects, however, I strongly urge any and all Legislators to consider more creative and different ways to find the funding for these downtown projects as opposed to harming the very people that you're trying to keep here in the first place. Thank you.

Applause

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. Ehrhardt. Our next speaker is Faud Faruque followed by Anthony Camadeo.

MR. FARUQUE:
Hello. I'm going to try to keep this as brief as possible. My name is Faud Faruque. I'm also a student from Stony Brook University. I'm 20 years old and a junior and I'm here to speak in opposition to the proposed mortgage hikes. As Jeff just pointed out, in the future like a lot of our peers at Stony Brook University, there's 25,000 people there and approximately 40 to 50% of the people there come from either Suffolk or Nassau County. And a lot of the students there, they do not feel that they can live on the Island come graduation or come post degree. It's too expensive to live here. I mean, if I asked a question saying like hey, how many of you know someone who moved to Florida or North Carolina, almost every single person here could raise their hand saying yeah, because it's too expensive to live here they moved down south.

So I'm just going to say that this is a bit -- as a young person who would like to keep living on this Island, I grew up here, to live on this Island, the proposed hikes would make it like almost detrimental for me to ever see like a future of me like buying a house here. When I get a job I'm probably going to have to look towards living in like South Carolina or North Carolina where it's much more affordable. So for like a better future for the next generation of millennials and people even like a couple of years younger than me, I would urge you to please look into this and, yeah, vote with your conscious. Go against it, please.
Applause

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you very much, Mr. Faruque. Next speaker is Anthony Camadeo followed by Lance Reinheimer.

11:36AM

MR. CAMADEO:
How are you doing? I want to thank you all for having us here today. My name is Anthony Camadeo. I'm a 20-year old undergraduate student currently attending Stony Brook University. In regards to the mortgage fee proposal, I want to make sure you're aware of your actions and how it's going to affect millennials and all homeowners across the Island. The average home here already costs 70% more than the average home than in the rest of the country. As for property taxes, they are quadruple the national median. According to the 2010 census, our grocery costs are 23% more, transportation costs are 13% more and health care 19% more.

Now, your justification may be that we make more money on the Island here to justify these costs, except that's not true. According to the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average weekly wage during the third quarter of 2014 was $1,022 in Nassau County and $1,031 in Suffolk County. The national average was $949.

Although it may seem that $300 is a small drop in the bucket in terms of purchasing a home, where do these fees stop? If your goal is to continue driving people off of the Island, then congratulations, you're on the right track. Thank you for your time. I hope I made my point clear that the youth and future homeowners of Long Island do not support your proposal. Thank you and Merry Christmas.

Applause

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you. Our next speaker is Lance Reinheimer followed by Andrea Bonilla.

11:38AM

MR. REINHEIMER:
Good morning. Lance Reinheimer, Executive Director of the Vanderbilt Museum. I'm here to speak on behalf and in support of IR 2079, which is a capital amending -- or a capital appropriating resolution for $115,000 to restore and renovate the inner dome of the planetarium. Part of the planetarium renovations that were done in 2013 included improvements to the roof, to the exterior roof of the building that was leaking. Over a period of time those leaks have stained and damaged the inside dome of the planetarium. So this is part of the ongoing renovations to the planetarium, which actually is the economic engine for the Vanderbilt.

11:39AM

We have 105,000 visitors each year and 80 to 90% of them come because of our planetarium. We're doing really well this year. If any of you saw in the paper we have twilight tours coming on the 26th and 27th of December. We're selling tickets on-line. We've sold over 250 tickets as of today. So we're doing well, and by keeping the planetarium looking its best, doing its best, it helps
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us economically survive into the future.

I also want to take a brief moment to thank the Legislature for your support during this past year, continued support. I appreciate it. We just took delivery of our ADA compliant van which was purchased through the Capital Program. We received it earlier this week and we're using it on the property. It's got a space for a wheelchair-bound person to bring them around the property and I appreciate all the help and support that this Legislature has given the Vanderbilt over the many years. Thank you very much. Merry Christmas, Happy Holidays, Happy New Year and thank you again.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Lance. Our next speaker is Andrea Bonilla followed by Hector Gavilla.

MS. BONILLA:
Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. My name Andrea Bonilla. I am here on behalf of Source the Station and the Huntington Station community. We are a place making organization to discuss the revitalization of Huntington Station, and on behalf of all the members and Huntington Station community, I'd just like to speak in support of the start up funds for a sewer study and engineering feasibility in Huntington Station. Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you. Our next speaker Hector Gavilla followed by Ian Artist.

MR. GAVILLA:
Hello, my name is Hector Gavilla. I'm a Real Estate broker and I'm speaking out against any increases in the tax map verification fees. And I am very impressed by the young men who spoke here earlier who are attending Stony Brook University. I hope that you're listening and I hope that they also remember to vote next November, to vote anybody out who is in favor of increasing fees that are hurting homeowners.

Now, last week DuWayne Gregory mentioned that he's a new homeowner, so congratulations, sir, on buying your new home. But what you may not understand is that it's not just a $300 increase. What's happening here is that you are changing the fee to $500 per mortgage instrument. So, Mr. Gregory, if you ever decide to refinance your home, you will have to pay $500 when you satisfy the loan, when you pay off the first loan that you have. And then you'll have to pay another $500 to get the new loan, hopefully to get a better interest rate and a lower monthly payment.

But what I'm basically saying is that you're going to have to spend $1,000 just to refinance your home. That's crazy. And also what's crazy about it is that it's the same fee whether your loan is a $200,000 loan or it's a $2 million home. So I know many of you are representing districts where they're financially struggling, and I deal with this every day with homeowners who have to move, and they're moving to other states like North Carolina, South Carolina, and they're telling me on a daily basis that they want to modify...
their mortgages and they just can't afford these mortgage payments. So now we have to go to them and say well, on top of that you're going to have to pay an additional thousand dollars even if you think about modifying that mortgage. That might be enough for them to say the heck with this place, I'm moving out of here.

And also, you are not going to get that revenue because what I just explained to you, the refinancing market may go down. So this money that you're projecting to make, which is $30 million -- I don't know if people in the room realize this, but the reason that Steve Bellone is proposing this resolution is to try and fill a $30 million gap in the budget. But that will be unsuccessful because you're hoping that people will continue to refinance and they will continue to get new mortgages, they will continue to get lines of credit. So this affects every mortgage instrument that is out there. So we will be back here again next year adding more fees to the mortgage, recording fees and other fees, and just keep adding on and on.

What we have here is not a revenue problem. What we have here in Suffolk County is a spending problem, and you need to go to your department heads, the different various departments, ask them, sit with them in a room and ask them how can we cut expenses? What can we do together? Nobody does that here. Your answer is just let's add more fees to the residents of Suffolk County and that is disgraceful. Remember this, when you're refinancing a home, you're buying a home for yourself or for your families, and also remember this next November when we are going to drain the swamp in Suffolk County. Thank you very much.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. Gavilla. Our next speaker is Ian Artist followed by Larry Foglia. Mr. Artist? Source the Station, Mr. Artist.

MS. ARTIST:
Hello. My name is Con Artist, but I'm not a con, I am an artist. So no con intended. I'm here on behalf of Source the Station. I live in Huntington Station. I've been living there for almost ten years and the Revitalization Program is ongoing, alive and we need sewers. Everybody needs sewers. We are civilized people and we really don't want anything like the bubonic plague to carry on. It will help everyone, all the surrounding towns, the surrounding villages, countries, everything spreads out. So, please, approve of whatever is needed so that we can go ahead and have the sewers in Huntington Station. The Revitalization Program is to help people. We are a very diversified area, and maybe this may help so that people don't defecate outdoors anymore. Okay. Thank you and I wish you all protection and health for yourself and families.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you. Our next speaker Larry Foglia followed by Debora Thivierge.

MR. FOGLIA:
Good morning. My name is Larry Foglia. I will be reading a letter into the record from Stephen Searl from the North Shore Land
Alliance, but this is in reference to Introductory Resolution 2106 about the PDR on Fox Hollow Farm. But I am also the farmer and the landowner and the trustee for some of the land of this farm. And Legislator Stern has the -- this letter to distribute.

So "Dear Suffolk County Legislators. My name is Stephen Searl and I'm the Director of Conservation at the North Shore Land Alliance, a non-profit conservation organization that serves the North Shore of Long Island. The Land Alliance works on protecting and preserving in perpetuity working farms, natural lands, green spaces, groundwater and historic sites on the North Shore of Long Island.

I'm here today to speak in support of Introductory Resolution 2106, authorizing an appraisal for the purchase of the development rights on the six-acre portion of Fox Hollow Farm in South Huntington. The existing farm is a total of ten acres and has been continuously farmed by the Foglia family for over 50 years. Over the years the farm has transitioned from horticultural production and nursery stock into organic vegetables. The family currently operates a community supported agricultural farm with 100 members. They also have a farm stand and a market and market their produce through local farmers markets.

Fox Hollow Farm is in the Suffolk County Agricultural District and receives a New York State agricultural exemption. Like many farms in Suffolk County, it is an important resource for the local community and beyond. Over the past several decades it has provided a source for jobs for many young people. It has provided many vegetables and plants for local customers, and the farm surplus produce has sourced many of the areas local food pantries. The farm may seem small in comparison to some of the larger farms out east, but it is an important one given its history and the fact that it's one of the few working farms left in South Huntington.

In terms of the proposed sale of the development rights, the owners are offering six acres that cover two separate parcels, one owned by the Foglia Family Trust, and an estate that needs to be settled."

I'm going to interject here that if the current adjudication on Chapter 8 had not taken place we would have submitted for 7.4 acres, but we had to remove the supportive structures from the proposal.

"Both parcels are in the process of being sold to the ELIJA Foundation, which stands for Empowering Long Island's Journey through Autism, a non-profit dedicated to improving the quality of programs and services available to children with Autism. ELIJA will continue and expand the farming enterprises at Fox Hollow Farm, keeping it an active, vibrant farm just as it has been and provide work experiences for young adults on the Autistic spectrum."

There's just a little bit more in the letter and you will all receive a copy of that. Thank you.
D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. Foglia. Our next speaker is Debora Thivierge
followed by Sondra Cochran.

11:49AM
MS. THIVIERGE:
Good morning and thank you for having me speak. My name is Debora
Thivierge and I'm the proud parent of an 18-year old diagnosed with
an Autism spectrum disorder. I'm also the founder and Director of
the ELIJA Foundation and the ELIJA school, which is a 501(c)3
non-for-profit organization. My foundation and the school are my
life's work. In 2001 I started the ELIJA Foundation, which is
currently the largest educational organization on Long Island
dedicated to disseminating science-based practices in Autism
treatment to parents, caregivers and professionals. We have
educated and advocated for hundreds, if not thousands, of
individuals over the past 15 years.

I'm here today to let you know that our progressive mission that
Larry Foglia just shared with you in supporting transitioning
adolescents and adults in vocational work opportunities through
community supported agriculture. Today on average 80% of
individuals with developmental disabilities are unemployed
according to the most recent 2015 Autism Indicator Study done by
Drexel University. Right now one in 68 children are being
diagnosed with Autism, with the rates continuing to climb. Our
society will be hit with a tsunami of needs as this community ages
out of education and into public support system and we need to
start problem-solving.

Although our farm project is small in nature, as Larry said, to the
needs of our society today, securing the centrally located,
beautiful and valuable farmland will protect it from being
developed and provide valuable opportunities for the community and
the diverse population we serve. To continue our commitment and
dissemination of empowering knowledge, Fox Hollow Farm will be a
pilot program for learning. For the past two years we've been
working together with the farm owners making -- to try and make
this vision a reality. Although I don't have farming experience, I
have a passion for making vision into reality, and I've learned so
much in my two years working with the Foglia family. I don't know
if you know them well, but they themselves are a treasure and
they're master educators at farming, but most importantly, masters
of how to live a meaningful life. With their knowledge and
dedication to the Huntington community there's no better place for
this project to take place.

We have a young, experienced farmer handpicked and they will be
doing training over the next couple of years and we hope that our
team at ELIJA will be able to provide an opportunity for young
adolescents and adults to be able to transition on to this farm.
It's very important to acquire this property as quickly as
possible. The adjoining parcels will create ten acres and the PDR
that we propose will help maximize production, preserve the entire
farm and keep it intact as it has been for the past 50 years. It
will provide us with the financial support for sustainability over
time. We hope you will support us in making our vision reality.
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Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak today and Happy New Year to everybody.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Debora. Our next speaker Sondra Cochran followed by Joseph Sabla.

MS. COCHRAN:
Is it still morning?

D.P.O. CALARCO:
You've got six minutes left.

MS. COCHRAN:
Good morning. My name is Sondra Cochran. I'm the Executive Director for the Wyandanch Community Development Corporation, I am the business manager for the New Shiloh Baptist Church in Wyandanch, I'm a member of the Wyandanch Rising Implementation Committee member and most importantly, I'm a 46-year resident of Suffolk County.

I'm here today to support the Long Island Music Hall of Fame located in Wyandanch Village. There's a resolution for financial support for that project, as Supervisor Schaeffer said earlier and the young man from the Long Island Music Hall of Fame, he made some very good points. So I'll keep it straight and to the point.

Between 2002 and 2004 the Town of Babylon citizens of Wyandanch and other key agencies had several community meetings for a visioning plan to bring the downtown back to life. These meetings led to the adoption of a plan which addressed programs and projects that will make the hamlet safe, walkable and provide housing and business opportunities, ultimately supporting economic growth and sustainability. The plan is referred to as the Wyandanch Rising Implementation Plan. This vision and plan included provisions for the Wyandanch area to be a cultural arts designation, which was identified by Wyandanch, the Town of Babylon and studies performed by consultants as an important piece to the success of the community, to bring the community back to life and the overall success of Wyandanch Rising itself.

A cultural arts master plan was recently completed, showing the average facility like a music hall may take in over $800,000 a year through programs and projects, foods and goods. Therefore, a positive economic output and a net positive economic outcome with an overall financial benefit ranging from 1.6 -- over $1.6 million a year. Most importantly, the study noted that art is not only a tool for economic and community development, it is totally necessary for improving the overall quality of life, attracting and retaining talent in the community and is a positive -- is positive for creating a good image of a rising community.

Your support is appreciated, and keep in mind that the project will help a long-term, blighted neighborhood to be transformed into -- into a neighborhood with increased safety, pride, opportunities, a transit-oriented development that's surrounded by decent houses and
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businesses, increased property values and economic growth. It's not said that often, but Wyandanch Rising was -- it opened a door for other communities for transit-oriented development in Suffolk County. It was deemed a spotlight community a few years ago by Governor Patterson and from there it's grown. I've heard people talking about Ronkonkoma and other stations that are building up. They're building housing around the communities and the transit and this is a good thing, but we have to remember that all aspects of the growth in a certain type of community is important, including the cultural. Thank you. And Happy Holidays.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Ms. Cochran. Our next speaker Joseph Sabla followed by Linda Henninger. Joseph Sabla from Fort Salonga Road? Joseph?
Okay. Next speaker is Linda Henninger. Linda, Kings Park Civic Association?

MS. HENNINGER:
Hi, sorry. I'm Linda Henninger representing the Kings Park Civic Association this morning and I'm here to ask for your support on Resolution 2117. The funds provided will help our community move forward with the revitalization of our downtown. It will not only help our community and the County economically, but also environmentally. It is our hope that as we move forward in our quest to revitalize our Main Street sewers will be, must be, part of that equation. These funds will help us move the ball down the court. Thank you very much.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you. Our next speaker is Linda Klampli, oh she's coming, followed by Carol Kolar.

MS. KLAMPI:
Hello, good morning. I stand here again this morning to advocate for the chained dogs of Suffolk County. I am speaking on behalf of all the dogs that live chained 24 hours a day, seven days a week, in freezing temperatures, snow, blizzards, rain, scorching heat, suffer fly bites, heartworm, parasites and daily neglect. These dogs are chained in the corner of yards, fed whenever the owner wants to. Often these dogs go for days with no food or water. There's no footprints in the snow, so we know no one's been out there. They never have clean water, suffer from extreme boredom, frustration behaviors, aggressive tendencies, all from living chained.

This is Queenie, currently living in Wyandanch. Our volunteers keep an eye on her through our Training Wheels Program. We deliver food, straw, clean the area they're living in. Luckily, two of our volunteers went out last Saturday and found Queenie so tangled to a tree she was having trouble breathing. Our volunteers were unable to free her due to the chain being so tight. They banged on the door with no answer, they called the police who finally showed up after the owner returned and kicked us off the property. This is how they live.
Meet Rico. He was taken in by our rescue after living on a chain 24 hours a day. He lived chained on a heavy tow chain, was outside during that freezing cold weather. He is now safe and warm with us. He will be fed every day and have access to clean water all the time, the basics for survival.

I invite you all, again, to come out with us and see what is going on in these backyards. See the misery and loneliness these dogs experience every single day. When a human approaches they often are so out of control and happy to see someone they jump all over them. The response they get from the owner often is screams and yells and hits the dog to get them down, all part of a vicious cycle of neglect and mistreatment.

In the last ten days a local ACL that we work with has taken away ten dogs from one house, two dogs from the same -- from a different house, two dogs from that same house, two of which were euthanized due to being in a horrible condition, 24 Rottweilers and a dead dog chained to a tree -- in the last ten days. I'm not a humaniac. I'm not one of those freaky people that you see, you know, I'm a realist. I live this every single day. I don't -- I don't take this lightly. I hope you all have a nice holiday because they won't. They're still going to be chained. This is how they live. Thank you.

Applause

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you. Next speaker is Carol Kolar followed by James Britz. Carol Kolar from Sayville? Military health care? Carol? No? Okay, not seeing Carol, my next speaker is James Britz. I've been informed James had to leave for a meeting, but he did leave some comments for the Legislators to read. Our next speaker is Alexander Albrecht. Alexander Albrecht?

MR. ALBRECHT:
Good morning. My name is Alexander Albrecht. I'm Carlos Lauro's son. I'm 21 years old and as of December 2015 I'm a graduate of Suffolk County Community College. I have an Associate's Degree in Business Administration. I was born and raised in Suffolk County. This is my home, and I'm standing here before you today on behalf of my grandfather, Eugene Lauro's Living Trust, hoping that you guys will grant my family's request to redeem the delinquent taxes at 1019 Middle Country Road in Ridge. The property has been in my family for over 30 years. So how did we get to this point? Due to forces beyond our control. I know it sounds like a convenient excuse, but it's a documentable fact.

This property was originally a lucrative investment. To briefly summarize the ordeal that led to us falling behind on the taxes, in 2007 we had a tenant that had defaulted on their lease. They left the property in disrepairs. My father was fortunate enough to be awarded a judgment of close to a million dollars to make the repairs, however, the entity had dissolved and we were unable to collect the money. We attempted to lease the salvageable portion of the facility. Unfortunately it was unsuccessful and it was
I've watched my father work industriously towards finding a resolution. He's made many sacrifices. I've been too young to have the ability to really assist my father. I've been there to support him, but financially the best I could do is come up with about $20,000, which is pretty much my life savings from working various part-time jobs over the years as I was a full-time student.

Now, for a proposed solution, executing a contract of sale we have with the Foley family, who is a successful local Real Estate entrepreneurs, who Patrick Cantone, who I hope will have the opportunity to speak, that brought to us. He's a Real Estate agent himself. I see this as a win/win for all the parties involved. It will cover our delinquent taxes, it will create jobs and it will give my family some peace of mind. Not only that, it will revitalize the property, and I believe this will address the concerns of the woman who had spoke on this issue earlier. As for myself personally, it would give me a sense of security and the opportunity to continue my personal growth and pursue my career and educational goals. Thank you in advance for your consideration and Happy Holidays to you all.

Applause

Mr. Cantone:
My name is Patrick Cantone. I'm a local real estate broker and I represent the Estate of Lauro on the property at 1019 Middle Country Road. I've been working on that property with them since 2013, which in 2013 we did find a tenant to rent it which started minor renovations on Building A. They put new windows, new doors, got the electric all hooked up, tiled the floors in the bathrooms and just ran out of funds. They were waiting for a grant to get money to do more renovations to the property. They weren't able to pay their lease and they had to be evicted. We put the property back on the market again for sale, which we finally got a buyer about four months ago that's in contract with that's going to renovate the place and we are working with the veterans association. We have about 18 veterans that are looking to be housed there as soon as the property is done.

This property is supposed to be closing within the next couple of weeks, but recently the County has boarded the property up and it's held up the sale right now. So the owner is trying to redeem the property back, which the funds would be coming from the closing, and the property will be renovated and as well as this property has not been -- it's been vacant and vandalized but there's never been, in the last four years that I've been working on the property, anybody staying or living in the property. We're there constantly. At least once a week we're over at the property checking it and we've been showing it quite often. And, again, there's never been anybody, any vagrants living in the property. And hopefully you
allow them to redeem the property, this way it can get renovated and we can start with housing that I know we desperately need. Thank you very much. Have a good Christmas.

**D.P.O. CALARCO:**
Thank you. Our next speaker Carlos Lauro followed by William Kokell.

**MR. LAURO:**
Good morning. My name is Carlos Lauro. I'm still overwhelmed with my son's speech. Let me say this to you. I did what I could. I just couldn't go against the economy. This recession was just cruel. I'm hoping you can end -- I'm trying to pass on a legacy from my father to my son. As a combat veteran myself I have issues that I have to deal with on a day-to-day basis, which I don't want to broadcast or make too public because I'm not exactly happy with it but it's -- look, it's life.

I would be very grateful for this body to consider the option that we have before us to redeem ourselves so we can all go on with our lives. That will be a wonderful thing, wouldn't it? I hope it's not too much to ask, but life can be cruel and the County can be horrific. As an individual with my kids being young, I felt like I was fighting a battle single-handed and of course I did not win. So I'm here as a wounded veteran, as a wounded individual, hoping to appeal to your better senses to give my family the opportunity to redeem themselves once and for all, so maybe I can go to my grave saying that I was able to achieve or win my last battle.

Thank you for your consideration. Thank you for your thoughts and I wish you nothing but the best and God Bless you all. Thank you. Have a Happy Holiday and a Merry Christmas. Take care.

**Applause**

**D.P.O. CALARCO:**

**MS. LENNON:**
Good afternoon. My name is Lillian Lennon and I'm a volunteer for RSVP Inc., Animal Welfare and Rescue located in eastern Long Island, Suffolk County. I've attended these meetings numerous times before to be one of the many voices advocating on behalf of our Suffolk County animals who are often abused, neglected and forgotten. My colleagues that have spoken before me addressed some of the dogs that are chained in the Wyandanch area. We also deal with this in eastern Long Island in the Riverhead area and the North and South Fork communities, very similar. I didn't bring pictures but we have pictures just like that.

The purpose of my speech this morning is very simple. We would like to make Suffolk County a non-tethering County going forward based on the evidence put forth before you today. I don't know what more evidence you need to see what's going on in our neighborhoods around us. Maybe not your particular neighborhood,
but it's all over Long Island.

Legislator Martinez e-mailed me after our meeting on November 22nd and specified that she'd spoken to a few of you, her colleagues, regarding drafting such legislation and more important, enforcing it. We would like stricter penalties for individuals who neglect and abuse animals. And, finally, we would like Roxy's Bill to be drafted to enable law enforcement to have the tools necessary to gather the appropriate evidence to prosecute such individuals.

Before I walked in here I was told by Legislator Browning that Roxy's Bill had passed, and then she said that Legislator Martinez is working on it. We are very confused. Please enlighten us as to the status of the bill since we were not informed or included in drafting Roxy's Bill's legislation. If it has been drafted and/or approved we weren't part of the process, so that confused me a little bit. This is not rocket science. It should not take this long. Roxy died in the spring and we are still waiting for a response from the Legislators who had agreed to make this happen. We would like to be part of the process.

And finally, as we celebrate the pending holiday season it is easy to forget what is most important. If we do not right the wrongs of those who hurt our children and our animals, then for me these seasonal festivities lose their meaning and become hollow. How can we celebrate while living things suffer all around us and we turn a collective blind eye pretending we do not see. You saw today. You saw the pictures. You can't turn a blind eye to that.

As I ask you today to make a special New Year's resolution for 2017, can we please make this year where we stop talking and start doing something about this disgraceful practice on behalf of some of our fellow Suffolk County residents who choose to inflict pain and suffering on our children and our animals. It all goes together. When the animals suffer, the children suffer. All right. You have the power to make it happen. Let's make Suffolk County the most humane County in this State, in this country. I wish you a blessed holiday.

Applause

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Ms. Lennon. Our next speaker is Joseph Latini followed by Chris Cuddihy.

LEG. SPENCER:
Happy holidays.

MR. LATINI:
Merry Christmas, Happy Holidays. The Public Portion is hard for you folks, I understand that, believe me, especially if you have prostate issues. This has been brutal. So thank you for your attention. I brought you a Christmas present. I don't know if you can take a look at it before you vote. It's a closing statement from a customer that we had that closed in April, before the proposed hikes that are coming out now for the recording fees. And
what it shows -- it's interesting. It actually shows about the law of unintended consequences. Listen, I've been listening to some of this stuff. Economic issues are bipartisan. This is not a partisan issue. This is how do we do something a little better than what we have before us. Okay? Unintended consequences.

The young lady that I'm passing around a closing statement for bought a house for $260,000, modest house, and used a grant from New York State to help pay for closing costs because she is of low income. Okay? Those grants are considered second mortgages, forgivable second mortgages. So for a $9,000 grant, what this bill will do is essentially charge this woman $650 to record her second-- her grant of closing costs. About seven points you're going to charge this woman to record at the County the grant that the State gave her. What the closing shows is after your $200 increase last year her recording fees just to the purchase a modest home, just the recording fees at the County, came out to $890. Recalculated for what you're about to vote on today, it would be $1855, a $965 increase.

We've -- listen -- look, there were 60 football players up here and we took a picture of them. And ten years from now I'm glad you took a picture because their parents are going to be looking at it crying because those kids are going to be in South Carolina or somewhere else. Legislator Krupski, I know this bothers you. Legislator Hahn, I know you bought a house recently where I used to live. Listen, please, I'm begging you, Legislator Lindsay, Legislator Stern, D'Amaro, you can vote no on this. Vote to table this. Do something. I will help you. I do a great 90-minute seminar on budgeting for my business partners. You're all welcome to come. But this here, a no vote will help us to draft something bipartisan. I will do what I can. Please vote no, vote to table. Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you. Our next speaker is Chris Cuddihy followed by Wendi Stranieri.

MR. CUDDIHY:
Good afternoon. Thank you very much. Chris Cuddihy, Vice-President of AME and Legislative Liaison. I'm here to speak on behalf of the 8,000 members of Suffolk County AME who support the need for a reoccurring revenue stream in Suffolk County's 2017 budget. It's a tough deal. It's a hard choice that you have to make, but we truly support you. All that we've recommended and lobbied over the years for a General Fund tax increase, AME is truly in favor of a recurring revenue stream, such as the mortgage fee and the increased park fees. This is vital funding resources for essential services our County and its residents deserve.

These fees represent roughly 34 million in recurring revenue with a great majority of that revenue being drawn specifically from, as we've heard, the mortgage tax fee. We as Suffolk County residents and taxpayers understand that this path to recession recovery for all of Suffolk County residents has been long and hard, and no fee
increase is easy to ask for, and we understand how difficult that's going to be for this entire body. But to continue to serve Suffolk County and its residents we must have the necessary funding to keep the lights on, the streets plowed, our veterans, seniors and children cared for.

The members of AME strive to serve all of Suffolk County and to supply the exceptional and essential services the residents deserve and also have come to rely on. It's in this desire to continue to provide these exceptional and essential services to Suffolk County residents that we at AME, the largest public sector union in New York State, ask for your support and we offer ours, from the proposed recurring revenue vital to the delivery of those services the public needs, deserves and that we continue to provide. Thank you very much. Have a great holiday.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Chris. You, too. Our next speaker is Wendi Stranieri. Wendi? No?

LEG. STERN:
She's gone.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
She's gone. I've been told she left. Then we have Cesar Malaga. And Peter Florey will follow Cesar.

MR. MALAGA:
Good afternoon. My name is Cesar Malaga. I'm at 11 Maplewood Road, West Babylon. First, I would like to thank Presiding Officer Gregory and Legislator Lindsay for proposing to decrease the number of Legislators in Suffolk County from 18 to 13. As you remember, you know, years ago, I know many of you are still young here, we had 10 Supervisors. It used to be the Board of Supervisors. That's it. We didn't have any other expense like rent of an office here, office there, assistant to the, you know, to the Town Supervisor. We didn't have any of that.

I read a study in 2008. At that point I come -- in 2008 it was close to $7 million that the Suffolk County Legislature was spending. Today it must be now over ten or $12 million a year. That's a lot of money. We cannot afford that amount of money. So let's decrease the number of Legislators from 18 to 10 as they used to be. Let's go back. You know, we don't have the money.

Now, the other thing I would like to talk about sewers. There was only one Legislator who said hey, the Southwest Sewer District residents are not going to pay for the connection for the schools for that area. We paid for that. We mortgaged for that. Now we have monies surplus that the County Executive is borrowing every year to, you know, for his budget. That surplus money should return to us, the Southwest Sewer District residents who paid for the construction. And now the Southwest Sewer District was built with 10% overflow. Now, if we start hooking up this other people, we might be over that amount and we'll have sewer problems. And I do not know whether you have allocated some money concerning, you
know, if we have another Sandy storm. The sewer plant might be
destroyed.

And the other thing, open land. You know, when I came back from
Switzerland back in 2002, something, Steve Levy had a plan to use
those 400 acres that we had at Yaphank. You know, I saw in Europe
that they had plots -- the County's or towns allocate 10 by 25 by
50 or a 100 plots and rent it to the residents so they can farm.
And that's what you have here. We should not be building any more.
The more we build, the more things we need in the County and that's
going to be lots of money. So would you keep, you know, our open
land.

The last thing I would like to know, we have an all -- funding all
-- Railroad Avenue, Little East Neck Road. We have too many
accidents, too many accidents continuously. No one wants to do
anything about it.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Mr. Malaga, your time is up.

MR. MALAGA:
Just one minute.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Mr. Malaga, I kept everyone to three minutes. I only have a few
cards left and I would like to give everybody an opportunity to
speak before we break for lunch.

MR. MALAGA:
Right. Give me one second.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
No, your time is up, Mr. Malaga. Thank you very much.

MR. MALAGA:
Who will provide --

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Legislator McCaffrey as your representative will be happy to speak
to you about the issue. He'll meet you outside of the horseshoe.

MR. MALAGA:
Thank you very much.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
You're welcome. Our next speaker is Peter Florey. Peter Florey?
Has he left? Okay. I'm told Peter Florey had left. Our next
speaker is Keri Michel, followed by Jim McGoldrick.

MS. MICHEL:
Good afternoon and Happy Holidays Councilwomen and men. Thank you
for this opportunity again to speak today. I'm grateful that my
topic of concern resonated with some at the last meeting. I would
like to publicly thank Legislator Tom Cilmi for reaching out to me
in regards to the ongoing concerns myself and many other advocates
have regarding the animal cruelty and tethering throughout Long Island.

I have since been able to connect with Legislator Sara Anker's office and have a meeting scheduled this Thursday, December 22nd. I truly hope that we can collectively work together to spearhead the needed reform to Suffolk County Law, Chapter 299, Outdoor Restrain of Pets, and more importantly, the well-needed enforcement of this law.

Dogs, like people, are social animals, yet hundreds of thousands of dogs in the United States live their entire lives at the end of a chain. When constantly tied up outside dogs become lonely, bored and anxious and often denied proper food and shelter. They can also develop aggressive behaviors. A new ordinance would prevent dogs in our community from suffering a sad, solitary life on a chain. Many dogs across Long Island continue to be tethered with chains and padlocks for extended hours of the day, which is against the law. Chains are often very heavy and short, limiting the dog's capability to move. Collars often become embedded, leading to painful injuries. Dogs can strangle themselves if the tether gets tangled or caught.

Chained dogs are often at risk from extreme weather conditions and can -- excuse me, and can lack food, water and basic care. By following animals -- by allowing animals to be tethered is inhumane. A tether restricts the dog's movement. A tether can also become tangled around or hooked on the dog's shelter structure or other objects, further restricting the dog's movement and potentially causing injury. Tethered animals are restricted to small areas and hard-packed earth or mud and accumulation of their own feces. The dogs can become entangled in the chains or the chains can get hung up in the trees or other obstacles. Because of the neglect, the collars around the dog's necks can cause irritation and rub the skin raw. With many of the animals chained as puppies, as the dogs grow other collars become embedded in the poor animal's necks.

Chained dogs are a public nuisance, notorious for barking. Continuously chained dogs are so lonely and frustrated their only outlet is to bark. When a dog is chained 24/7 he/she does not receive adequate exercise and the lack of mobility is aggravating. The pent up energy can manifest itself to barking. Dogs are social animals. Constantly tied up outside they become lonely, bored and anxious, which can lead to increasing aggression. Research conducted by the Center of Disease Control found that chained dogs are 2.8 times more likely to bite than other non-chained dogs. That number increases to 5.4 times more likely to bite children under the age of 12. Chained dogs often become very defensive of their territory and protective of their small area. We need your help. We need every Legislator's support in the fight to unchain our dogs. Please let us know you are listening and you will help us achieve our plight. Please support No Tethering Law. Thank you.
D.P.O. CALARCO: Thank you, Ms. Michel. Our next speaker is Jim McGoldrick followed by Nancy Porter Libert.

MR. McGOLDRICK: Good morning. I'd like to wish everybody a Happy Holiday and a Merry Christmas. I'm going here in regards to the mortgage fees. I'm going to speak from a personal experience. I have four grown children, they're adults. One of my children have already moved to the State of Florida due to the exorbitant prices of living here. I have another one considering it. This fee is going to not only cost these kids a lot of money in the long run, it's breaking up families. Because of this you really have to rethink this. There's other ways to get money. You have problems and I understand it, I'm with you. Increase the fines on driving without a license, increase the fines of driving without insurance. That's where you should go, not helping people -- not hurting young generation or elderly trying to sell their homes. I would please consider do not vote that in.

You are breaking up many families on Long Island. My children are educated, they're hard-working. They do everything for themselves. A few of them live here. They struggle to pay the taxes. If they want to sell their home and move now it's another thousand to 1800 like that gentleman said. I just don't think it's right to do to our kids. I'm going to get tired of getting in airplanes flying around the country, all right? Thank you. Have a good holiday. And maybe that gentleman that had a problem with the taxes we can do something for him. Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO: Thank you, Mr. McGoldrick. Our next speaker is Nancy Porta Libert followed by Dr. Charles Bevington.

MS. PORTA LIBERT: Good afternoon. Thank you for all you do on behalf of the residents of Suffolk County and thank you for this opportunity to speak to amending anti-tethering. The late, great Mahatma Gandi wisely said a nation's moral compass can be judged by the way it treats its animals. I believe that is profoundly true. Let us never be ashamed to be compassionate, let us never be slow or reluctant to legislate compassion. The images of suffering are many and varied, but suffering is suffering. I urge you to be brave and I urge you to dare. Let us address this amending of tethering and reset our moral compass. A blessed Christmas to you all. Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO: Thank you, Mr. McGoldrick. Our next speaker is Nancy Porta Libert followed by Dr. Charles Bevington.

DR. BEVINGTON: Thank you for having me, and I'm really pleased to be in front of this august body. I want to compliment you. I'm here to talk about Public Works, 2002, the Vector Control. In my work life I'm
area. In the last, I don't know, 20 years I can say non-personnel related I've been able to either increase revenues or decrease costs by about a million dollars a year. That's my expertise. But as I grow towards retirement the environment is my issue, so as President of the Rocky Point Civics Association, as Legislative Chair for the Sierra Club of Long Island, the Atlantic Chapter, I want to compliment you on vector control.

First of all, your increased emphasis on wetlands management and restoration vector control is leading an independent, interdepartmental, intra-agency team to utilize the 1.3 million to improve our Federal funds from the National Fish and Wildlife right out of your budget. I think everyone should know that about integrated marsh management to improve coastal resiliency, and that is key to our changing weather and systems. But one part of that is the Methoprene use, and I have distributed, through my Legislator, Sarah Anker, but addressed to do the Chair of the department. I physically copied -- signed, but electronically. I did some research so -- I know you need an extra 40 pages of reading, I don't think so, but I highlighted pros and cons. But there's a lot of research that needs to be done and it's a health issue.

I came before Dr. Spencer about three years ago with the same issue and I will do the research. I will get funded to somehow do some more research on Methoprene. I don't think it's your only choice, but it's a small part of Public Works but I think it should be considered as an alternative. There are nontoxic uses that can control mosquitoes. And again, thank you very much and have a great holiday.

D.P.O. CALARCO: Great. Thank you. And Happy Holidays to you as well, Doctor Bevington. I do not have any other cards. Are there any other speakers in the audience who would like to address the Legislature at this time? Seeing none, I'll make a motion to close the Public Portion. Seconded by the Presiding Officer Gregory. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? The Public Portion is closed.

MR. RICHBERG: Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Muratore).

P.O. GREGORY: Okay. We're just going to make an announcement. We're going to have an Executive Session after the Public Hearings this afternoon with the County Attorney, and after we recessed for a break for lunch, for those who are interested, we're going to take a holiday picture in front of the horseshoe. Okay? That's our business for this morning. We stand recessed. Thank you.

("The meeting was recessed at 12:33 P.M."")

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

(The meeting was reconvened at 2:30 p.m.)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Good afternoon, Mr. Clerk. Please do the roll call.

MR. RICHBERG:
Good afternoon, Mr. Presiding Officer.

02:27PM

LEG. SPENCER:
(Not Present)

02:27PM

LEG. D'AMARO:
Here.

02:27PM

LEG. STERN:
Here.

02:27PM

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Here.

02:27PM

LEG. TROTTA:
Here.

02:27PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
Here.

02:28PM

LEG. BARRAGA:
Here.

02:28PM

LEG. CILMI:
Here.

02:28PM

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Here.

02:28PM

LEG. LINDSAY:
Here.

02:28PM

LEG. ANKER:
(Not Present)

02:28PM

LEG. HAHN:
Present.

02:28PM

LEG. MURATORE:
(Absent)

02:28PM

LEG. BROWNING:
Here.

02:28PM

LEG. FLEMING:
Present.
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LEG. KRUPSKI:
Here.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Present.

P.O. GREGORY:
Here.

MR. RICHBERG:
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Anker and Spencer/Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Welcome back. We're in the Public Hearing portion. We have several Public Hearings this afternoon, the first being a continuation of I.R. 2055 - Improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (Ronkonkoma Hub Project (CP 8156)). And I do not -- oh, I do. Steve Kopenza? Pezna? Kopezna? Excuse me, sorry.

MR. KOPEZNA:
Enough.

P.O. GREGORY:
I'm doing it phonetically, right?

(*Laughter*)

Please, come forward.

MR. KOPEZNA:
Okay. I just want to thank everybody for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Ronkonkoma Chamber of Commerce on the Ronkonkoma Hub Project. I'm just going to read a statement.

The Ronkonkoma Hub project will provide the opportunity to revitalize a blighted area, creating a vibrant, active community that stimulates innovation and creativity for current and future Long Islanders to live. The project has received support from local civic and chamber organizations, the Lake Ronkonkoma Chamber of Commerce, Holbrook Chamber of Commerce, and also local civic groups such as the Ronkonkoma Civic Association, Lake Ronkonkoma Civic Association, and emergency service groups that include the Lake Ronkonkoma Fire Department.

When fully executed, over $650 million of public and private capital will be invested into the Ronkonkoma Hub. The redevelopment will provide needed construction and permanent jobs to our region.

I just want to add that Rob Loscalzo and his staff from Tritec did an outstanding job planning this. And if anybody's seen those renderings, the architecture is absolutely -- it's stunning, it's really nice.
So I'm going to leave with a statement on my own. Let's get 'er done, in the words of Larry the Cable Guy. And I just want to wish all of you a great holiday. Thank you for having -- letting me have the opportunity to speak.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Thank you very much.

MR. KOPEZNA:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Mary Ann Johnston. There you are, okay.

MS. JOHNSTON:
Good afternoon. Happy Holidays, everyone. I'm here not to throw a wet blanket on the Ronkonkoma Hub, but to remind you that the original SEQRA included non-site sewer treatment plant. And that was one of the reasons that ABCO raised no objections, because a public benefit would yield from that on-site plan, and that the area surrounding it could possibly be connected as well.

We need to take seriously when we're -- how much more we're going to dump on Bergen Point and into the Great South Bay and the Atlantic Ocean; when we're going to fund and/or endorse high density projects that have risen from 450 initial units to over 1450 units. We need to be very clear that there needs to be a public benefit. And the biggest public benefit this Legislature can demand of any developer is that when they want to build high density, they put in state-of-the-art sewer treatment. That is the least that can happen.

There is no benefit to the Ronkonkoma area environmentally by allowing it to go forward and go through other communities, and possibly even hook up Sayville. We have no objection to that. However, SEQRA demands that those impacts be assessed and they have not. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Okay. That's all the cards that I have for I.R. 2055. Is there anyone else that would like to speak that has not spoken already? Please come forward. Okay, seeing none, I'll make a motion to close I.R. 2055.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second, Legislator Lindsay.

MR. MARAFINO:
I'm sorry. Actually, the Administration would like to recess this public hearing at the request of Public Works.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I'll make a motion -- change my motion to recess, second by
Legislator Lindsay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. MARAFINO:
Thank you.

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Spencer/Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. 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? Please come forward. Okay. Legislator Browning?

LEG. BROWNING:
Motion to recess.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion to recess by Legislator Browning on I.R. 1764, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Spencer/Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 1887 - A Local Law to clarify Item Pricing Requirements (Gilmi). I have several cards, first being Charlie -- where did he go? Charlie Gardner. There you go. All right.

MR. GARDNER:
Thank you, sir. Good afternoon. My name is Charles Gardner. I am the immediate past president and current board member of the Kings Park Chamber of Commerce. I'm here to speak in support of I.R. 1887, a Local Law to clarify item pricing requirements.

The current law has been in effect for decades. Consumer Affairs seeks now to expand the scope of this law, and intends to enforce it against hardware stores, paint stores, beauty stores, and other retail outlets that historically have not been subject to the requirements of this law.

Supermarkets were the focus of the original legislation. Almost all the many complaints of overcharging received by the County from consumer were against supermarkets. Supermarkets offer thousands of items for sale, with many prices changing on a weekly basis, and, thus, were the source of almost all of the complaints.

The stores back then were in a transition from hand-stamped item prices to electronic pricing using scanner systems. The coordination of the old system with the new left a lot to be desired. It proved for many to be confusing and difficult. Last week's price stickers remained on items that had not yet been purchased, even though the price might be lower or higher the next week. Simply put, the coordination needed to ensure the same price
was displayed on shelf prices, individual hand-stamped item prices, and the prices entered in the store's computer system was deficient. Thursday night to Friday was a particularly chaotic time due to the weekly prices changes, up and down, going into effect on that Friday.

In supermarkets, also, as we all know, a typical purchase includes many different items, making it difficult for consumers to verify the prices being charged on every single item as they are rung up. Over time, however, the number of complaints declined significantly due to enforcement, and also to better management of existing technology. And last I checked, the number of complaints has remained extremely low, less than one or two a week. That number pales in comparison to the hundreds of thousands of transactions that take place daily throughout Suffolk County.

Also, in smaller stores, price changes do not occur for most items on a weekly basis. Questions about price are more easily answered by store personnel, and a typical purchase might only be a small number of items, making it much easier for the store personnel and the buyer to verify the correct price at the time of the purchase.

This new policy is not consumer protection. It is not the result of complaints or systemic overcharges. Employees of the County are under much pressure to create new revenue streams or schemes wherever possible. It is a means to help balance the budget on the backs of small business owners who are low hanging fruit just waiting to have their pockets picked by the County. It is time to stop the continuing assault on business, especially small business. These businesses are a captive audience that the County needs to stop using as a crutch to help solve its budgetary woes. The business community is not a bottomless piggy bank.

Not only do we support I.R. 1887, we would expand it to exclude other types of small businesses, not just hardware and paint stores. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Charlie. Oh, Charlie, hold on. Legislator Cilmi has a -- several Legislators have questions for you.

LEG. CILMI:
Hey, Charlie.

MR. GARDNER:
Legislator.

LEG. CILMI:
Thanks for being here. So, in addition to being the president of the Kings Park Chamber of Commerce, you said?

MR. GARDNER:
Immediate past. Current member of the board, immediate past president, yes.
General Meeting - December 20, 2016

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. You also worked for the County.

MR. GARDNER:
Yes, I did, for 40 years.

LEG. CILMI:
Forty years. And in what capacity in Consumer Affairs were you at the County.

MR. GARDNER:
I retired as the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay.

MR. GARDNER:
Started as Weights and Measures -- well, actually started as a welfare caseworker back in the day.

LEG. CILMI:
Wow. So it's safe to say that you're pretty knowledgeable about the County's item pricing law and the subsequent waiver policy that was passed and put into place, and, you know, the arguments for and against that happened at that time?

MR. GARDNER:
Yes, I was there, as they say.

LEG. CILMI:
You said during your testimony that the law was intended, basically, to address pricing issues at supermarkets.

MR. GARDNER:
Yes, because at the time we were -- if you go back to the late '80s, early '90s, we were receiving 4 to 500 complaints a year, and almost all of them were against supermarkets, and for some of the reasons that I allege. It wasn't incompetency -- well, maybe a little bit of incompetency, trying to catch up with the technology, but it certainly wasn't fraud, it wasn't intentional. It was just thousands of (demonstrating) hand-stamping. And then Thursday night, Friday the new sale is gone, you got to take all those stickers off, put new ones on, and make sure it's coordinated with the circulars, the weekly circulars, the window price signs and the computer system.

LEG. CILMI:
The waiver that was developed, in other words, the County allows retailers to opt out of having to individually price items in their stores, stock-keeping items in their stores, and in order to do that, you have to agree to -- you know, you have to have inspections, and you have to have a certain level of pricing accuracy, which is also, by the way -- correct me if I'm wrong, but that's required by State legislation as well.
MR. GARDNER:
There is a State item pricing law, that without the County's law, there is a State item pricing law that has been in effect for years, yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Which requires, I think, retailers to be 98% accurate with their pricing.

MR. GARDNER:
Correct.

LEG. CILMI:
Stock shelf pricing compared to the pricing that's at the register.

MR. GARDNER:
Yes, to any advertised price. It might be in the weekly paper, it might be in the circular, it might be in the window sign --

LEG. CILMI:
Right.

MR. GARDNER:
-- or the shelf sign, or the individual item price itself.

LEG. CILMI:
Right. And so would you say that after the County's item pricing waiver law went into place -- what did you see happening at that point? I mean, it's just thousands of dollars that retailers were paying at the time to get out of having to individually price every item, right?

MR. GARDNER:
Yes. It depends on the store size. It goes up to $15,000 in a calendar year.

LEG. CILMI:
And so it was a significant part of Consumer Affairs' revenue, I would imagine.

MR. GARDNER:
I don't have the numbers, but yes. Yeah, that was -- the waiver was instituted the year I was leaving, so it was -- it didn't fully get implemented until after I had left. So I'm not -- I don't have information as to how much money, but, obviously, it's quite a bit.

LEG. CILMI:
And in your time there, you don't recall many complaints from health and beauty stores about item pricing issues, or hardware stores about item pricing issues?

MR. GARDNER:
No. Again I don't --

LEG. CILMI:
Toy stores or anything?
MR. GARDNER:
I don't have exact numbers, but I can tell you without hesitation, almost all of the complaints were against -- were about supermarkets. We did expand it a little bit when the drug stores -- you know, if you can remember back then when drug stores were drug stores, but, you know, the CVS, the Rite Aids of the world started.

LEG. CILMI:
Selling grocery products.

MR. GARDNER:
Selling a lot of grocery -- but, you know, in the beginning, it was one aisle or two. But now -- you know, now, all of a sudden, we were seeing five, six, seven, eight in the larger stores, a lot of the aisles of the exact same items now in competition with the supermarkets. So, yes, they were added to the mix, if you want.

LEG. CILMI:
How did you keep track of a complaint when it came in to your department, typically? Was there a -- was there any sort of written record of that complaint?

MR. GARDNER:
It was -- if you didn't have a written record, you didn't have a complaint, period.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. So --

MR. GARDNER:
It's called a CA4 you had to fill out. The consumer had to -- the complainant had to fill out a CA4 and turn it into the Department.

LEG. CILMI:
Well, I'm wondering, I've requested a number of times of our Consumer Affairs Department to get all of the complaints, the copies of all of the complaints, because they say that there are thousands of complaints on item pricing.

MR. GARDNER:
Thousands?

LEG. CILMI:
I've asked them for copies of the complaints and I can't seem to get them to give me those copies. Can you explain that?

MR. GARDNER:
No. I would -- I mean, in the heyday of when we passed this -- remember, this law was originally passed directly as a result of an untenable situation. There were just -- there were overcharges like you couldn't remember, but even then it wasn't that, it wasn't thousands.

LEG. CILMI:
Right.
MR. GARDNER:
Certainly not, no, no, no. I mean, not even near that number.

LEG. CILMI:
So what was that form, the C --

MR. GARDNER:
CA4. I don't know if it's -- you know, it's a different department now. It might be a different form number. But, again, you had to fill out a form in writing. If we didn't have a complaint in writing, we didn't have a complaint.

LEG. CILMI:
And so what do you make -- what do you make of this new effort to go after hardware stores, paint stores --

MR. GARDNER:
Well, speaking --

LEG. CILMI:
-- cosmetic stores, etcetera?

MR. GARDNER:
Speaking for the member of the Chamber of Commerce, it's what problem are you trying to solve? If you don't have any complaints -- that's why our members -- by the way, the president of my Chamber of Commerce happens to own a hardware store, so he's acutely aware of the policies. If -- what problems are we trying to solve?

LEG. CILMI:
Right. Thank you. Thank you very much, Charlie. Yeah, I think the answer, as somebody pointed out behind the horseshoe, is budget problems, I think is what the answer to your question is.

MR. GARDNER:
Well, true.

LEG. CILMI:
Thank you.

MR. GARDNER:
You're welcome.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
Just so people are clear on this, when you go into a grocery store, they pay a fee every year not to have the items priced individually, is that --

MR. GARDNER:
If they pay -- I believe the law is still the same when we started. You apply for a waiver, you pay the money based on the size of your store. You are then subjected to two inspections, of which you
have to pass at a 98% accuracy rate, and then you are exempt from
item pricing for the rest of only that year. Now next year, you
got to do it all over again.

02:44PM  LEG. TROTTA:
You have to pay it again?

02:44PM  MR. GARDNER:
Again.

02:44PM  LEG. TROTTA:
And that's thousands of dollars in some cases?

02:44PM  MR. GARDNER:
It's a scale. It's a scale. I believe it starts at 500, it goes
to 15,000.

02:44PM  LEG. TROTTA:
For a big store, like a big --

02:44PM  MR. GARDNER:
That's correct.

02:44PM  LEG. TROTTA:
Okay. So now they want to go into hardware stores and other stores
that carry little things and enforce the law or --

02:44PM  MR. GARDNER:
Well, both. Well, either enforce the law and keep going in and
making sure everything is item-priced that they deem -- which sku's
you have to item price, or pay for the waiver and we'll leave you
alone.

02:44PM  LEG. TROTTA:
So they want -- they're going in and asking identify waiver?

02:44PM  MR. GARDNER:
They'd much rather have the waiver, because then they don't have to
do all the inspections, of course. And they just -- it's like --
it's like free money from my members.

02:45PM  LEG. TROTTA:
I've been doing this three years, I've never heard one complaint on
this ever.

02:45PM  MR. GARDNER:
No.

02:45PM  LEG. TROTTA:
So okay.

02:45PM  MR. GARDNER:
No.

02:45PM  LEG. TROTTA:
Thank you.
MR. GARDNER:
You're welcome.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Hi, Charlie.

MR. GARDNER:
I'm sorry, Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:
That's all right. Happy Holidays. Just a couple of questions.

MR. GARDNER:
We didn't have definitions such as that, small. I mean, we just -- the inspections were aimed at supermarkets, the CVS type stores, and then any stores that we might get -- that we might get a complaint. Occasionally, we did get complaints from other than supermarkets and drug stores. But the routine price, item-price inspections were in places like CVS and Rite Aid and all of the supermarkets.

LEG. LINDSAY:
And as an alternative to itemized pricing or buying the waiver, were you able to just purchase -- have a scanner available where customers could walk up to the scanner and read the bar code and it would pop up, telling what the price of the item is?

MR. GARDNER:
Some stores had that, but that didn't relieve you of the item pricing requirements.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Okay. If it did, would your opinion change on the item pricing regulations?

MR. GARDNER:
Well --

LEG. CILMI:
If I may, I believe -- Legislator, I believe it's part of the law. In order to get the waiver, I think you have to have those scanners.

MR. GARDNER:
For the waiver, yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
So it's not in lieu of the waiver, it's part of the waiver.
MR. GARDNER: Part of the waiver.

LEG. LINDSAY: Okay.

MR. GARDNER: You have to pass those inspections and have a scanner available for your customers, which, again, if you're looking at a smaller hardware store, I'm not talking about Home Depot, I'm not -- neither -- they're irrelevant. I'm talking about the small hardware stores of which, by the way, we don't have all that many left. It's -- I mean, I can think of my one in Kings Park. If you got a question, the people are right there. There's -- he's got maybe, I don't know, six aisles, maybe seven. It's not like the rash of complaints that we were getting, Legislator, were because, again, you're in a supermarket, you're pushing that cart up to the checkout, you have -- you've got a $100, 120, $150 purchase. There are many, many different items. There's no way that you could possibly keep up. You know, when you're at the hardware store, may you got three -- you got a couple of light bulbs, you got some batteries, maybe. You're at the check, "Four dollars? What do you mean $4, I thought that was $3." I mean, it's going to be right there, it's going to be taken care of.

LEG. LINDSAY: I'm just laughing.

MR. GARDNER: We don't need government --

LEG. LINDSAY: Right, no.

MR. GARDNER: -- to come in and solve that problem. There is no problem.

LEG. LINDSAY: I was laughing, because I was just in a hardware store with -- refusing to take a cart, because I only needed one thing, with twelve things in my arms, trying to figure out where an extension cord was --

MR. GARDNER: Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY: -- and not being able to find anybody to help me to tell me which was the least expensive extension cord I could just throw outside on some Christmas lights. So, okay. I appreciate your input, Charlie. I respect your opinions based on your past experience.

MR. GARDNER: Thank you.
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right. Next, Hank Brinkmann.

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
Hi. My name is Hank Brinkmann. My family owns and operates a small chain of four hardware stores, all in the County of Suffolk. We've been impacted by this item pricing waiver. I'm here to just show my support for Legislator Cilmi's bill to exempt hardware stores from this waiver.

I can just attest that we don't have an issue. We don't have any confusion as to the pricing on the products in our stores. We don't get customer complaints about a customer is unable to find prices on these products. And it just seems to me like it's another tax coming down, and something that's, you know, not welcomed. It's going to cause a raise in the -- our operating costs, or be subject to paying for the waiver. It's just going to be passed on to our customers, and I don't think it's going to be appreciated.

Suffolk County is not an inexpensive place to live. People are used to being taxed, and I think they're -- you know, quite frankly, they're tired of it. And I guess that's all I have to say.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Good afternoon. How many stores do you have?

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
We have four stores.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Where are they?

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
We're in Sayville, Miller Place, Blue Point and Holbrook.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So, you know, you're a small businessman and you're doing a fair amount of paperwork for the government. How much more paperwork would this require you to do? Is it four times the amount if you had one store, or is it less than that, because you'd have some sort of efficiencies there?

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
To be honest with you, I don't know, but I would imagine there would be some sort of efficiencies, being that we would do the same thing four times.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Do you think one of these two laws would make a change in your operation as far as spending more manpower to comply with or not comply with something?
MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
Well, certainly. If we were exempt from the law, then yeah.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Do you consider yourself exempt today?

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
No.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Okay. All right. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
Thank you. Thanks, Hank, for being here. So this is all new to you this year, right?

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
That's right.

LEG. CILMI:
At some point, somebody from the Consumer Affairs Department, other than the Weights and Measures people who normally come into your store, somebody else came into one of your stores and said, "Hey, you know, you guys are subject to this item pricing law, and you either have to individually price all of these items in your store, or you can fill out this waiver application, write us a check, and you can avoid having to individually price those items in your store," right, and that's basically what they said?

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
Yup, that's right.

LEG. CILMI:
Yeah. Did they tell you if their visit to you had anything to do with a visit or a complaint, complaint, rather, from a consumer?

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
No, they didn't mention that, no.

LEG. CILMI:
You said you have four stores.

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
How much in total are you paying as a result of this item pricing -- have you paid? Have you --

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
No.
LEG. CILMI:
-- applied for the waiver?

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
No, we have not.

02:52PM

LEG. CILMI:
No. So you're just kind of subjecting yourself to the County.
You're actually -- are you pricing these items in your store?
Or maybe you shouldn't even answer the question.

02:52PM

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Maybe you shouldn't answer.

02:52PM

LEG. CILMI:
But Consumer Affairs has been into your store a number of times
since that time?

02:52PM

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
It's very clear as to what the price is of every item in our store,
you know. I don't think there's a whole lot of confusion as to
what the prices are of the items in our store. I have never heard
of a customer, you know -- I mean, we watch everything from -- you
know, we do everything to make our stores as shopable and easy to
shop as possible. It's -- you know, having a price on every item,
or having a price displayed for each item is a fundamental part of
retail. It's -- you know, it's one of the things that make buying
easy. We do anything to make buying easy for our customers. We
very much value our customers. We don't want to do anything to
create a complaint or a negative feeling from our customers. So we
want to very clearly communicate our price to our customers,
because, if we don't, I don't think that that customer is going to
pick up and call the County. I think they're going to drive next
door or just down the road and buy it from somebody else. It's
very competitive out there, and that's why we make sure that we
communicate pricing clearly to our customers. I don't think it's
the County's responsibility to step in and mandate that prices be
clearly displayed, you know, competition does that.

02:53PM

LEG. CILMI:
Right. And so this is costing you how much money, again, that you
didn't have to pay before, if you had -- if you actually did write
the check to the County to get --

02:54PM

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
I believe it would be around $5,000.

02:54PM

LEG. CILMI:
Five thousand dollars. It's really just $5,000, right, it's not a
lot of money?

02:54PM

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
Well, it makes a difference, you know, for a small business.

02:54PM

LEG. CILMI:
I was sarcastic.
MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
For a small business like ours, it does make a difference.

LEG. CILMI:
Of course it does. What happens? I mean, do you -- do you just kind of, you know, take less money in your paycheck, or, you know, what would you do in that case?

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
No. That would have to be passed on to the consumer. And, you know, I feel that, you know, that that's a waste. It's -- you know, consumers shouldn't -- you know, like I mentioned before, you know, it's just another tax. It's just another way of taxing the people of the County, it's -- you know, if you're going to tax the people of the County, you know, you might as well step forward and just tax them, not just do it blindly.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. Thanks for -- thanks for coming out, Hank.

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
Yup.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
Let me get this straight. You're in your store and a guy comes in and says, "You need to item price this or give me $5,000"? Essentially, is that what happened?

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
More or less, that was the gist of it, yeah.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yeah. That sounds like extortion to me.

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
That's what it sounded like to me as well.

LEG. TROTTA:
And I want to apologize as an official of the County that this happened to you. It's disgusting and despicable, and I'm embarrassed that this happened to you. I mean, it's the United States of America, it's not Russia, where a government official comes in and extorts you. You had no complaints, no problems, you're doing your job.

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
Well, it's nice to hear.

LEG. TROTTA:
I'm embarrassed representing the County.

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
Thank you.
P.O. GREGORY:
Lou, did you have a question?

LEG. D’AMARO:
No.

P.O. GREGORY:
Oh, I thought you did. Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr. Brinkmann.

MR. HANK BRINKMANN:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Next I have is Ben Brinkmann.

MR. BEN BRINKMANN:
Hello, everybody. Ben Brinkmann. I’m Hank’s brother. I’m here just to double down on everything that -- the concerns that Hank has expressed, that we run our business, we do the best to run our business as tightly and as cleanly as possible. We do a hell of a job. We’re one of the few hardware chains that are still successful out there, and we’d like to stay that way, and this certainly doesn’t help.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.

MR. BEN BRINKMANN:
I’d be happy to answer any questions.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Thank you. No, no questions. All right. Thank you. That’s all the cards I have. Is there anyone else that would like to -- I see a hand. Okay. All right, Mary Ann.

MS. JOHNSTON:
I didn’t come prepared to speak to this, but I do know that ABCO is a big supporter of shop local. And when you make it harder for hardware stores to stay in business, and local drug stores, against big chains, you diminish that ability to have local vibrant downtowns and business centers. So, realistically, I think you really have to do what Mr. Brinkmann suggested. If you need to raise funds, you need to raise the tax. That’s why the government has the power of the purse. But you can’t keep choosing individual segments of this County’s business community to put the tax on them. This isn’t fair.

We -- I know that you cannot -- open a Home Depot, open a Lowe’s, there won’t be a hardware store within seven miles of that store within six months. Brinkmann’s happens to be one of our vibrant ones. We have some Ace that are vibrant in Suffolk County that are still good. And you need not to discourage that type of business activity, because it employs local people and it makes good economic sense, because they pay their taxes here, they’re not coming out of Atlanta or anywhere else. They are doing their
business here. And when we have companies that do their business here -- I miss my hardware stores. I got Lowe's and Home Depot, and that selection isn't always good. And I'm very distressed that they can just pay a fine, because the whole point of item pricing is for the consumer, not for revenue. Thank you.

02:58PM

LEG. CILMI:
Mr. Chair.

02:58PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes. Mary Ann, Legislator Cilmi has a question.

02:58PM

LEG. CILMI:
Hi, Mary Ann.

02:58PM

MS. JOHNSTON:
Hi. How are you?

02:58PM

LEG. CILMI:
Thank you for impromptu speaking there. I just want to make it clear to you that the Home Depots and Lowe's of the world are not exempt from this law by nature of their size. This is not only applying to --

02:59PM

MS. JOHNSTON:
No, I agree, they're not exempt, but they can pay the fine or the fee.

02:59PM

LEG. CILMI:
But did you know that Home -- in order for Home Depot or Lowe's, or a store like that to get out of individually pricing every single item, they're paying $15,000 per store per year? That adds to your pricing as well, obviously.

02:59PM

MS. JOHNSTON:
Yeah, it's passed on to the consumer. There's one less employee checking prices.

02:59PM

LEG. CILMI:
Or helping customers with the handful of products that they're walking around with.

02:59PM

LEG. LINDSAY:
I couldn't find them.

02:59PM

MS. JOHNSTON:
And as a customer, you walk in there, you don't have a clue what the price is.

02:59PM

LEG. CILMI:
Right.

02:59PM

MS. JOHNSTON:
And that's the whole point of the law, is that the customer has a clue what the price is. It's not there for revenue. Raise taxes, folks. Thanks.
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right. Again, that's all the cards that I have. Is there anyone else? Okay. Tom?

LEG. CILMI:
Oh, motion to close.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion to close I.R. 1887, second by -- by Legislator Cilmi, second by Legislator Trotta. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Spencer/Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I'll make a motion to close 1988.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Spencer/Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 1998 - A Charter Law to Reduce the Number of County Legislative Districts (Lindsay). I have 100 cards. No, I'm only kidding. I have a few cards. Tom Bermel.

MR. BERMEL:
Good afternoon. I'm just responding to this article that came out in the Newsday about a month ago related to call to trim Suffolk's Legislature.

About four-and-a-half years ago -- first of all, I'm sorry, my name is Tom Bermel. I live in East Patchogue. I'm a taxpayer, I'm a disabled Veteran, and I'm a blank, so I have no interest vested here. About four-and-a-half years ago, a source gave me some information that the relatively new County Executive was to slash budgets and lay off employees across the Board in all County departments, and I seriously doubt that they really wanted to cut down on the employees in the Police Department. And I remember saying at the time that, "Gee, I wonder if they're going to cut the
Legislature while they slash employees and budgets across the Board. Probably not going to happen." There was certainly no hue and cry from the Legislature to save any of those jobs that were slashed, although I know that some Legislators led County employees down roads that led to the loss of a lot more jobs at a cost of many, many millions of dollars to the taxpayers. And off the top of my head, I know it was at least $100 million.

Why cut the Legislature? Well, one simple reason would be because they're the most expensive part-time jobs in the County.

I support Mr. Lindsay's bill, but I think it was a little short in a couple of areas. Number one, don't cut it to 13, cut it to nine, and it couldn't come soon enough. And it's very negotiable, because if you had nine, then you could make them into full-time jobs and still save the County many millions of dollars.

I'm sure that when the 18-member Legislature was created many years ago, that the voters had to approve it at that point in time. I really don't remember, it was a little before my time. But I would say let's pass this bill and give the voters an opportunity to make that decision.

I certainly support Mr. Lindsay's bill here today. Thank you for your time, and have a Happy Holiday.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Mr. Bermel. And let me just state for the record, many people here, my colleagues work 30, 40, 50 hours or more. So I don't know many part-time jobs that work those hours. But for some reason, that seems to be the consensus, although mistakenly. Mary Ann Johnston. You're busy today.

MS. JOHNSTON:
Yeah. I thought I'd get here this morning, but I overslept.

(*Laughter*)

Anyway, we have some very serious concerns about adding 35,000 more constituents to the districts, and that's the only way you can achieve this. And, basically, I don't think that it's ever good when you try to shrink the voice of the people. The people need to be heard. It's hard to be heard.

When this Board started, it had 18 Legislators. It had an average of one aide in each district. It now has at least three. So if you add 35,000 more constituents to the remaining districts, you're going to have to hire people, not make savings, and that's realistically what will happen. In the meantime, those 35,000 voters who had access to a Legislator, who lived in their district, was familiar with their concerns and the needs of that district, that voice will be silenced for those people, those voters.

That is not the purpose of what you need to do. You need to first start with your own house. If there are savings to be made in the Legislature, start here. Find ways to do that. Do more with less.
We've have been waiting for that and we haven't seen a whole lot of it. But when you start to say the electors will choose -- will choose their own voters, that's not the way to move. The voters choose their electors, and we have 18 districts, because that's what works. It's comparable to the districts in Westchester, in Nassau County, and in other areas locally in the metropolitan area. Some of them have a few less, some of them have a few more, but none of them have as few as 13 with more than a million-and-a-half people in the districts and in the County.

I also think the projection for growth is not realistic. We look at the tax -- the surveys and the census, and our County is not growing at that rate. So to be providing good constituent service, we need to be accessible, available. And I'm all for full-time positions, except that -- and I know many of you work many, many longer hours than 40 hours a week. But the reality is the public thinks you're working and earning a part-time job. And if you say full-time, that limits what you do on the outside. That means you have to get higher salaries. So I'm not so sure that that will work either.

But, realistically, we're opposed. ABCO, I've surveyed our board and our members and we're opposed to shrinking these districts down. We think that -- and there's, you know, a mixture of some people. If you're going to make it less, why not eliminate it in its entirety? I don't think that would work with the Supreme Court, one vote, one person rule, but some think that's something, go back to the old way. That's not possible. But you expand the vote of the public. You expand your accessibility, and you make -- and you make sure that you can reach those people, rather than --

P.O. GREGORY:
Mary Ann.

MS. JOHNSTON: -- shrinking the districts. I thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Your time's up, but Legislator Lindsay does have a question for you.

MS. JOHNSTON: Sure.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Hi, Ms. Johnston. Thanks for coming in. Happy Holidays to you.

MS. JOHNSTON: Happy Holidays to you.

LEG. LINDSAY: Do you -- have you ever spoken to your New York State Assemblyman before?

MS. JOHNSTON: Excuse me?
LEG. LINDSAY: Have you ever spoken with your New York State Assemblyperson representing you?

MS. JOHNSTON: I have spoken to Mr. Murray on occasion and Mr. Palumbo on occasion, and I met with Mr. Englebright last week. My Assemblyman is Mr. Murray.

LEG. LINDSAY: Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: However, as president of ABCO, I have to deal with all of them, including the State Senators.

LEG. LINDSAY: Have you ever had difficulty getting them to take a meeting with you or returning a phone call?


LEG. LINDSAY: So they don't return phone calls.

MS. JOHNSTON: I waited three-and-a-half weeks to meet with Senator LaValle, and almost a month to meet with Mr. Englebright. They're not always here. So unless I want to travel to Albany, I'm not going to be able to meet with them as easily.

LEG. LINDSAY: Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: You're far more accessible.

LEG. LINDSAY: But if they were here --

MS. JOHNSTON: I know where to find you.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. LINDSAY: If they were here, do you think you'd have difficulty meeting with them?

MS. JOHNSTON: I think that it -- I think that it's problematic, you know, because meeting with them is less of an issue than whether the people who are in their district feel they've been heard. And in many of those districts, they don't feel that way, and I can tell you that quite clearly.
LEG. LINDSAY:
But for what reason? Do you think that they're just not
responsive, or do you think they're just too busy, they don't have
time?

03:09PM

MS. JOHNSTON:
Well, I think if I were to give you a really good reason, it's
because there's no one running against them.

03:09PM

LEG. LINDSAY:
Okay. So you don't think it's due to the fact that they represent
too many people and they don't have time to call people back and
meet with them when they request a meeting?

03:09PM

MS. JOHNSTON:
I think they do the best they can, you know, but there are less
issues prevalent at the State level that impact the local
community. So you're the first level beyond the Town Boards, and
you have the power of the County's opinion, a similar thing with
the sewer district. You know, merging all those people together,
whole people -- whole communities that presently have a voice may
not have one. That would be the unintended consequence of having
done that. And I think if you're going to do it, you need to
really put some very clear thought into it. Bring it out to the
local communities. This is a state that mandates community-based
planning, so you should be doing that, not top down.

03:10PM

LEG. LINDSAY:
Isn't that could kind of what we're doing here, though? We're just
putting this to the voters to say --

03:10PM

MS. JOHNSTON:
But you're putting it to the voters, but you --

03:10PM

LEG. LINDSAY:
Let them decide how they want to be -- how they want to be
governed?

03:10PM

MS. JOHNSTON:
Based on what?

03:10PM

LEG. LINDSAY:
Based on --

03:10PM

MS. JOHNSTON:
To get input from them?

03:10PM

LEG. LINDSAY:
I'm actually getting a lot of input from the people that I
represent in my district.

03:10PM

MS. JOHNSTON:
And?

03:10PM

LEG. LINDSAY:
And that's a result of where this legislation was put forward.
MS. JOHNSTON:
And where are the savings?

LEG. LINDSAY:
The savings are in reducing the number of Legislators. We'd save about $4 1/2 million a year.

MS. JOHNSTON:
And you're certain of that?

LEG. LINDSAY:
I am certain of that. If the Budget Director was there, I would ask him to confirm it, but those are the figures that we've gotten from the Budget Director.

MS. JOHNSTON:
We're not so certain of those figures.

LEG. LINDSAY:
And what are you basing that on?

MS. JOHNSTON:
I had my treasurer look at it, and he said, you know, growth of government does not shrink. You know, if you're going to add 35,000 more people to each of those 13 districts, tell me what you're going to add to the staff of each of those remaining districts. I didn't see that.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Because it wasn't --

MS. JOHNSTON:
But you're going to have them do more with less.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Just like you're asking us to do now, you're asking us to do more with less, just like we're asking the County employees to do more with less.

MS. JOHNSTON:
I'm asking you not -- No, I'm not asking you to do more with less. I'm asking you to leave 18 Legislators in place.

(*Applause*)

And if you need to do it some other way, you need to look at savings there first. But you don't steal the voice of the people.

LEG. LINDSAY:
I'm not looking to steal the voice. I'm looking to give the voice to the people, let them decide how they want to be governed.

MS. JOHNSTON:
When you put that on the referendum, guess what happens. That's not community input.
LEG. LINDSAY:
That's not --

MS. JOHNSTON:
That's not.

LEG. LINDSAY:
This is community input.

MS. JOHNSTON:
It's not.

LEG. LINDSAY:
So the voters voting is not community input?

MS. JOHNSTON:
When someone has to come here at 2 o'clock in the afternoon to tell you what they think, that's not community input. This is a working class County. Those people have jobs. They can't come out to tell you what they think.

LEG. LINDSAY:
No, and that's why you can --

MS. JOHNSTON:
They probably are calling you, Mr. Lindsay, and it's your bill.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yeah, and that's why I meet with them after business hours, and I meet with them on the weekends, and --

MS. JOHNSTON:
And it is your bill. But the reality is our communities -- and we have eight Legislators here who represent parts of Brookhaven. My civics want to keep their reps, they don't want to lose them, and it's that simple, so --

LEG. LINDSAY:
I think that's part of the issue, is everybody --

MS. JOHNSTON:
And we don't know how the geographic would work out.

LEG. LINDSAY:
It would be decided upon -- if the referendum passed and we redistrict in 2020 --

MS. JOHNSTON:
And what districts will be eliminated?

LEG. LINDSAY:
It wouldn't be any specific district. When they redistrict after 2020, which we have to do every ten years after a census --

MS. JOHNSTON:
Correct.
LEG. LINDSAY: -- instead of dividing it into 18 pieces, you divide it into 13 pieces.

MS. JOHNSTON: Thirteen with 115,000 voters --

LEG. LINDSAY: Right.

MS. JOHNSTON: -- in each district, or perhaps less.

LEG. LINDSAY: Which compared a New York State Assembly district, is still about 70,000 voters less than what you have in an Assembly district, which leads to my point, I've --

MS. JOHNSTON: As I said --

LEG. LINDSAY: I've never met someone who's ever had trouble getting their Assemblyperson on the phone or getting a meeting with their Assemblyperson.

MS. JOHNSTON: I think I've already told you that you would have been joking with me. Getting my Assemblyman on the phone --

P.O. GREGORY: Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: -- is difficult.

P.O. GREGORY: Now we're --

MS. JOHNSTON: It's difficult, and I have a very high profile, so I can usually reach them, but I'm sure lot's of others can't.

LEG. LINDSAY: I think that's an issue with your specific Assemblyperson, then, and should be addressed with that person specifically.

MS. JOHNSTON: Right, and I don't think it's relevant here. So I don't even know why we're discussing it.

LEG. LINDSAY: It is, because we're talking about the numbers of people that they represent verus the number of --
MS. JOHNSTON:
And they represent them on --

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, okay.

MS. JOHNSTON:
-- sir, on State issues. I don't want to debate you, but they
represent them on State issues.

03:13PM

P.O. GREGORY:
You're doing pretty good.

MS. JOHNSTON:
You're far more local.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. LINDSAY:
Which they're -- which they're supposed to be local as well, your
local representative, the State level.

03:14PM

MS. JOHNSTON:
They're local as far as State issues. And I think I was here three
weeks ago asking to stay out of County business, really, when they
brought out the drag strippers.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON:
Okay? Thank you.

03:14PM

P.O. GREGORY:
We're going to move on now.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Happy Holidays, Mrs. Johnston.

03:14PM

MS. JOHNSTON:
You, too.

03:14PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. All right. Lisa, you've got a tough job following
that. And then, Don, you're up afterwards.

03:14PM

MS. SCOTT:
Yeah. Mary Ann, you're good on all the topic. This is wonderful.
Happy Holidays to all of you.

03:14PM

The League of Women Voters is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization
that encourages the informed and active participation of citizens
in government, and the Suffolk County League has placed an emphasis
in 2016 on government transparency. Those two aspects of our
mission are potentially affected by I.R. 1998.
Reducing the number of Legislative Districts to save money comes at a potential price, reducing the ability of each citizen to have access to a Legislator who would then represent a larger population. Instead of each Legislator representing about 83,000 residents, their districts would then serve approximately 106 or maybe more thousand.

If the staff and hours are maintained, which one presumes, since I.R. 1998 stressed cost savings, it means there would be 28% more work for that office, or 28% longer response time for constituent service. Or perhaps one out of every four requests or needs, or of each district's residents, would remain unaddressed. In a diverse district, some voices might be ignored.

County level Legislators have a unique ability to serve in a relatively small district, which makes them accessible and engaged. Your role is to make government understandable, open, personal, and responsible.

The Suffolk County League of Women Voters does not have yet a position on I.R. 1998. We think this matter needs further open discussion, not only by Legislators, but also by community organizations who work for the public good in Suffolk County. We urge you to deliberate and discuss. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY: Oh, yes. Lisa, Legislator Lindsay has a question.

LEG. LINDSAY: Just a quick comment. And my plan today is to leave the public hearing open to allow further input from the public, and I would encourage any of your members or any of the community groups that want to weigh in on this measure, as, obviously, it's an important one to everyone in the community to. I would encourage them to do so, so we'll continue to keep the public hearing open and allow them to come to testify.

MS. SCOTT: Yeah, that was what I anticipated. We don't know yet what the calendar is for next, though, right? Those dates will be set after the new meeting?

LEG. LINDSAY: Yes, they'll be set at the Organizational Meeting January 3rd?

P.O. GREGORY: Yup.

MS. SCOTT: Yeah. And just to add, the other district that -- or I should say County that had looked at this was Albany County, has looked at it a couple of times. They have much, much smaller Legislative districts in Albany County, and they keep trying to reduce and the public's been voting against it. But theirs is a more complex proposal affecting their county charters, too.
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LEG. LINDSAY:
I would ask you and your members take a look outside of New York State in what they do in other counties beyond New York. You’ll see counties twice as large as ours with a third less representation, so --

MS. SCOTT:
Well, we like to think New York State and Suffolk County voters are more engaged, more interested. It's hard -- I think it's hard to compare outside of the state, because the dynamics and the politics are or so different. But definitely, yeah.

LEG. LINDSAY:
I would just -- yeah, I would just ask you to look at that as well just to see, because it comes at a cost. And everyone wants the services, but they don't want to pay for the high taxes, so, you know, the two, unfortunately, go hand in hand. So thank you.

MS. SCOTT:
You got a tough job ahead of you. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. All right. Don Seubert.

MR. SEUBERT:
Good afternoon. Don Seubert in Medford. I'm going to have to play with my -- this technology is not my forte. Okay. So I just want to try to get this. I'm sorry, give me a second. I just lost it. I just lost it again. Damn.

The Medford taxpayers is opposed to Resolution 1998. Slashing the County Legislative districts will liquidate and dilute the individual citizens' participation, issues and influence. The Medford taxpayers and civics know well the importance of having a hands-on County Legislature, and colleagues who have the energy and time to listen.

People register, vote, and support people who can and do represent their concerns, especially on days just like this, basically Christmas Eve midnight resolutions. We need more people to better represent us, not less. This resolution will likely result in more electeds' indifference, greater removal from the community concerns, fewer returned phone calls, further dollar stretching of big time political contributions, party chairmen, and real grass root graduate school neighborhood education in each of the diverse communities' wants and needs.

The dedicated lasting vision to make each Suffolk street or hamlet have the deserving quality of life, pride and peace of mind to call it home will be evaporated, best diminished, and exit from the working class neighborhoods. We have dysfunctional density, traffic, safety, taxing, social siting solutions and sustainable problems. Reducing the number of Legislators from 18 to 13 is bizarre. About a 30% increase in responsibility. If you don't have enough work, just tell us.
We see a lot to be done in our community. Do you run -- do you run toward district issues or away? Do you really truly enlighten your constituents, motivate their input, research, present logical evidence and science-based solutions to make legal and economically wise decisions? There is plenty that need to be done. It is usually one person or a small group with an idea. People have lives to live and jobs. This idea could be community policing, roadside litter, save our drinking water, the Central Pine Barrens, overcrowded homes, congregation of laborers, herbicides, pesticides, fertility and possible health risks, dead fish in the Forge River or Shinnecock, use Suffolk Police -- a use of public lands like in Yaphank, solar, wind farms, Suffolk Infirmary, Foley Nursing Home, a dangerous County road, even, landing field jobs at OTB, a preserved tract of land, an historic site lost forever.

We are an island. Islands have limited resources. Your own Planning Department's forecast as to population growth states most towns will increase, even Islip, about 8 or 9%. So I don't know, contrary to what Mary Ann said. But your statistics show us. So what are you going to do, shrink it, expand it, then shrink it again?

You know, we need more than ever enlightened elected visionaries who care to be proud to call Suffolk home. Don't even think about slashing five lights, for even one less will make a difference. So we hope you can please see that we need people to go to. We need you to intervene at the town for us. We could see more. You -- more of you could do that, to go when we have issues. Because it's always one person, but there might be 1,000 others out there. They just don't -- you know, it takes a pain in the neck to come down here and speak in front of everybody.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Mr. Seubert.

MR. SEUBERT:
Everybody feels that way. So I think if you can just please make a Christmas present and remove this from our --

LEG. LINDSAY:
Don't worry, it's not going to pass.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right.

MR. SEUBERT:
Okay. I know it's not going to be voted on, but that's not the point.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Seubert. Thank you.

MR. SEUBERT:
Okay. Thank you.
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P.O. GREGORY:
All right. That's the last card I have. Anyone else like to speak on this matter? Please come forward. Okay. Legislator Lindsay?

LEG. LINDSAY:
Motion to recess, please.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion to recess I.R. 1998, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:
Fourteen. (Not Present: Legislators Anker, D'Amaro and Spencer/Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 2051 - A Local law Amending Chapter 818 of the Suffolk County Code to Modify the Fees which may be applied by the Suffolk County Traffic and Parking Violations Agency (Co. Exec.). Anyone here like to speak on this matter? No? Okay.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Motion to close.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion to close by Legislator Calarco, I'll second.

LEG. FLEMING:
Discussion.

LEG. TROTTA:
Motion to table -- to recess.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion to recess by Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
Recess, that's what I meant.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:
Discussion on the motion to close. There is a motion to close?

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes, there is, yeah.

LEG. FLEMING:
And a second?

P.O. GREGORY:
Yeah.
LEG. FLEMING:
Can I have discussion?

P.O. GREGORY:
Yeah.

LEG. FLEMING:
Thank you. I just wanted to note, I originally voted to keep this public hearing open. I had some very real concerns about the practices at the Motor Vehicle Administration. And I have to say, members of the Bar Association and the Chief Administrative Law Judge, Judge Hinrichs, have looked into it, and I have found the Administration really quite responsive to some of the concerns.

I think the concerns were very real. At the same time, I do think when we think of traffic safety as, you know, the kind of public health crisis that it is, every time you open your phone there's another mangled piece of metal somewhere on the highway, and another, you know, life lost or injured. So I think that it is very important to be aggressive about traffic prosecutions, but I do think that we have to recognize people's Constitutional rights, and that that court should be run in accordance with Office of Court Administration standards.

You know, if we close this hearing now, I understand, I've had assurances from the Administration that meetings will go forward that are really well informed by members of the Bar who practice in front of that court; that I've been assured that I'll be able to ask the questions that I have with regard to the supplying of interpreters, the identification of judges, the scheduling of judges, the practice of honoring precedent and law with regard to the supplying of supporting documentation for prosecutions. All those things need to be scrutinized, and I do believe that there is a willingness to do that, and I'm really pleased about that.

So, you know, you have my assurances that I'm going to continue to be aggressive about pursuing these questions, and I do believe that the Administration has in good faith offered to follow up on some of these issues. So I support the closing of the hearing at this point and moving forward with looking at the fees. And I'd be happy to answer questions in the future with regard to the questions and the solutions that are being proposed going forward. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right. So we have a motion to close, we have a motion to recess.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Second the recess.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion to recess goes first. Roll call.
(*Roll Call by Jason Richberg - Clerk*)

LEG. TROTTA: Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY: Yes.

LEG. SPENCER: No.

LEG. D'AMARO: No.

LEG. STERN: No.

LEG. KENNEDY: Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA: No.

LEG. CILMI: Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ: No.

LEG. LINDSAY: No.

LEG. ANKER: (Not Present)

LEG. HAHN: No to recess.

LEG. MURATORE: (Absent)

LEG. BROWNING: Yes.

LEG. FLEMING: No.

LEG. KRUPSKI: No.

D.P.O. CALARCO: No.

P.O. GREGORY: No.
LEG. ANKER:
No.

MR. RICHBERG:
Five. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

03:26PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Motion to close.

03:26PM

(*Roll Call by Jason Richberg - Clerk*)

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yes.

03:26PM

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

03:26PM

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

03:26PM

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

03:26PM

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

03:26PM

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
No.

03:27PM

LEG. TROTTA:
No.

03:27PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
No.

03:27PM

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

03:27PM

LEG. CILMI:
No.

03:27PM

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

03:27PM

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

03:27PM

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

03:27PM

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

03:27PM

LEG. MURATORE:
(Absent)

03:27PM
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LEG. BROWNING:  
No.

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:  
Twelve. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:  

LEG. FLEMING:  
Motion to close.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Motion to close by Legislator -- oh, Mary Ann, she's back.

MS. JOHNSTON:  
I really don't know if this is related, but I found it to be an ethical -- an ethical issue.

I recently closed on a refinance of my home, and the title company charged me the $300 fee that isn't effective until January 1, 2017. Now whose oversight is there to see to it that I don't have to pay a fee that you haven't even approved yet? I closed on December 7th.

It seems to me that this is a really serious problem. And when you send out any kind of a notice about an impending increase in fees, it has to be clearly understood by the people who are going to charge those fees that they're not permitted to do so, even under implementation rules, until it's filed with the DOS, because it's not a law. And there is no basis for anyone to be taking it.

And they told the title company that the reason they were going to do this is they were three to four weeks behind, and they were going to be charging the fee based on the date of recording the document, rather than the date that the document was presented to the Clerk. So excuse me, but that provides a great deal of incentive not to file the document in a timely fashion, because that provides the funds that you're looking for.

This has to stop. But I'm asking very honestly that you find a way to refund those fees that title companies are charging homeowners in this County to refinance or purchase, a first time home buyer. That three hundred dollars, it's not a lot of money, but it's enough to make a difference, and, boy, it ticked me off. Anyway, thank you.
P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. This is not applicable to this bill and discussion
today, but it certainly is worth taking note of, and we'll get the
information and we'll look into it for you.

03:29PM

MS. JOHNSTON:
I appreciate that.

03:30PM

P.O. GREGORY:
All right.

03:30PM

LEG. FLEMING:
Mr. Presiding Officer, if I could clarify what this bill actually
does.

03:30PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Yeah.

03:30PM

LEG. FLEMING:
Because it really doesn't have anything to do with mortgage fees.
This bill just comes out of the -- what I saw, as Chair of the Ways
and Means Committee, as a failure of the regulatory system to
ensure transparency with regard to conflicts of interest. What
this bill does is clarify and amplify that financial disclosure
statements are not confidential, and that they have to be made
available for public inspection by the Board of Ethics within a
short period of time after disclosure.

03:30PM

This came out of Newsday, actually, FOILing, you know, Freedom of
Information Act request for the financial disclosure form of a
Senior District Attorney, and that still hasn't been made public.
I don't think that's what the law was originally intended to do.

03:30PM

And so the Board of Ethics did come before the Ways and Means
Committee and did a very good job of articulating why they felt
that they were unable to do what I think was the intention of the
law, which was to offer that transparency, so that folks could see
whether or not there was a determination, or they could determine
for themselves whether or not the Senior Assistant District
Attorney had any kind of conflicts of interest.

03:31PM

So there's also -- there are a number of other fixes that this law
does, including that if the Board receives a complaint of
misconduct that isn't in the proper form, they will inform the
complainant how to go about putting it in the proper form, so that
a complainant will get satisfaction with a legitimate request. It
takes the function of the FOIL Appeals Officer out of the Board of
Ethics, because they complain that with both roles in place, they
couldn't -- they couldn't release the form. It decriminalizes the
unauthorized disclosure. There's still a very high fine, but you
don't go to jail. They wouldn't go to jail if they disclosed
something and it wasn't -- it shouldn't have been disclosed. And
then it enhances the penalties for employees who don't comply with
those financial disclosure forms.

03:32PM
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So it really doesn't have to do with what the speaker was requesting, but I think they're important fixes, and I'd appreciate support moving forward. I don't know if I made a motion to close, but I would move to close.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Motion to close.

LEG. HAHN:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I'd like to make a motion setting the date for the following Public Hearing, first General Meeting in 2017, Rose Caracappa Auditorium in Hauppauge, New York: I.R. 1927 (A Charter Law to Increase the Transparency of Asset Forfeiture Funds (Hahn). I'll 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 Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. At this time, we will make a motion to go into Executive Session to discuss the EDF versus County of Suffolk lawsuit with the County Attorney. Second by Legislator Cilmi?

LEG. CILMI:
No, I'm actually -- on the record, I don't agree that we should be doing this in Executive Session.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Calarco to go into Executive Session.

LEG. HAHN:
What is it?
MR. NOLAN:
Well, it's an ongoing lawsuit, which I guess they're still a
possibility of an appeal. So it's a litigation, and I think it's
an appropriate discussion to have in Executive Session.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. CILMI:
I'm opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
Abstentions? All right. Thank you, folks. We are in Executive
Session. Okay. If everyone could please exit the room.
Hopefully, we'll call you back shortly.

(*Executive Session: 3:34 p.m. to 4:32 p.m.*).

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Can I have all Legislators to the horseshoe. Mr. Clerk,
we're just getting out of Executive Session and we're ready to
proceed with the agenda.

I'm going to make a motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

D. P.O. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed?
Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Kennedy and McCaffrey/Absent:
Legislator Muratore)

**TABLED RESOLUTIONS**

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay going to Tabled Resolutions. I.R. 1476 - Establishing County
policy to hire former County employees on preferred lists
(Browning). Legislator Browning? Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:
Oh, I was reading something. Which one are we on?

P.O. GREGORY:
1476, preferred list, Tabled Resolutions.

LEG. BROWNING:
Motion to table.
P.O. GREGORY: 
Motion to table I.R. 1476, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

04:33PM 
MR. RICHBERG: 
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Kennedy.

P.O. GREGORY: 
I.R. 1852 - A Local Law amending Chapter 77 of the Suffolk County Code to clarify application of the Suffolk County Ethics Code to former County employees (Co. Exec.).

04:33PM 
D. P.O. CALARCO: 
I'll make a motion for purposes of discussion.

04:33PM 
P.O. GREGORY: 
Motion to approve by Legislator Calarco. Anyone second?

LEG. ANKER: 
Second.

04:33PM 
P.O. GREGORY: 
Second by Legislator Anker. On the motion, anyone?

04:34PM 
P.O. GREGORY: 
Who's that? Oh, okay, Legislator Trotta. Do you have a question?

LEG. TROTTA: 
Yeah. Just this is the one where you can't appear before the --

04:34PM 
MR. NOLAN: 
Right. This is the -- we discussed this at the last General Meeting where we have in our code a prohibition on people leaving the County and coming back before the agency or department they served. This bill makes an exception for former employee officers who come back on the side of the County, to work for the County. So it would allow former employees to come back, work for the County in a consultant or a contract role, and it would not be a violation of the Code of Ethics.

04:34PM 
LEG. TROTTA: 
Don't we do that already?

MR. NOLAN: 
I know people do come back, but I guess they would like to clean it up and, you know, clear it and make it consistent with the code.

04:34PM 
LEG. TROTTA: 
I spoke with a guy in the Health Department the other day. He retired and he came back and worked.

04:34PM 
MR. NOLAN: 
I've heard that, too.

04:34PM 
LEG. TROTTA: 
So is he violating the Code of Ethics, then?
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MR. NOLAN:
I don't give out those types of opinions.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Hahn?

04:35PM

LEG. HAHN:
And I also know that we've actually written laws, you know, encouraging this in some instances, like when we have Social Services, CPS -- is it CPS where we had retirees, that we wanted to have them come back? And then we were investigating whether it could work for 911 Operators, if we could have some retirees come back.

So, you know, I certainly understand the original intent in terms of not wanting to appear before agencies representing someone -- you know, someone else, but when you're going to help out the County when they need -- you know, whether it be seasonal, or temporary, or part-time, or whatever workers, we need the expertise, but somebody doesn't want to come back in a full-time capacity. You know, I just think that there are reasons we would want to -- this to be allowed.

P.O. GREGORY:
My concern, I think, is if you have high level employees that retire and want to come back as a consultant to work part-time, I think to me that would be an issue, you know? So I think there are certainly areas where we need them. You know, we have -- you know, we talked about some of the emergency operators and some personnel in Social Services and things like that, I think that's different. But if you have someone coming in, you know, and they fill out a -- like an independent contractor, you know, they can be making -- you know, say $70,000, or whatever, as a -- you know, as a consultant to, you know, some department. Where -- how does this bill restrict that, or does it loosen it for those opportunities to occur? I know that happens to some extent now.

MR. NOLAN:
Well, this law would -- obviously, it loosens the restriction. I think the law makes a determination that it's in our Code of Ethics. And while that may not be a great policy, or practice, or the best course, it's not a conflict of interest to have somebody, a former employee come back, as long as they are working on the County side. So that the Administration, or the Department Head, or whoever, has the ability to do this if they see fit, and they're not barred anymore by it being a prohibited conduct in the Code of Ethics.

P.O. GREGORY:
So they're doing it, so there must have been some type of potential issue that came up.

MR. NOLAN:
Yeah, I don't know. I mean, I've heard anecdotally that people have come back to the County who used to work for the County, they're coming back on a contract basis. So I don't know when this
became an issue to somebody in the Administration that they felt they should come forward with this law. But I suppose the issue was raised and it was decided the best course of action was to come here with this bill, but I can’t speak for the Administration, it’s their law.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Yeah. And then I'll get -- Bridget?

**LEG. FLEMING:**
I just think it's important to note that there's already an exception for appearing before a County agency, interacting with a County agency, but there is no exemption for actually working for the County once you've already retired. I know other bureaucracies do it, but I think that's where -- that's where they're trying to now build in this other exemption. I, myself, am opposed to it.

**D.P.O. CALARCO:**
I think my understanding of this, and I know the County Attorney is here, and we've spoken about this a number of times, what has happened, and I don't think it was the intention when the body crafted and approved the legislation creating the Ethics Law, because we have -- it is a matter of course of business for many years, had retirees come back to fill our needs from time to time, whether it's in CPS, or the Health Department, or in the Budget Office for that matter. But I think somebody requested an opinion from the Board of Ethics, and the Board of Ethics declared that those people coming back to work for the County were appearing before the County, and, therefore, were in violation of the law.

So I respect the maybe policy decision whether or not we want to be doing this in terms of rehiring back retirees. I don't think it was the intention of this body when we passed the law in the first instance. And that there really -- the intention was to prevent people who work for the County, whether they were engineers in the Health Department, or DPW, or where have you, coming back and lobbying on behalf of a client, using their inside knowledge of the County in order to do that, or their personal connections in the County in order to do that. And, certainly, it wasn't intended to prevent somebody coming back and working for the County in their prior capacity. I just don't think that was the original intent of the law, and that's what this resolution would do, is clarify that issue.

If people have a question about whether or not we want to have as a policy the ability to bring back people, or maybe we want to set it as a policy that we could only bring back people subject to approval of this body, or we only want to bring back people who are filling lower level roles and not management type positions, I think those are policies issues that maybe we should take up in a further piece of legislation that's outside of and apart from the Ethics Code.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
I don't understand that.
P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:
I just don't understand the opposition to it. Maybe I'm missing something here, but -- and to Counsel, just correct me if I'm wrong. What this bill would make clear is that if someone leaves the employ of the County, they could be hired back on the County side.

MR. NOLAN:
Right.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Not to appear adverse or contrary to a County position, but as a person under contract now representing the County's interests.

MR. NOLAN:
Right. The post employment restriction --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Did we do that with our Director of Civil Service?

P.O. GREGORY:
A waiver.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Didn't he retire? Not to single him out. I mean --

MR. NOLAN:
No. He's an employee. He's an employee.

LEG. D'AMARO:
He's still an employee?

MR. NOLAN:
He's still an employee of the County.

LEG. D'AMARO:
But -- so if we want to retain the expertise and the experience of a County employee, who maybe wants to work more on a part-time basis, or on a limited period of time, or for a limited scope, why would we want to go out and hire someone that has no experience? Like it just doesn't seem to make sense to oppose this. More of a clarification in the law, I think, than -- I mean, can -- is it a blanket prohibition right now that you can't do that, or is this just something that's not clear?

MR. NOLAN:
If you're asking me how I read the code, would it prohibit hiring somebody back on the County side, I would say no.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.
MR. NOLAN:
But maybe the Board -- according to Legislator Calarco, maybe the
Board of Ethics had a different opinion.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

MR. NOLAN:
So this would, I guess, be clarification.

LEG. D'AMARO:
But let's just give the Board of Ethics some guidance and say, "Of
course there's no conflict." You know, if you're concerned, as we
know they are with every issue of them, you know, being put in a
position of missing it, if there's an ethical violation, you know,
so let's make it clear to them, that of course there's no conflict
here in hiring back a former County employee to work for the
County, for whatever scope, duration, period, reason there may be.
I just don't see why we wouldn't want to keep the employee pool or
the worker pool as open as possible so we can get whatever
expertise we need. I don't see any conflict with working for the
County. Of course, if it's -- if you're going to the other side,
that's completely different. So I'm going to support this.

P.O. GREGORY:
Anybody else? Okay. All right. So we have a motion and a second
to approve I.R. 1852. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? I'm
going to oppose. I just don't -- I don't know, there's something
about it.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
I'm opposed.

P.O. GREGORY:
I'm sorry, I can't articulate it more than that, but I just -- I
don't know.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Al, feels the same way you do.

MR. RICHBERG:
and P.O. Gregory/Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right. I.R. 1870 - To expand the scope of the Energy
Utility Legislative Oversight Committee (Martinez).

LEG. D'AMARO:
Excuse me. Just note my recusal on the record, please.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Thank you.
LEG. HAHN:
I also need to note my recusal.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Motion by Legislator Martinez -- motion to table, excuse me, by Legislator Martinez, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Fifteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 1890 - A Local Law to further incentivize the creation of affordable housing and to clarify requirements for residential developments connecting to a sewer district (Calarco).

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Calarco, I'll second. On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
This is something that we've had a lot of discussion about over the last couple of years. I really feel strongly that this will result in less affordable housing being built. And it takes away the option of the towns to do any meaningful planning when you could move one or more of the affordable units off site. That's what the towns do, they have options to develop or redevelop areas that they'd like to working with the developer, and this will take away that option completely.

Sitting on the Sewer Agency, the meeting yesterday, I did ask one of the applicants, if you had an option of putting in more affordable housing and having a lower connection fee, they said they would not exercise that option. So, you know, it's not like someone's going to do it every time.

And, also, this lowers the requirement of affordable housing from 20% in a project that connects to a County sewer district to 15%, and I think -- I think that's going in the wrong direction, because right now everyone talks about, "Oh, we need more affordable housing." This is how you -- you guarantee it right now 20%. This is going to -- this is going to lower that to 15%, so I can't -- you know, I couldn't support this.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Thank you. I've had some similar concerns about this proposal. My biggest concern, as we discussed at other meetings, is that the residents of the Southwest Sewer District could be impacted adversely by this. I mean, this changes a whole new set of reductions based on the amount of affordable units. It kind of
accelerates it, and it's kind of gotten away from the view that if
you've got a certain amount of affordable units, that you should
have a corresponding reduction in the connection fees.

And, basically, these connection fees are supposed to be, from what
I understand, to somebody who's been outside the district, to kind
of reimburse the people in the district that have been paying for
that infrastructure for many years. And by way of example would be
the Southwest Sewer District, which I personally have been paying
into for 32 years, and it was before that. So you have somebody
from the outside come in and now gets the benefit of that
infrastructure in the -- just by virtue of our waiving those fees.
And it creates affordable housing that's outside the district that
doesn't necessarily even benefit the people in that district.

So, in many ways, we're not getting the benefit of the affordable
housing. We're getting additional sewage into that sewer plant,
and we're waiving the fees that were supposed to be used to
compensate those people for that.

I understand we all have to do what we -- to encourage affordable
housing, no matter where it is. I'm not being parochial, not
necessarily in my district. I know we need to sewer as many people
as we can, and that's important to me, because I don't care where
it is, that groundwater, if it gets, you know, full of nitrates
or -- it's going to end up in the Great South Bay and affect my
life or my constituents' life one way or the other and we need to
do our part with that.

My big concern here is the amount of subsidies that basically
aren't based on the amount of affordables. I mean, at 20%, it's a
20% reduction in connection fee, but then it continues to go on up.
Twenty-five percent becomes a 26% reduction, all the way up to a
70% -- percentage of affordable houses is an 80%. And if you build
75% of affordable housing in there, that is a 100% waiver of all
those connection fees.

I had spoken to the sponsor about this bill, about my concerns, and
at the last meeting, when it was voted down, that was one of my
objections. And I would really like to see this bill passed, I
really would, I think to encourage any kind of affordables. I kind
of disagree with my colleague, Krupski, I think it should go down
to 15% to allow more people to get involved in this in some sort of
affordable, because there's a tipping point when it makes it worth
their while or not. And I just think that with this fee schedule
in here, it kind of moves that burden up, more so on the Southwest
Sewer District people. But I also have a concern that there are
some projects that are in the pipeline that are dependent upon this
legislation to get passed. And if it doesn't, that they will then
find an alternative, whether it be building other sewer plants or
doing other things that may not necessarily be the best
environmental impact that we want to see, or they might not get
built at all.

And I want to see this development. I think we need more, you
know, affordable housing, I think we need more housing on -- in
Suffolk County. But my concern is the sliding scale that seems to
grow exponentially in there, and that is my concern about this bill. And I know we've had some discussions, myself and the sponsor, about how we can remedy that. And I don't want to not support this bill, which does a lot of the things that helps people connect to sewers, and lowers that number, and potentially brings more affordable units, but my problem is how do we get passed the impact that it's going to have potentially on the Southwest Sewer District people?

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah, thank you. And through the Chair, Legislator McCaffrey, just to follow up with what your comments were and the issue that you raised. So your objection is not so much against the policy of us having a sliding scale, it's more about that the second half of this, if you will, where the relief is higher and higher, or waiver of the fee is higher and higher?

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Yeah.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
My concern is on this hiring, when you get beyond 50%, when we start waiving 50%, 56% of those connection fees, you know. And we have a couple of big projects that are in the pipeline, you can say. And I know they say it doesn't pertain to them, but if we're looking at the Heartland project, and it's got 9,000 potential units, and if half of them become affordable units, then we're looking at a waiver of almost $67 million in connection fees.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right, but would this -- would this bill apply to that project?

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
I don't know. I don't know. And I haven't gotten any real -- I'm told yes, I'm told no. But as I'm sitting here today, I have a problem with that, you know, because I don't think there's enough clarity in there. I mean, we expanded the Southwest Sewer District, that plant, that Bergen Point plant.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
It cost over $60 million, 60 to $70 million to do that, and that was paid for by the residents of the Southwest Sewer District. And the reason that was expanded was to accept future out-of-district connections. And so if we're waiving these fees and we've paid for the expansion of this plant to accommodate these -- the out-of-district sewer connections, and then we're waiving the fees, it doesn't seem fair. I mean, we're taking -- not only we're
taking the sewage, we're paying for the privilege of it. So that's what I'm having trouble with.

LEG. D'AMARO:
I understand your comments and your logic, and I think it's sound. And I think what you're saying is in defense of the residents of the Southwest Sewer District is from a dollars and cents point of view, and I understand that, and I think that makes a lot of sense. However, those very same residents that you speak to have also come to this podium many, many times and complained that their sons and daughters are living in their basements and they have nowhere to go. So I think they wouldn't necessarily object to putting a policy in place where, yeah, they're going to take some financial hit in the sewer district with connection fees, but in return, we're trying to solve another more widespread problem, perhaps, of, you know, not having people fleeing off Long Island, especially younger people that are finding it difficult to stay here for many reasons.

So my question is -- and I understand your point, that at some point, maybe at the 50% mark or maybe higher, where the policy of workforce housing is outweighed by the amount of funds that the district might be losing. But my question is, putting aside this Heartland project, I mean, do we know what the real impact to the sewer district will be based on this sliding scale, the second half of it?

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
No, we don't, because we don't know, you know, what's out there. I mean, we don't know what potentially could be out there, and that's my concern. I mean, I know there's projects that would have minimal impact on this, and I don't see that being a problem.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
But I think if this were to be passed, it needs to be addressed, what my long-time concerns are. I'm concerned about affordable housing. I've got two adult children living at home.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Sure.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
I would love to have them out on their own, but they can't afford to do it. And, as I said, I want to make sure that we keep our waters clean, and that sewer plant does a good job of it. But we've expanded that plant for the purpose of taking outside --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
-- sewage into there. And if those fees are going to be waived, I don't think it's right that that burden fall directly on those --
the residents of the Southwest Sewer District.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right. Well, let me just suggest that taking a large project, which would have the most dollars and cents impact on the sewer district, if there's 9,000 units or 6,000 units being developed, and that developer is willing to make 75% of those units affordable, I'm willing to waive that connection fee 100%. And I think that that will benefit the people living in that sewer district more than the connection fee that's being waived, especially in the long-term.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Listen, I understand the importance of the affordable housing, but I'm not quite sure that the -- you know, the people that I represent in that district that want to create affordable housing somewhere else. I mean, we're talking today about, you know, Huntington wants to expand their -- you know, their sewage into there, and you know where that's going to go. It's going to go, because it flows downhill, and it's going to come down into the Southwest Sewer District. And so every day we're talking about more and more expansion, and we've already paid for it. And it's hard for me to justify to my constituents, the ratepayers of the Southwest Sewer District, that that's a good deal for them. You know, try to build a sewer plant somewhere else. Even where they really need it, they're having trouble. You thought we had trouble finding a place for a casino? Try to build a sewer plant next to you, people don't want it.

LEG. D'AMARO:
No, I agree. I agree.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
And so -- but we're willing to take it. We're just saying don't make us pay for it. And this, what I have in front of me scares me. And unless I can get a commitment from -- you know, that this is going to be addressed, I have serious concerns.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Again, I appreciate your concerns. I just think, as -- and I appreciate your representation of the folks that live in the sewer district, especially because you are concerned about a loss of revenue to them and how it impacts them, and maybe even their tax bill eventually, so that's a legitimate concern. But, again, I think that over the years that I've sat here and listened over and over and over again to residents talk about affordability problems and staying on Long Island, I say I would welcome the largest projects with the highest percentage of workforce housing and I'll waive those sewer fees if you make that commitment to house our young people here. And that's just a policy difference, or maybe we meet in the middle somewhere on all of this. But I'm willing to support this type of legislation and these numbers and give it a chance, and let's see if the workforce housing really materializes. Because if it does not, they don't get the waiver and they pay the hookup fee, so it's one or the other.
LEG. MC CAFFREY:
But, you know, if you speak to these developers, they're saying it's not just the connection fees, it is the fees that the County charges for the Health Department permits and all the other things that equal up almost to what this -- the cost is for the connection fees. So why don't we waive -- instead of waiving the sewage fee, why don't we waive the other fees that are involved in it, and so it doesn't impact the Southwest Sewer District, or minimizes the amount of the impact on the Southwest Sewer District?

So, I mean, if we want to do it, if the County wanted to subsidize it, fine, let's do it, if we think it's that important. But it should be the whole County and not just the Southwest Sewer District, because these projects are going to benefit people that are outside the district, because that's exactly who we're talking about. So we should figure out a way that this burden or this reduction of fees that we're giving to these developers, that that burden from that gets spread over everyone that could potentially benefit from that affordable housing.

LEG. D'AMARO:
And that's another fair argument. And if you put that bill in, I'd be willing to consider it.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
I don't want to hold these projects, I really don't. I know there's some in the pipeline. I agree with other portions of it. But, you know, I would like to see if I get, you know, commitments from other people to address the schedule and look at other ways to mitigate the cost of this, I'll seriously consider supporting the bill.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
Thank you. I have two questions, one I think is a simple question. We pass this today, projects that come before us still have to -- well, projects that are applying for these reductions in connection fees still have to come before the Legislature to authorize, correct?

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
So this sets, basically, a blanket policy guideline for us to follow.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Correct.

LEG. CILMI:
And sets some expectations for the developers.
The other question is more complicated, and I would pose it to you, as the sponsor. Maybe you've -- maybe you've sort of addressed this question in your deliberations here.

A couple of weeks ago, I was at a meeting with respect to the potential sewer ing of Great River, and, in turn, the sewers will go out to Oakdale, Sayville area. And the proposal to the residents of Great River, and I assume it will be similar to the residents at Oakdale and Sayville, was that depending on the amount of grants that the County receives to help subsidize the cost of the installation of sewers, the annual cost to each resident in that community, in the Great River community, ranged anywhere from, I think, almost $900 a year, at a 75% subsidy of cost, to, I think, close to 4,000, or in excess of $4,000 a year at a very low subsidy of cost over a 30-year period. So if we received a 50% subsidy in cost, which is the number that they were sort of thinking they might get to, what that meant to residents of Great River at least was that they were going to pay roughly $1200 per year for 30 years to have sewers installed in their community.

So my question is how do I support this and then go to the residents of that -- those communities and look at them with a straight face and say, "You guys are going to have to pay in excess of $30,000 over the course of 30 years for your sewer connections"?

D.P.O. CALARCO: So I would say those residents are still getting a benefit in that they're not paying a connection fee, I don't believe, and they're going to be paying user fees.

LEG. CILMI: No, no, no, no. In addition to the user fees.

D.P.O. CALARCO: In addition to the user fees?

LEG. CILMI: They're going to pay user fees, but then they're also going to pay for the construction.

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

D.P.O. CALARCO: Sure. Okay. So the construction that's being 75% aided by the grants that we were going to -- that we're looking to receive from the State and Federal government is still 75% aided to get them to being able to apply. So they are getting a discount, just like we're looking to provide a discount for those people who would be connecting out-of-district through this program. So I would say that they're getting something for it. Just like the residents of the Southwest Sewer District right now didn't pay for the complete
construction of the Southwest Sewer District; the Federal

government subsidized that by 80%. So they certainly got a benefit

in terms of other people outside of the Southwest Sewer District

helping them to get the initial installation and construction of

that plan and the sewer lines that run through it.

And any expansion we do, whether it's the Great River expansion,

the Mastic-Shirley expansion, down in Patchogue where we're looking
to do it; all of those projects are receiving some sort of subsidy

that's going to help make them viable because we -- I don't think

that under any circumstances the residents of Great River should or
could be asked to pay the full freight to sewer their community, it
just isn't really a viable -- which is why sewers have not been
done in nearly thirty some-odd years in Suffolk County; it's just

not a viable option.

LEG. CILMI:

Well, I think 75% is, first of all, unlikely. So the amount of

subsidy, while you're right, it is still subsidy coming from either

the Federal or the State governments, it'll be significantly less

than that. And still, they have the potential to have to pay, you

know, $30,000 over the course of the 30 years for their sewer

connections and some of these folks won't have to pay anything or

will have to pay substantially less than that. And at the same
time, a lot of these projects are getting, separately are getting

Federal or State money, they're getting IDA money, so they're being

subsidized in other ways, or they're getting help through Jump

Start money and a variety of other mechanisms.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

So that's the -- I hear you, Tom. And later on in this agenda

we're going to vote on resolutions to appropriate funds for

workforce and affordable housing programs that the County has been
doing for some time, both for land acquisition and infrastructure

improvements, because the County -- and this is another example

where I'm following the way the County's policies have gone on

affordable housing and workforce, has taken a purely carrot

approach and that we offer carrots to the private community to

develop the needed housing that we need in our communities to meet

the needs of our residents, which is a very heightened need. We do

not have -- and we’ve had presentations here by St. Joe's and by

Rutger's University who did a study for us many years ago where we

have talked over and over and over again about us not having enough

housing stock to meet the needs of all of our residents of Suffolk

County. And it's not a matter of us not having it because we want
to purely be a suburban County, because there's a lot of other

suburban counties that have the nix, the right nix of housing

affordabilities to their residents. Westchester County has the

right nix for their residents and they're just as an affluent and

suburban County as we are. So it's not an out of character issue

per se, it's just a matter of us not -- you know, not having had

that development happen. So we are looking for those carrots to

make that affordable housing happen.
And that's what we're getting. We're not just giving a discount for the sake of giving a discount. The discount is to encourage and obtain more affordable housing options, whether they're owner-occupied town houses or they're rentals.

LEG. CILMI:
So ultimately what I'm trying to get passed, and this is sort of a 30,000 foot view, is that we are concentrating here on new affordable housing and trying to make new housing more affordable for folks while every single day our current housing becomes less affordable. We -- and this is almost -- in some ways, this is actually helping to make our current housing situation less affordable, because it's taking costs that would be borne, you know, by the new residents and pushing them on to our existing residents. You know, we continue to pass new fee after new fee and all kinds of increases and, you know, it goes on and on and on. Every day we continue to make our existing property owners and property taxpayers, we continue to make those properties less affordable for those residents, for those existing residents.

And on the other hand, now we're looking to make new housing more affordable.

So I'm not sure where you draw the line. I just know that it's become unaffordable for the average middle class person to live here now. I think we should be focusing more attention on trying to retain those property owners before we start spending more time on attracting new property owners.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
So I think I would disagree with your statement from the perspective that I don't know who these new residents are that you're talking about. Are we talking about bringing people from out of state? I mean, the people who are going to be acquiring and getting these homes that are looking to be developed are people who live in Suffolk County. These are our residents who need to have a place that they can afford to live. I don't disagree with you that affordability in this County is a problem.

LEG. CILMI:
But their parents are moving.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Their parents are moving, they're moving, everybody's moving because we don't have affordable housing for people to live in.

LEG. CILMI:
Well, we're going to have plenty of affordable housing if everybody decides to move and all their houses will be vacant.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
I think we, you know -- I take a different look at the way we have to grow as a County, and maybe this is just a philosophical difference of opinion. But I don't think staying stagnant is something that is -- something that is doable by a community. You either have to learn how to grow and accommodate the needs of the residents that you have or you're going to lose those residents.
So if we're going to sit here and say we do not want to support and see any kind of new development in any place in any way whatsoever because we want to cling on to the past --

**LEG. CILMI:**
Which we haven't said; that's not fair.

**D.P.O. CALARCO:**
We are not going to be able to be as sustainable area as a region. And let's face it, I don't think anybody ever wants to say this; single-family homes are a tax negative. They do not produce the tax revenue to sustain their properties. That's one of the biggest reasons why we have the burden that's placed on our single-family home owners. Because if you have a child in the school district -- if you have two children in a school district, over the course of a 30-year mortgage, you are not paying into the school district what that school district is paying out to educate your children if they go to school for the life of their education.

You have to have a diversity of development. You have to have different types of housing options, and you need to have commercial options, you need to have industrial properties. I mean, you need to have, you know, the different mix to help pay for things because that's how it works.

**LEG. CILMI:**
I agree with all that and we have and I have personally supported lots of investment in affordable housing here.

**D.P.O. CALARCO:**
We have.

**LEG. CILMI:**
We have made -- this County has made a commitment to that and we have, and all of us have supported that commitment through our votes here at the Legislature. All I'm saying is there comes a point in time where we all have to realize that we're making our current -- we're making it unaffordable to live here; through every additional fee, every additional tax that we levy, we are making it unaffordable to live here. And to the extent that we're focusing on new developments and making those new developments affordable. If we continue to lose existing residents because they can't afford to live in their homes anymore because it's become too expensive, then it's a zero-sum at best.

**D.P.O. CALARCO:**
So what I'm looking to do is to alleviate a fee. That's what this bill does, it eliminates a fee. And whether or not this bill passes has no impact whatsoever whether or not the residents of Great River are going to be able to afford the proposed expansion of sewers into their community, it doesn't impact them.

But let me speak to the bill a little bit more broadly, because I think that even with this bill and even at a 100% waiver of a connection fee, the residents of the sewer district that that connection's going to are going to benefit. First let me deal with
the zoning issue. The towns still contain -- you know, retain all of the zoning powers and they can make any zoning decisions they want, and if they decide that going 5% more on affordable housing or allowing the density that allows that 5% more on affordable housing to be viable, is something they don't want and they want it sent off-site, you know, that's a decision they can make and then it just impacts the ability of that developer to connect to the sewer district.

In terms of the affordability rates, because I know this has also come up, both James Britz who is the Vice-President of the Long Island Housing Partnership, and Peter Flori who is another developer who's done affordable housing projects throughout the County were here today to speak in favor of my bill. And I know that there was, you know, discussion about whether 120 -- 120% median income is the right level for affordability issues, and I think that's a broader question. I left it at that level in my bill because that's the level the County has really set for workforce housing, and it's something I'll take a look at next year in terms of whether or not rentals should only be done at 80%.

But in terms of our current waiver laws, we have a law on the books that allows somebody to come to the Legislature and apply for a waiver of their connection fee of 25% of the connection fee if they do 35% affordable housing. They could come and ask us for a waiver of 50% of their connection fee if they do 50% affordable housing. They could come to us and ask for a waiver of 50% plus money out of our Multifaceted Land Acquisition Program, which doesn't even exist anymore, for infrastructure improvements if they do 70% affordable.

So we have a whole host of various provisions on the books. Not to mention if you do an urban renewal project, you could get a 100% waiver of your connection fees, and that's not just for the residential portion, that's for the entire thing which is exactly what's happening in Wyandanch. I know that the number that's been thrown out there for the Wyandanch Rising connection fee waiver was at one point as high as 15 million. According to Department of Public Works, that number is currently a little over two million that's been approved by us through Legislative action and can go as high as, potentially, 3.19 million in connection fees waived total for the Wyandanch project. And that's the residential portion, the commercial portion, the railroad station and everything else.

So we have a whole host of different laws on the books already. And I think what I'm trying to do is bring a consistent one policy for this that deals with residential homes so that we can get housing built that accommodates people.

Now, the residents of the sewer district have no assurances that anybody from out of districts can connect. So we may have done an expansion with the hopes that there are out-of-district connections, but there's no assurance. So if the community is right now telling us, the development community is telling us that the way this is structured right now, our laws are structured right now, it is not financially viable for them to do out-of-district connections, guess what they're going to do? They're not going to
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connect. And not only are the residents of that district not going to get that key money, they're also not going to get the yearly usage fees that the development is going to pay into it. So they're paying the full freight for an expansion that may not even -- they may not necessarily need, I guess.

But the reality is that if there's existing capacity, the way our County sewer districts operate right now is that if there's -- whatever the cost is to operate that district is borne by the people who are either in the district or connected from out-of-district connections. We do not budget anticipating that somebody from out of districts are going to come in and connect because we have no guarantees that anybody is going to ever do that, and so we take those things on a case-by-case basis. And every out-of-district connection that comes in is another person who's paying user fees that's helping to share the burden of the cost of the operation of that district. Whether they're paying the key money in full amount or they're getting a 20% reduction or a 50% reduction or a 100% reduction, they're still paying something year-in that's something the current residents and current connectees will not have to pay anymore. So there is a benefit that's coming in; you got more buyers, you got a bigger pool of people paying in.

Now, I hear Legislator McCaffrey's concern that as you start getting up the scale into 50 and 60 and 70% affordable housing projects, that we are giving them too big of a reduction. I don't anticipate that there's going to be a run all of a sudden of developers saying, I'm going to come in at 70% so I can get 100% reduction of my key money; I just don't see that happening. Not to say that there won't ever be a project. I'm sure there will be projects that'll come in that'll ask us for that, because there are certain developers out there, like Peter Flori who was here earlier, who make it their company's mission to build affordable housing. So they go out and they not only look to do it through potentially this program, but also by seeking the County funds in other programs that we have or seeking State monies in other programs they have or Federal monies in programs they have, as you mentioned, to put the numbers together to make that work.

The reality is it's very expensive to do anything on Long Island, including build, and this is trying to help reduce some of our fees to make it less expensive to build on the Island so that these projects can get constructed. I worked hard with both the development community as well as the housing community to find a way that is, I think, fair, that doesn't put an extra burden on people, and it is continuing to take the carrot approach of saying here are some incentives to do what we think is important for this region. And if we want to retain our workforce, which is the number one thing the business community tells us is a problem on Long Island, they don't say it's the taxes, they say it's the ability to retain a workforce. I mean, that's from the Long Island Association, that's from the business community, that's from the corporate, the CEOs of major corporations who are saying our biggest problem is keeping workers on the Island because they can't -- yeah, because they can't -- yeah, there's no housing for
them.

LEG. CILMI:  
No, because their tax structure is too high.

05:17PM

LEG. LINDSAY:
They're going to higher taxing districts.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
They do. I mean, you had -- you have some of these corporations moving into cities like Boston. We need to find the right balance. And if you don't think that it's also just good for our region, I invite you down to Patchogue Village. Come check out my downtown, because that place is vibrant. Our average age of residents that live in the Village of Patchogue is under 50 right now; we're probably the only region in the entire County that has that low of an age, because we are attracting the younger people to come live in our communities, we're attracting the new people.

05:17PM

And quite honestly, houses in the neighborhoods -- and this is what I tell people all the time in my communities. So if you want to get people out of basements in Medford, if you want to get the people out of the attics in East Patchogue, you've got to give them housing that's legal that's affordable for them to get into. If you want the neighboring houses to start going up, you want to see real success, you can't keep a house on the market in Patchogue Village right now. I had friends put their house up, they sold it in a day, they had a bidding war over a two-bedroom little house that was in walking distance to the downtown, because that's what that does. When you create this housing, when you create these opportunities, when you create those new downtowns, you're creating an atmosphere where people want to stay on the Island and they're willing to pay a little bit more. The young people are moving to Brooklyn; their housing costs are a lot more in Brooklyn, but they have a little bit more of an experience. So I think that this is what we need to try to do. I think this provides some housing incentives and I think it does it without putting any extra undo burden on anybody.

05:18PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right, so we have a --

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Can I just follow up with that?

05:19PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Please, quickly.

05:19PM

LEG. McCAFFREY:
I will. It does do an unfair burden on someone, and I feel it's the residents of the Southwest Sewer District. The plant was -- you made it sound like they expanded the plant just on a whim. The plant was expanded for the purpose of taking in out of districts. So, you know, I will -- I haven't decided what I'm doing. I may even pass for the second time in my career and just see what happens here, but I doubt it, I don't like doing that; I just
wanted to do it the first time to see what it felt like.

("Laughter")

But if I did, I will be coming back quickly with something that addresses my concerns and the concerns of the other Legislators in this district.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
I would just say that if it's too costly to connect, then your residents are going to be paying the burden without anybody even sharing in the usage fees.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
No, and I appreciate the fact that you met with the developers and everybody else in the community. You know, maybe someone should have talked to you know, the Legislators where that plant in that district is located.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
I have sewer districts in my district as well, I have Medford which has two different plants that have had out-of-district connections, and of the 13 residential housing projects that have been done since we required -- the 20% requirement, only five of them are in the Southwest Sewer District. So I know you want to frame it as if everything is flowing to Southwest, but that's just not necessarily the case.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
We're getting more than most.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, all right. All right, so we have a motion to approve. Okay? Motion and a second. All right, roll call.

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

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Yes.
LEG. TROTTA: No.

LEG. KENNEDY: Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA: No.

LEG. CILMI: Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ: Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY: Yes.

LEG. ANKER: Yes.

LEG. HAHN: Yes.

LEG. MURATORE: (Absent).

LEG. BROWNING: Yes.

LEG. FLEMING: Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI: No.

MR. RICHBERG: Fourteen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

P.O. GREGORY: Okay, IR 2005-16 - Authorizing the renewal of the Lease of premises located at 53345 Main Road, Bldg. 7, Unit 1, Southold, NY for use by Suffolk County District Attorney’s Office (County Executive). I forget -- who made the motion.

LEG. KRUPSKI: (Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY: Motion by Legislator Krupski. Second by Legislator Fleming. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. TROTTA: On the motion?
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P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.

LEG. TROTTA:
What is this? I question everything with the District Attorney now.

MR. NOLAN:
According to the reso, they lease space in the Town of Southold for administrative purposes, and it's a renewal for five years, through 2022, with three-year annual escalators in the rent.

LEG. TROTTA:
Is this a courthouse or --

LEG. KRUPSKI:
No.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Fourteen hundred square feet.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Can I -- Mr. Presiding Officer?

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you. No, it's in Feather Hill; it's commercial space.

LEG. TROTTA:
So what is it?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
It's an office. It's an office in commercial space, like a retail space.

LEG. TROTTA:
Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay? We have a motion, a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. IR 2006-16 - Authorizing the Lease of premises to be utilized by the Suffolk County Police Department as a police substation at Cherry Grove (County Executive). Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).
P.O. GREGORY:

IR 2011-16 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law
No. 13-1976 Michael Schulte (SCTM No. 0900-070.00-01.00-019.000)
(County Executive).

05:23PM

LEG. FLEMING:

Motion.

05:23PM

P.O. GREGORY:

Motion by Legislator Fleming. Second by Legislator Browning.

All in --

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Lou had a question.

05:23PM

LEG. D’AMARO:

Yeah, I just want to thank the Administration and the department
for getting back to me; it turns out it's not a buildable lot, so.
There was a reason why that -- if I'm remembering, this is the
right bill where that front portion might have been available
through the town; they did make the inquiry, it's not available
because it's being utilized for some surrounding -- to benefit some
surrounding properties, so we're good. And thank you for doing
that.

05:23PM

P.O. GREGORY:

All right, we have a motion, a second. All in favor? Opposed?
Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seven -- Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

05:23PM

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 2035-16 - Reducing pipeline debt by authorizing the County
Comptroller to close certain capital projects and transfer funds
(County Executive). Motion by Legislator Anker.

05:24PM

LEG. HAHN:

(Raised hand).

05:24PM

P.O. GREGORY:

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

MR. RICHBERG:

Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

05:24PM

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay. I have a request to take IR 2073 out of order, I'm going to
address that real quick, on page eight. Transferring -- it's in
Public Works. Transferring Southwest Stabilization Reserve Funds
to the Capital Fund, amending the 2016 Operating Budget, amending
the 2016 Capital Budget, and appropriating funds for the
improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest,
Final Effluent Pump Station (CP 8108) (County Executive). I make a
motion to take this out of order.
LEG. MARTINEZ:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Martinez. All in favor? Opposed?
Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, I'll make a motion to approve IR 2073.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Martinez.

LEG. TROTTA:
What is this?

P.O. GREGORY:
2073.

LEG. CILMI:
Public Works.

LEG. TROTTA:
Stand by one second.

P.O. GREGORY:
It has nothing to do with Jim Burke or Tom Spota.

LEG. TROTTA:
I voted against it; can someone remind me --

(*Laughter*)

LEG. D'AMARO:
Excuse me. Is this 2073?

P.O. GREGORY:
2073, yeah.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Can we bring up the Commissioner? I'm pretty sure I know what this is, but I don't want Legislator Trotta to think there was anything going on here. I believe it's to pump the additional sewage that's coming into the sewer plant.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is for the final effluent pump station, this was the additional -- I thought it was 2.7 million. What number is it, 2073?
LEG. KENNEDY:
2073.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Thank you.

LEG. D'AMARO:
You have a grant of 3.6, the project is 2.7.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, it's 2.7 million that we're requesting here due to unforeseen
conditions that we encountered once we started this work. One of
them being the floor where we're looking to put some of these
additional electrical control panels. The rebar inside the
floor --

LEG. TROTTA:
I remember this; this is where you were building something and you
opened it up and you found something.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right, correct. There were two conditions; one, the rebar in the
floor was found to be a lot more deteriorated than it was
originally expected. And also --

LEG. TROTTA:
I remember, we spent a fortune on planning and I'm saying, well,
clearly we should get our money back from the planner because they
didn't see this. I gotcha, okay.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed?
Abstentions?

LEG. TROTTA:
Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen (Opposed: Legislator Trotta - Absent: Legislator Muratore).
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P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right, page six, Budget & Finance:

IR 1769-16 - Amending the 2016 Operating Budget and appropriating
funds in connection with bonding for judgments in a liability case
against the County (County Executive).

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Motion.

LEG. TROTTA:
What number is this?
D.P.O. CALARCO:  
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Motion by Legislator Calarco. 1769, Budget & Finance, page six.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Motion by Legislator Calarco. Who was that?

LEG. D'AMARO:  
D'Amaro.

P.O. GREGORY:  
D'Amaro? Motion by Legislator D'Amaro. Second by Legislator D'Amaro on 1769, motion by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? 
Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:  
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

P.O. GREGORY:  
IR 1769A, Bond Resolution (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York authorizing the issuance of $312,299 Bonds to finance the settlement of a General Liability Case against the County), same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

D.P.O. CALARCO:  
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:  
Yes.

LEG. STERN:  
Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:  
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:  
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:  
Yes.
LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
(Absent).

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

P. O. GREGORY:
Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

P. O. GREGORY:
IR 2075-16 - Authorizing the County Comptroller to transfer funds to cover unanticipated expenses in the 2016 Adopted Discretionary Budget (County Executive).

LEG. D'AMARO:
Motion.

P. O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator D'Amaro.

D. P. O. CALARCO:
Second.

P. O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).
P.O. GREGORY:
IR 2076-16 - Authorizing the County Comptroller to transfer funds to cover unanticipated expenses in the 2016 Adopted Mandated Budget (County Executive). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

05:28PM

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

05:28PM

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 2115-16 - Creating a Grant Management Fund (County Executive).

05:28PM

LEG. D'AMARO:
Motion.

05:28PM

P.O. GREGORY:

05:28PM

LEG. KRUPSKI:
What is the funding and who's going to manage it? And will it result in an increase in a position or payroll?

05:28PM

MR. LIPP:
No, it's just a way of counting for things. Putting it all in one fund, you can see where stuff comes from. That being said, it'll take a couple of years to fully implement because you have a lower expense in the budget that will occur now because some of the -- some of the grants which would have normally been in the budget will only show up as the year goes on. But in the long run it should be a good thing.

05:29PM

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

05:29PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Anyone else? Okay, we have a motion, a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

05:29PM

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

05:29PM

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 2093-16 - Authorizing the Department of Economic Development and Planning to commit to benchmarking County Buildings to allow the Department to apply for a No-Match Clean Energy Grant through New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) (County Executive).

05:29PM

LEG. SPENCER:
Motion.

05:29PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Spencer. I'll second. All in favor?

05:29PM
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Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

05:29PM

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 2105-16 - Accepting and appropriating 88% state grant funds from the New York State Department of Transportation in the amount of $70,400 for Airport Pavement Marking Equipment at Francis S. Gabreski Airport and to execute grant related agreements (County Executive). Motion by Legislator Fleming.

05:29PM

LEG. KRUPSKI:
(Raised hand).

05:30PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

05:30PM

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

05:30PM

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 2114-16 - Awarding funds in connection with Jumpstart Suffolk (CP 6424) (Presiding Officer Gregory). Motion by Legislator Calarco. I'll second. All in favor?

05:30PM

LEG. TROTTA:
On the motion.

05:30PM

P.O. GREGORY:
On the motion, Legislator Trotta.

05:30PM

LEG. TROTTA:
Here we go. This is just burdening with more debt that we don't have. It's -- you know, I cringe when I see the Long Island Music Hall of Fame when we have a Long Island Sports Hall of Fame that is now hanging somewhere. If anybody thinks that this is going to be, you know, bringing people in and keeping them, you know, I don't care -- we have probably 15 empty stores in Huntington Village, probably within a hundred yards of the Paramount Theatre. I think there should be a test and put the Long Island Music Hall of Fame there for a year to see if it can flourish down there.

05:30PM

LEG. SPENCER:
Fifteen empty stores? What the --

05:31PM

LEG. TROTTA:
Doc, you don't want it down there?

05:31PM

LEG. SPENCER:
There's not 15 empty stores.

05:31PM

LEG. TROTTA:
Oh, there's definite -- can I tell you something? There's at least four -- well, I'm not going to get into that. I cannot support
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LEG. SPENCER: You're talking about my house (laughter).


LEG. KRUPSKI: I have a question for Economic Development and Planning.

COMMISSIONER WARD: Good evening.

LEG. KRUPSKI: Welcome. This money was authorized when? As a Bond.

COMMISSIONER WARD: This is from the 2005 Capital -- I'm sorry, 2015; I misspoke.

LEG. KRUPSKI: So we authorized the money and then these projects -- how did these -- like how are these projects before us today? This is -- the thing is with this and the other resolutions, it's sort of the chicken and the egg, but it's sort of the chicken and the egg because we authorize the money, we don't know what the money is for and then we're told, Well, now we're going to vote on these. Don't worry, you have another bite at the apple, and now all of a sudden these are bundled in a very curious manner and now we're told, Well, you have to vote for these because you authorized the money in 2015. So it's a chicken and the egg thing. So how were these projects selected and then how -- why were they bundled the way they were bundled?

COMMISSIONER WARD: The -- I actually think it would be helpful to sort of step back and sort of give a bigger picture overview. When we worked on the Capital Budget, we set aside a limited amount of funding for economic development projects, and the projects that are here in these three resolutions total 7.5 million in investments in Suffolk County. And it's within that envelope, it's less than 7% of the overall Capital Budget, we kind of want to make sure we step back and look at that. And these, you know, limited investments send an important message to other levels of government and private sector development that leverage bigger investments here that support good community-based projects and create construction and permanent jobs. And these amounts were set aside in the Capital Budget to ensure that while we recognize the significant financial constraints the County is in, the County is also investing in the future and working every day to support projects to revitalize our communities, leverage non-County public and private sector dollars and support projects to retain the young talent that we've all heard kids leaving. By following the principals that were laid out in the comprehensive plan that was unanimously approved by the Legislature, and that we're creating an environment where companies that are already here can stay and grow and places where we see this.
these successful revitalizations, like Patchogue which we've heard a lot about today, success becomes -- you know, begets more opportunities and we'll need to continue to invest in the County through ongoing affordable housing, job training, cultural investments, and these investments are ongoing, they're investments that other governments throughout the nation and the region are making as well.

So these are to send an important message to communities that through Suffolk County, our residents engage in smart, community-based planning and we help advance those projects, and that's what these projects represent. We're supporting those community revitalization initiatives and we are supporting planning and design ultimately that will get to construction as well. We want more communities engaged in that process and that's what we've really done and where these projects come, all from, community-based plans.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Specifically the Bluepoint project, does the brewery put any money into that? I mean, it's seems like -- it's being called the Bluepoint Brewery Project; do they have any financial stake in this, or is this just public money being used?

COMMISSIONER WARD:
Well, this is -- you heard from the Mayor of Patchogue today, Mayor Pontieri. You know, this is a key investment that they have been looking to make in this area to improve pedestrian connection to the lakefront. It helps that this private entity nearby is investing 35 million into their facility, that will make this all the more attractive for people to want to walk and create a positive, you know, pedestrian experience.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you. And then the Wyandanch project, somehow the Music Hall of Fame is tied in with HRH. I have a question about the HRH; who would own that building and who would run and maintain that?

COMMISSIONER WARD:
It's the town's projects, so I would really look to the town to answer that. They're really trying to get this building off the ground because it's key to completing the first phase of development there. But I would look to, you know, the town solution for there, they have a master developer, which is the Albanese Organization, and see what their, you know, plan is for that.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
To answer your question, Building C, to my understanding, will be owned by the developer. But June, I think, of last year there were two grant resolutions that we had supported, one for HRH at the Wyandanch Clinic and one for funding for, I think, the Patchogue Clinic in Rob's district. And there's a match -- for $8 million,
there's a matching grant. So this move is to help facilitate -- you know, Building C is going to be the Music Hall of Fame, but there's also the relocate the Wyandanch Health Clinic, which 30, 40 years ago when I was a kid I went there. You know, it's an old supermarket and they've been trying to facilitate that move to there, the YMCA is looking to go there as well. I think there's a physical therapist that's going to go there, so it's all going to help facilitate that move. But my understanding is the developer will own that property.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I do have a short list; Legislator Trotta and then McCaffrey.

LEG. TROTTA:
Are you -- you know, are you at all concerned, given the fact that the Sports Hall of Fame bounced around and no one ever went to it, that we're spending this money for something that has been untested, it didn't make it in other places?

COMMISSIONER WARD:
It's not a Sports Hall of Fame and they have a base of awardees that attract --

LEG. TROTTA:
What is that base?

COMMISSIONER WARD:
Pardon?

LEG. TROTTA:
What is that base?

COMMISSIONER WARD:
The have their fans of the awardees and they do awardees every year. But again, I'm not that -- I'm here to present what the town has presented us.

LEG. TROTTA:
You know, I -- whatever the -- Anheuser-Busch made $8 billion last year. I mean, this is corporate, you know, welfare, for moving a road in Patchogue. And why isn't Patchogue Village paying for it? You know, why are the taxpayers of Suffolk County taking out a bond when we're flat-busted broke to subsidize Anheuser-Busch? I mean, it's just something that the taxpayers should be very, very upset about and I can't support.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
I was encouraged to hear today that there's other than the Long Island Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, which, you know, I did -- after
our meeting I did some research and they had kind of been in one place, it didn't work out, went to another place. So as a self-sustaining project, I had--there's a sole tenant, I begin to have some concerns. But Supervisor Schaeffer came here today and laid out some--a pretty good plan for what was going to happen there, which was the most encouraging being the public or the private infusion of money in there as well, which I think is important to Wyandanch. I mean, because at a certain point we're going to run out of public money to put in there. And I think it's nice to see other people willing to make an investment in there and moving that health center over to that building that I think would be helpful and eventually save the money to the County as well, so I like the idea.

But one concern I had is how these resolutions are coming to us. You know, we did approve this Jump Start money as a whole, but I really think in the future that these projects should be come as standalone projects. You know, we have four of them in here that are really unrelated. You know, we have two infrastructure projects that are unrelated to each other, one in Patchogue, one in Wyandanch. And the only thing that was related is the project in Lindenhurst and Kings Park which were very similar in terms of appropriating money for planning, for, you know, the visioning for their downtown. So I would just encourage in the future that these come--if they're not similar, they should be coming as separate resolutions to us, I think that would be helpful.

COMMISSIONER WARD:
We looked for geographic diversity and for projects that were ready, really ready to go. So I understand that sentiment.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
I mean, but there's no reason why we couldn't have these resolutions before us today as separate resolutions. Because we could come across a project that we have serious concerns about and it would be--you would have to vote against another one for that to happen, you know, to knock one out because you have concerns about one or table one because you want to address concerns about another one and there might be a time issue with the one that you want to support. So probably my recommendation, you know, going forward would be that they come across as separate, you know, whenever possible.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Good afternoon, Theresa. Just to give a point of reference, because I know Legislator Krupski brought it up, so did Legislator Trotta. You know, I have some facts and figures here. As the Chair of the Economic Development Committee, we go through these numbers pretty tightly and really review to see. And my objective is always to not just give away money, which, you know, I think some of the misinformation that's out there is we're just handing checks out to developers and that's clearly not the case; this money is going into road improvements, infrastructure improvements
that help the project move along. But just using the projects that we're speaking about here. So Patchogue Village, it's a million dollar grant that we're putting out, there's $150 million in private investment money. So that's leveraging 1-to-150, that's a pretty good leverage that I would take any day of the week and twice on Sunday.

Looking at the Town of Babylon, the Long Island Music Hall of Fame, we're putting in 1.25 million and we're leveraging 30 to $40 million in private sector investment funds. So you want to talk about return on investment. You know, I would make an argument that by putting this money out, we're probably recapturing it almost before the bonds are paid off because of the amount of sales tax that's going to be paid, amount of income in the form of wages that's going to be paid to workers who are then going to go out and buy things and sales tax that they're going to be generating and the economic activity that results from private sector investments of, you know, just between these two projects alone, almost $200 million.

So I will gladly support this and I would encourage you, as the Commissioner, to look for other opportunities where we can find these types of investments. Anywhere we can get 150-to-1 in return, I would say bring it before this body and I'll be the first to support it. So I will be voting in favor of this. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER WARD:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Just -- I would like to address two parts of this resolution.

First, obviously the Patchogue portion, which is very important to me and my district. And when the Mayor was here earlier and during committee, he made a point of referencing that the project that would be effecting Waverly Avenue, which is a County roadway, is actually the culmination of a project that was originally designed at least 15 years ago, not under Legislator Eddington but under Legislator Foley, and never was put to its full completion. And this would do that by creating, pooling the lanes down into -- and eliminating the very wide median, creating a park-like atmosphere that the Village of Patchogue will maintain, by the way, along Patchogue Lake as well as new off-street parking -- which I can't believe he left out considering our need for parking in the Village of Patchogue -- and making it easier for the fire department to be able to get south of Main Street because it's very difficult for them to navigate with their large truck. So there's a lot of benefits that come from the Patchogue portion of this project.

But I also, in support of the Hall of Fame -- and trust me, I have the empty Sports Hall of Fame building in Patchogue which is one of the few vacancies still in Patchogue, I can appreciate the concerns about halls of fames. This one has a performance art theatre component to it, which I think is really important to any
downtown's growth. If you ask the people in Patchogue what was the initial investment that helped their downtown recover, it was the theatre because downtowns are more than anything destination venues now, they're recreational assets. If you go to Huntington it's the Paramount, if you go to Bay Shore, they have the Bolton Theatre, if you go out to Riverhead you have the Riverhead Theatre. So any of our major downtowns that are really starting to see a renaissance or a revitalization have those theatres to help bring people into their downtown which helps give customers to the shops and restaurants that'll be in the neighboring area that'll help them grow. So I think it's really a vital asset. And in Patchogue, it was the Village of Patchogue who first put up the money to fix the Patchogue Theatre and get it operational because they saw that it was an asset. So both from the needs of my community as well as Wyandanch, I think this is a good investment.

P.O. GREGORY: Okay. All right, so we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. TROTTA: Opposed.


P.O. GREGORY: Okay. Can I have all Legislators to the horseshoe, please?

2116A Bond Resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

D.P.O. CALARCO: Fourteen; you said 16.

MR. NOLAN: 2114.

P.O. GREGORY: 2114, I'm sorry, 2114A, I said 2116 (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $2,500,000 in Bonds to finance said County's respective portions of the cost of Jumpstart Suffolk Projects for the Village of Patchogue, the Village of Port Jefferson, and the Town of Babylon (CP 6424.315). (*Roll Called by Mr. Richberg - Clerk of the Legislature*)

D.P.O. CALARCO: Yes.

P.O. GREGORY: Yes.

LEG. SPENCER: (Not Present).
LEG. D'AMARO: Yes.

LEG. STERN: Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY: Yes.

LEG. TROTTA: No.

LEG. KENNEDY: Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA: Yes.

LEG. CILMI: Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ: Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY: Yes.

LEG. ANKER: Yes.

LEG. HAHN: Yes.

LEG. MURATORE: (Absent).

LEG. BROWNING: Yes.

LEG. FLEMING: Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI: Yes.


P.O. GREGORY: 2116-16 - Amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating and awarding funds in connection with Jumpstart Suffolk (CP 6424).

LEG. LINDSAY: Motion.
P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Lindsay.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
I'll second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor?  Opposed?
Abstentions?

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

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, 2116A, Bond Resolution (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York authorizing the issuance of $1,500,000 in Bonds to finance said County’s portion of the cost of a Jumpstart Suffolk Project for the Town of Brookhaven (CP 6424.317), same motion, same second.
Roll call.
(*Roll Called by Mr. Richberg - Clerk of the Legislature*)

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
(Not Present).

LEG. D’AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.
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LEG. MARTINEZ: Yes.

LEG. ANKER: Yes.

LEG. HAHN: Yes.

LEG. MURATORE: (Absent).

LEG. BROWNING: Yes.

LEG. FLEMING: Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI: Yes.

P.O. GREGORY: Second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. TROTTA: (Raised hand).

LEG. KRUPSKI: On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY: On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI: I've got a question about the airport project. This is to build an international facility, what would you call it, a customs house at the airport. And the question would be if it's a Federal customs house, why wouldn't the Federal government be building it? And also, do we have any assurances that we're going get an
international flights in? Are there any agreements? Is there any sort of, like, agreements with the other major airports in our area -- Newark and Kennedy and LaGuardia -- that are going to make it very difficult to get commercial international flights into the airport, or are we just going to get, I don't know, ignored, or locked out for a better term?

COMMISSIONER WARD:
So the representative from the airport was here earlier today and I believe answered those questions. I just need to consult with staff for a minute, if you don't mind.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Sure.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Mr. Presiding Officer, if I can. We discussed this at committee, maybe I can add some clarity for Legislator Krupski.

P.O. GREGORY:
Please.

LEG. LINDSAY:
We met with the airport Commissioner, it's more of a you've got to build it and then they'll add flights; they can't add the flights before customs house is in. And the reason why the Federal government doesn't build the customs house is because they don't own the airport, the town owns the airport so they're responsible for the infrastructure of it. The customs agents would have to man it and provide the personnel, but it's still the responsibility of the owner of the airport to provide the facility.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So who owns -- like flown out of JFK, who owns the customs house there?

LEG. LINDSAY:
The Port Authority because they own and operate those airports. So in this situation it would be the Town of Islip because they own and operate McArthur Airport.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So is there any -- I understand that part. I'm still not sure -- so you're saying they didn't receive any Federal money to build it?

LEG. LINDSAY:
I'm not -- I can't -- I'm not aware of that.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yeah, I don't how the Port Authority is funded. I don't think we want to pull that string, but.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yeah, I don't know how the -- if they received any Federal. I'm just telling you from the conversations that we've had that this won't fully fund the building, I think it's just helping with a
portion of it. They may have some State and Federal grants that
are going to assist in the rest of construction.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
But what -- even if it's built, is there any -- what assurance do
we have that anyone's going to actually ever -- it's ever going to
be opened?

LEG. LINDSAY:
I don't believe there's any assurance that they'll get
international flights, but if they don't build it there's zero
percent chance of them getting international flights.

COMMISSIONER WARD:
They have 11 million in Federal, State and Town grants for the
construction, so this is for the planning and the design.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Is there a timeline on the project?

COMMISSIONER WARD:
I would need to defer to the town on their exact timeline. I mean,
they're beginning planning and design, that's what we're funding
here.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So the other funding is in place and they're going to -- they're
just waiting on this planning money? I mean, I think that -- I'll
be honest with you, I think the airport is an unbelievable asset to
Suffolk County. And when you look at travel, you know, into the
city to fly out of, in and out of, it's a real benefit to all the
County. But I just want assurances that, in fact, you know, we're
going to bond 1.25 million and then, you know, in five years
someone will say, Hey, whatever happened to that customs house
there at Islip they were going to build?

COMMISSIONER WARD:
Well, they have the construction money, so they should -- you know,
this is a project that we're funding the design and they're ready
to go -- then they would be ready to go into construction once the
design's finished.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Well, thank you. And then one question about the funding for the
Port Jefferson sewer expansion? Isn't there a study for a Port
Jefferson sewer expansion?

COMMISSIONER WARD:
No, it's the Upper Port Revitalization.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Okay, it has nothing to do with sewers.

COMMISSIONER WARD:
No, it does not.
LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you. And I did hear the representative from Port Jeff this
morning. Thank you.

05:53PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Anyone else? All right, we have a motion, a second. All in
favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

05:53PM

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen (Opposed: Legislator Trotta - Absent: Legislator Muratore).

05:53PM

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 21117A, Bond Resolution (of the County Of Suffolk, New York,
authorizing the issuance of $3,500,000 In Bonds to finance planning
costs in connection with Start-Up/NY/Suffolk County (CP 6427.111,

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

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
No.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
(Absent).
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LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

05:53PM

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

05:53PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

05:53PM

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen (Opposed: Legislator Trotta - Absent: Legislator Muratore).

05:53PM

Environment, Planning & Agriculture

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 2087-16 - Appropriating $150,000 in Capital Funds in connection with the Peconic Bay Estuary Program for part of the County match for the annual Peconic Estuary $600,000 Program grant (CP 8235)(County Executive). I have a motion by Legislator Krupski, or no?

05:54PM

LEG. KRUPSKI:
I'm sorry; what was the resolution?

05:54PM

P.O. GREGORY:
2087.

05:54PM

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yeah, so moved. Thank you.

05:54PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

05:54PM

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

05:54PM

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 2087A, Bond Resolution (of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $150,000 Bonds to finance the cost of design and improvements for marine monitoring of the Peconic Bay Estuary Program (CP 8235.118, .410), same motion, same second.

05:54PM

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

05:54PM

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

05:54PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

05:54PM

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.
LEG. D'AMARO: Yes.

LEG. STERN: Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY: Yes.

LEG. TROTTA: No.

LEG. KENNEDY: Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA: Yes.

LEG. CILMI: Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ: Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY: (Not Present).

LEG. ANKER: Yes.

LEG. HAHN: Yes.

LEG. MURATORE: (Absent).

LEG. BROWNING: Yes.

LEG. FLEMING: Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO: Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY: Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen (Opposed: Legislator Trotta - Absent: Legislator Muratore).

P.O. GREGORY:

Okay, IR 2102-16 - Accepting and appropriating 50% State grant funds from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation in the amount of $1,500,000 for the Suffolk County Septic/Cesspool Upgrade Program Enterprise II (SCUPE II)
administered by the Suffolk County Department of Health Services, Division of Environmental Quality and to execute grant related agreements (County Executive).

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Krupski. Second by Legislator Fleming? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen (Not Present: Legislator Lindsay - Absent: Legislator Muratore).

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 2106-16 - 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 – Lawrence Foglia and Heather Forest/"Fox Hollow Farm" – Town of Huntington (SCTM Nos. 0400-203.00-02.00-051.001 p/o and 0400-203.00-02.00-051.003 p/o) (County Executive). Motion by Legislator Stern.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion?

P.O. GREGORY:
On the motion.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So this is a -- this is kind of an unusual appraisal on an unusual parcel here, and I know the owner was in here this morning; it was a long time ago, I don't know if everyone remembers what he said. This went through the Suffolk County Farmland Committee, and I think the reason it was approved is because if you look at the aerial picture of this, it doesn't look like what you think of as a farm, and it's not just because it's in Huntington, it just looks like it's sort of overgrown and tree'd. But actually, the trees are part of his agricultural operation and he's raising plants that require shade, and so he's using the whole property and he's using the shade as part -- instead of putting up -- he could cut the trees down and put up hoop houses with shade cloth, but instead he's using the natural vegetation there and it's cleared underneath and he's got irrigation underneath and he'd like to see it -- I think it's a legacy to see that parcel preserved as farmland. And I'm more than willing to support that as farmland, you know, in Huntington, because, you know, this should have happened 50 years ago in Huntington. There was a lot of good farmland there that didn't get preserved.
We just spent I don't know how many millions of dollars in economic
development and planning for different projects in -- a lot of it's
directed to certain parts of the County and, you know -- right now
this proposal is to put this parcel into our Farmland Preservation
Program under Chapter 8, and I tell you that the Farmland
Preservation Program in this County is really -- I think it's
starting to erode. We've already had one person who we made an
offer to declined the offer because of the Chapter 8 problems.
We've had another person who put their parcel in for Farmland
Preservation, asked for an extension so he had more time to try to
sort out what's going to happen with the future of the program, and
I think we need to -- and I know the County Executive is very
supportive of restoring the program to a functional program and I
just hope that, you know, we could all work together to achieve
that goal, to make the County program, which is the model for the
country, functional again.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:
Yeah, thank you. And thank you to Legislator Krupski for your
comments and for your support. Yes, Mr. Foglia was here earlier
with other supporters and in part anyway, part of his presentation
was reading from correspondence from the North Shore Land
Alliance -- I hope that all of my colleagues have a copy of it --
which does lay out many of the important elements of this property
and its hopeful acquisition.

This is a property that is in the Ag District, it is an important
ongoing farm concern for -- and potential purchase for western
Suffolk County. And I did also want to point out that this is a --
to be a joint acquisition with the Town of Huntington for a 50/50
purchase, and so that is a proceeding as well and so I ask my
colleagues for their support. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed?
Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen (Not Present: Legislator Cilmi - Absent: Legislator
Muratore).

Government Operations, Personnel, Information Technology & Housing

IR 2077-16 - Amending the Suffolk County Classification and Salary
Plan in connection with new position titles in the police
department: Assistant Commissioner of Police (Strategic
Communications); and the Department of Public Works: Assistant
Chief Engineer (Public Works) (Presiding Officer Gregory). I make
a motion to approve. Second by Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
No.
P.O. GREGORY: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought you were cosponsor.

LEG. McCAFFREY: No, on the motion.

P.O. GREGORY: Oh, okay.

D.P.O. CALARCO: I'll second.


LEG. McCAFFREY: Thank you. You know, I had -- we had the Commissioner here at the hearing.

LEG. TROTTA: He's here now.

LEG. McCAFFREY: Oh, is he here right now? He's behind the podium there. Commissioner -- would it be okay if I could ask the Commissioner a couple of questions?

P.O. GREGORY: Sure.

LEG. McCAFFREY: Commissioner, how are you?

COMMISSIONER SINI: I'm doing well. How are you?

LEG. McCAFFREY: Good, good. You know, we had the discussion about -- we had some discussion about the qualifications for the position and we eventually received a resume from Justin Myers. I think he said -- I don't want to be nitpicking, but I think he said he had a Master's Degree, he's working on that, I don't know if he's completed that work in strategic planning. We had some concerns that the title that he'll be given, I know that that will be an exempt title, that it takes it out of the Civil Service position that it's in now; is that correct?

COMMISSIONER SINI: That's correct.

LEG. McCAFFREY: What is the reason for that, why we would -- we had it as a Civil Service title, and why they could not keep it that way.
COMMISSIONER SINI:
This is a provisional title, so essentially a test will have to be given for this title to continue to exist. My view is that this is someone who would be in charge, someone who is in charge of all strategic communications for a very large agency, the eleventh largest Police Department in the country, the largest Police Department in the State outside the NYPD. And it’s someone who the Commissioner, whether it’s me or the future Commissioner, needs to have full confidence in and I think it’s only appropriate to have this title exempt.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
This is -- I mean, this title has been around for a long time and we've been the eleventh largest police district in a long time. Why the change now? What is it -- why would we take it away from that Civil Service position and allow it to be maybe the best qualified person in there. Let's look at what the tests are, if he's in the top three we can pick him, and there might be more qualified people out there. I mean, he's new to the Police Department, he came over recently, so his -- I don't think he's got a wealth of knowledge in terms of communicating with a police background. I mean, that's fair to say, right? So there might be somebody out there that's got more experience in there that could actually do the job better or, you know, score better on the test if it were a Civil Service test.

COMMISSIONER SINI:
I think, you know, I made the decision to civilianize the position and the decision to bring in a communications professional as opposed to a sworn member. Prior to this position being done by a civilian, it was being done by a Chief, and he obviously was making substantially more money than this position affords. So it's a strategic decision in terms of having a communication professional in there and it's also a significant cost savings to the County.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
I don't disagree with, you know, making that civilian position. I don't think that it should have been a Chief's position to begin with. But we -- actually, we didn't really save that money because that Chief was put in another Chief's position, right?

COMMISSIONER SINI:
No, I don't think that's a fair characterization, because we added a Chief to oversee the Internal Affairs Bureau, that's a position that existed prior to me being Commissioner, it just wasn't filled. And that's a position that we were going to fill regardless of what we did in terms of the Public Information Office. I made it a top priority of the Suffolk County Police Department to reform Internal Affairs. One of the steps, among many, were to make sure that there's adequate supervision and that the department was valuing the Bureau, and part of that was to add a Chief to the supervisory chain.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Yeah. No, I don't disagree with the fact that, you know, you want to civilianize that department. We have to look at everything.
From what I understand we have our overtime, I think we're budgeted for 35 million, as of December 1st we're at $49 million. So anything that -- no, that's not accurate?

COMMISSIONER SINI: No, I don't think that's accurate.

LEG. McCAFFREY: I got it from the Comptroller who got it from the payroll department, as of December 1, so I'll have to double check that.

COMMISSIONER SINI: Off the top of my head, I believe -- yeah, I don't think that's accurate.

LEG. McCAFFREY: All right, I'll ask him to double check his numbers. I spoke to him today. I mean, so that's a concern. So everything we can do to --

COMMISSIONER SINI: Yeah. I mean --

LEG. McCAFFREY: -- reduce that. So I was -- and then we're looking at a title, and we had this discussion the other day, concerning, you know, even that title itself, at 141,000, which I think he's at, and he'll go up to 151.

COMMISSIONER SINI: The adoption of this resolution has zero fiscal impact on the County. He's -- in the current title he's in, he's scheduled for that raise in July. This resolution has no fiscal impact, it will not result in a raise of any sort. When I last spoke before the Legislature, before the committee, we stated, because at the time it was accurate, that there would have been a 100 to $200 raise at some point when the individual received a step increase. We've been able to rework that so there's zero fiscal impact.

With respect to overtime, overtime is something that I track on a daily basis. I've implemented numerous initiatives to track overtime, including utilizing a new electronic software program so that we can really crunch the numbers. As you know, much of our overtime is caused by personnel shortage; about 50% of our overtime is caused by personnel shortage. And to really just explain what that means, when we have certain posts that we obviously have to fill for public safety, and when we have personnel shortage and we don't have the officer to fill that post, we have to hire on overtime. The -- this PIO generally, and certainly this resolution, has no -- has no impact on overtime except to note that the overall initiative to civilianize PIO is going to reduce overtime. We had -- not only did we have Chief Fallon who was a sworn member making over 220 something thousand dollars overseeing the Bureau, we also had another sworn officer there. And when that individual was outstanding, but every time she had to do work she was paid. So when you have civilian exempt employees,
they're on call 24/7, and when you have Civil Service PIOs, Public
Information Officers, the overtime is obviously substantially less
than what a sworn member would be. So we're going to be not only
saving the salary difference between Chief Fallon and the Assistant
Commissioner, we're going to be saving further expenses by the way
we're running PIO now.

And, you know, just to make it clear, this isn't someone who merely
picks up the phone calls when Newsday -- when Newsday calls.
That's certainly a big part of it, to answer media inquiries. We
receive 200 to 300 calls a day, but that's for both media inquiries
and that's for Crime Stoppers. So PIO mans the desk for Crime
Stoppers. And as many of you know, we rolled out a new initiative,
631-852-NARC, which has been widely popular in your district,
particularly in the Lindenhurst area, where people can call that
number, remain anonymous, report drug dealing in the communities
and receive cash rewards for tips that lead to arrests. And we
rolled that out on March 31st and since that rollout we've received
over 1300 tips.

Now, that has allowed us to increase narcotics enforcement
dramatically. Part of that is a 120%, approximately, increase in
search warrants which has resulted not only in taking drugs, bad
guys and guns off the street, but it's also resulted in the
increase in asset forfeiture money that we can take in, that we
have taken in and we can use for law enforcement purposes. We have
right now -- I have over $4 million earmarked for asset forfeiture,
that is a dramatic, dramatic increase over last year. And that's
in part because we now work with our Federal law enforcement
partners, that opens up a whole new door for asset forfeiture, and
that's in part because of all the cash that we're seizing in
connection with our narcotics investigations.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
And I applaud you for that. Everyone supported that decision to
aggressively, as you did, partner with the Federal government. I
mean, that was something, you know, that was missing and you get it
and we get it and we're reaping the benefits of that and that was a
great idea. But you know, we have -- people look at it and say,
Look, we have this position, and even at this grade of should we
have been paying a Chief $220,000, whatever we were paying him.
Should we be paying somebody in this function even at 141, at the
grade that he's coming in at? You know, that's the question that
needs to be answered. And me and you both share the belief that we
need more cops on the street because that is what's going to, you
know, reduce the crime. That is what's going to fill the gaps when
we have more retirements and we have a lot of -- we have a full
class now that's in the pipeline, but the fact of the matter is we
don't know what's going to happen after January in terms of
retirements or in July, and by the time we train police officers it
takes longer. So the more resources we can put into this, into the
policing is something that we want to see, you know. I understand
that he also has a car?

COMMISSIONER SINI:
Yes, he has a -- yes, he has a car.
LEG. McCAFFREY:
And I understand that it's a car that's equipped with lights and sirens?

06:10PM
COMMISSIONER SINI:
I don't know that off the top of my head. I don't know.

06:10PM
LEG. McCAFFREY:
Okay, maybe we could find out if that's the case. And someone I think would have to explain to us why someone in -- head of the PIO would have that, you know?

06:10PM
COMMISSIONER SINI:
As the command staff, they all have take-home cars. And I think it would probably cost more money for the County to take a car parked to take a light package out, but if you want me to look into that I will.

06:10PM
LEG. McCAFFREY:
No, I mean -- and the fact is, I don't know, is he considered command staff? I mean, what is the level of --

06:10PM
COMMISSIONER SINI:
Yeah, command staff would be Commissioners and Chiefs.

06:10PM
LEG. McCAFFREY:
And he's considered a Commissioner??

06:10PM
COMMISSIONER SINI:
He'll be -- right now he's a Deputy Assistant, or an Assistant Deputy, and this resolution will make him an Assistant Commissioner.

06:11PM
LEG. McCAFFREY:
And as an Assistant Deputy, would he -- should he have a take-home car?

06:11PM
COMMISSIONER SINI:
Here's an individual who's traveling on County business 24/7. Whether it's to press conferences, events, community events, you know, it's -- it's certainly a -- it's something that all the Chiefs have, it's something that -- I have a take-home car, my two Deputies, the 1st Deputy Police Commissioner has a take-home car.

06:11PM
LEG. McCAFFREY:
I'm not questioning those, Commissioner, absolutely not. I'm just -- we're looking at someone whose primary function is press, you know.

06:11PM
COMMISSIONER SINI:
Well, that's --

06:11PM
LEG. McCAFFREY:
And should they have a take-home car, and there's a lot of people who would probably say, I don't think so. And if the car's got lights and sirens, that's really something else, too, you know,
we'd be concerned about.

COMMISSIONER SINI:
I mean, we can have this conversation, but certainly the resolution -- respectfully, before this body -- has to do with creating a new title so that the Police Commissioner, whether it's me or Police Commissioner in the future, can ensure that they have someone who they trust in that position. This is a position that carries an enormous responsibility, and it's not just for the people in the department or the department itself, it's for the County. Many of the -- this is all of your Police Department as well, and we all benefit from the department and we all strive and make sure the department is doing well.

And this individual coordinates all media inquiries, which is critically important in this day and age. I think, you know, sometimes there is a whole nother side to this position involving Crime Stoppers, and I think you get that, so I appreciate that and I won't belabor that; but that's a huge part. Let's just put that aside for the part -- for the moment and talk about media. I think there's been some suggestion, both at the hearing and now today, that this isn't important. I think media and policing, you know, the Police Department being transparent and being able to deal with the media effectively and being able to deal with community groups effectively is critically important. You can put on CNN or Fox News any night of the week and you'll see some sort of situation where if there was better communication, perhaps problems could have been avoided, and I think this is a critically important position.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
And I don't disagree, and that's why I think it should remain as a Civil Service test with a competitive exam.

COMMISSIONER SINI:
I could not disagree with you more. I mean, you think we should test for this? Respectfully, testing for this position is, I think, just practically -- it's just not practical. This is a position where you want an individual that is able to keep information confidential, someone who will be at times briefed on extremely sensitive matters, someone who is -- someone that -- you know, this position I think lends itself perfectly to an exempt position, and that's effectively the reason for this resolution.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Good evening, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER SINI:
Good evening.
LEG. LINDSAY:
I just want to add some additional clarity and my opinion on some of the comments that were made. I want -- whether he has lights and sirens on his car or not, I think he should. If you look at some of the unfortunate events that have occurred nationally over the last several years, it's obvious that ineffective communication has led to rioting, has led to all kinds of additional issues that are brought to bear because of unfortunate situations. I think communication is always the key. And I would rather have someone who is a professional and expertise is in the area of communication, not someone who scored the highest grade on a Civil Service test. And it should be at the pleasure at the Commissioner, at your pleasure, because that person needs to effectively work for you, with you, and needs to be someone that you trust and can trust with information that is very sensitive and is going to be communicated in a timely fashion.

So I fully plan to support this measure and I -- if he doesn't have lights and sirens, I would be one -- I would support that as well.

I think if there's an incident that occurs, he needs to be at the scene of that incident so that that communication is immediate. Because that's other areas where we've seen unfortunate miscommunication take place. As we all know, once the word's out there, it's so hard to change the facts that are inaccurate once they're in the public eye, and we need to put those facts in place as quickly as possible and in as an effective way as possible and I think this is a good measure and I plan to vote in favor of it.

COMMISSIONER SINI:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
You said something very telling there, that he's, you know, a confidant and he could have top secret stuff that's very important, and on his resume, before his education, he lists his campaign experience in detail working on all these campaigns. You know, this seems to me to be like some political hack who needed a job, because clearly he wouldn't list his campaign experience. And it says 2002 to present. You know, I take exception to you sitting here saying this when the guy is saying to you and to everyone in this Legislature that he is a campaign operative; not my words, his words.

COMMISSIONER SINI:
The fact that he has political experience on campaigns does not make him not qualified for this position.

LEG. TROTTA:
Well, Trotta, he shouldn't --

COMMISSIONER SINI:
In fact, I think the experience one earns, the experience that you can get campaigning is directly relevant to strategic
communications.

**LEG. TROTTA:** Clearly not when it comes to a top secret situation --

**COMMISSIONER SINI:** He doesn't have top secret clearance and you know that, Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTTA:** I know, but maybe he should. Maybe it should be someone --

**COMMISSIONER SINI:** I don't have top secret clearance, I have secret clearance.

**LEG. TROTTA:** Okay. Is he a certified Public Information Officer which the previous officers were?

**COMMISSIONER SINI:** I'm sorry?

**LEG. TROTTA:** There's a State and National Association that actually certifies Public Information Officers.

**COMMISSIONER SINI:** First of all, this resolution is not specific to Mr. Meyers. This position allows this Commissioner and future Commissioners to appoint --

**LEG. TROTTA:** I agree with you; you got me on all that. I don't like the fact that on his resume he lists very prominently, 2002 to present, that he's a campaign operative, essentially.

**COMMISSIONER SINI:** This is an individual with government communications experience, I believe it's over a decade. He's been in the County doing communication experience for the last several years. He knows the County, he knows communications, he has completed all of his Master's work at Columbia in communications; he may not have received the degree yet, but he's done with classes. And this individual, based on his prior work experience, based on his resume, based on what he did in the County, his work ethic in the County, I believe is the best person for the job, and that's the decision I get to make.

**LEG. TROTTA:** I am not arguing and I believe you. I think you should pick the person you want. However, the fact that this on his resume shows his government campaign experience prominently --

**COMMISSIONER SINI:** Did you not want him to honestly put his work experience on his resume; is that what you're suggesting?
LEG. TROTTA: No, what I'm suggesting is that this guy is, you know, clearly going to be somewhat jaded because he has responsibilities to certain political parties, and the Police Department should be non-political and when I see this, it looks very political to me.

COMMISSIONER SINI: We make sure that the Police Department is not political. In every decision that we make at the Police Department, we make --

LEG. TROTTA: How many people did you interview for this?

COMMISSIONER SINI: I -- Justin is the person I picked.

LEG. TROTTA: Okay, so you didn't interview anybody else.

COMMISSIONER SINI: I don't believe I interviewed for that specific position, no.

LEG. TROTTA: Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY: Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA: Yeah, just one or two comments. On a personal level, I've always taken the position -- and I know what's before me here -- that when I vote on a Commissioner, I voted for you and I debated for you. I usually take the position that once I vote for a Commissioner I leave him alone, let them make their own decisions, let them bring in the personnel and people that they feel are effective, that will be loyal and trustworthy that will get results, and I've always felt that way. Just spending a lot of time on one individual or two individuals, I wish I didn't have to deal with it; you should just be able to make the appointment, and in the end you're the one ultimately responsible for his actions.

So, we're debating a lot of time with this and, bottom line, I just feel that it should be your call. That's the way it should be with all Commissioners, your call. And if things go poorly, all right, certainly you'll have to pay the price. But in this case, if this individual or any individual, if you feel comfortable with the person, if they're going to get in there and do the job, they're going to be effective, they're going to be loyal and they're going to get results, because after all is said and done it's results that count. I mean, some people are great talkers and they can debate, but they don't get results, and that's what's important. And in the end, you'll be judged on your results. And there's a couple of issues that have come up in the last four or five months, very serious issues, which I know you're concentrating your time, but there's a lot of people waiting for results, especially in terms of Brentwood. If this fellow or the people around you can
help you achieve that very important result in that area, that's what we're looking for. As far as I'm concerned, I have no problem with this individual. I wish I -- you know, I don't even want to deal with these things, they're minor issues. That's your job, you should have the right to appoint who you want.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
Thank you. Hi, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER SINI:
How are you?

LEG. CILMI:
Good, thanks. Full from the egg nog (laughter).

P.O. GREGORY:
You need a strategic communication person.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. CILMI:
You're right, you're right. So I don't really want to talk about Justin in particular. I agree that you should have the ability to hire somebody who you think can best represent the department and who can best articulate, you know, what the department wants to articulate, and it's very difficult to do in a test.

What I want to really talk about is you stated very emphatically that there's no budgetary impact to this resolution. Does it allow, though, for increased cost, increased payroll cost that you would build in, let's say, to next year's budget?

COMMISSIONER SINI:
In what respect?

LEG. CILMI:
In other words, does it give you more wiggle room, if you will, to increase a salary that would then be ultimately end up in next year's proposed budget -- when I say next year's, I mean 2018's proposed budget -- and then, you know, we would have to deal with it at that point.

COMMISSIONER SINI:
That I would come before you with another resolution asking for a pay increase?

LEG. CILMI:
No. No, no no. In other words, he makes "X" amount right now, that position makes "X" amount right now; if we create this new position, what is the salary level that this new position would allow for? Is it greater than what the current salary is or less than what the current salary is?
COMMISSIONER SINI:
It's exactly the same.

LEG. CILMI:
Exactly the same.

COMMISSIONER SINI:
A hundred and fifty --

LEG. CILMI:
And does it allow for that salary --

COMMISSIONER SINI:
-- one hundred nineteen.

LEG. CILMI:
And does it allow for that salary to increase?

COMMISSIONER SINI:
No.

LEG. CILMI:
It doesn't. Whereas if he stayed in the exempt or in the current position, then it does increase.

COMMISSIONER SINI:
I think he would have capped out at that amount.

LEG. CILMI:
He would have capped at that amount.

COMMISSIONER SINI:
Let me check because I have that information.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. While you're looking --

COMMISSIONER SINI:
He would have capped out at that amount; that's my information that I have.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. Are there other positions within the department that, you know, could basically -- that currently exist that could basically be assigned the same responsibilities; oversight of the Police Information Office?

COMMISSIONER SINI:
No, one of the keys -- one of the key attributes of this title is that it is a high-ranking title. The PIO Officer, the person in charge of PIO, is dealing across commands, they have to -- they have to get information from people of all ranks, including the rank of Chief, and it's important that the person who's doing that has the rank in order to get that sort of cooperation. As you know, it's a paramilitary organization and folks who are essentially telling other individuals what information to give
needs to have a sufficient rank.

LEG. CILMI:
Name all of the Chiefs that are -- that you have in the department now.

06:25PM

COMMISSIONER SINI:
By name?

06:25PM

LEG. CILMI:
No, not by name, by title. We know we have Chief of Department --

COMMISSIONER SINI:
Chief of Department who's a four-star, then you have three Chief of Divisions, Division Chiefs; you have Chief of Support Services, Chief of Patrol and Chief of Detectives. And then we have a Chief who oversees Internal Affairs, okay. And then we have Assistant Chiefs and Deputy Chiefs. We have two Assistant Chiefs, one in the Detectives Division -- I'm sorry, that's a Deputy Chief. It's a Deputy Chief in the Detectives Division, and then we have an Assistant Chief and a Deputy Chief in the Patrol Division. So essentially what you have is you have your Chief of Department, you have your three divisions: Support Services has a three-star and then a one-star; Detectives has a three-star and a one-star; and Patrol has a three, two, one-star.

LEG. CILMI:
And what about Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Chief Deputy Commissioner, Chief --

COMMISSIONER SINI:
So we have the Police Commissioner, obviously.

LEG. CILMI:
Right.

COMMISSIONER SINI:
And then we have a first Deputy Police Commissioner who is essentially my top advisor and he also has specific responsibilities, including but not limited to overseeing internal affairs and labor relations for the department. We then have a Deputy Police Commissioner who oversees and is in charge of our Community Relations Bureau, and then we have a -- we have an Assistant Deputy Police Commissioner for Budget which is a part-time employee who assists with budget matters.

LEG. CILMI:
So the Deputy who oversees communications?

COMMISSIONER SINI:
Right now the title is Assistant Deputy.

LEG. CILMI:
Assistant Deputy that oversees Communications?
COMMISSIONER SINI:
Right.

LEG. CILMI:
That's a --

COMMISSIONER SINI:
It's a --

LEG. CILMI:
Is that an exempt position?

COMMISSIONER SINI:
It's a provisional position that will -- will essentially not exist at some point because it will have to -- unless there's a test given, is my understanding.

LEG. CILMI:
Well, okay. Because my question was, or is why can't we just fold this position into one of the other -- I mean, you have a lot of Chiefs and a lot of Assistant Chiefs and a lot of Deputy Chiefs and Deputy Commissioners and Assistant Deputy Commissioners and --

COMMISSIONER SINI:
We have less Chiefs and Commissioners than any department even close to our size.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINI:
I can get you all the numbers from Nassau, I can get you the numbers from other departments that are similar size. We are relatively understaffed compared to other Police Departments.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINI:
Keep in mind how large this department is and how large these divisions are. So you have the Patrol Division, I mentioned three Chiefs, a three-star, a two-star and a one-star. Patrol is all seven precincts, all police officers, it's all the different bureaus -- Marine Bureau, Highway Patrol Bureau, Special Patrol which includes Emergency Services, that's essentially, among other things, you're SWAT team, K-nine. It's an enormous amount of individuals, there's over -- there's well over a thousand sworn members in the Patrol Division and there's a lot going on. And then Detectives is very similar; you're talking about all the different precinct squads and then all the different specialized commands that have Detectives.

LEG. CILMI:
And Support Services.
COMMISSIONER SINI:
Support Services only has one Chief — I mean, has two Chiefs, only the three-star and a one-star. And Support Services, talk about the unsung hero in the Police Department. They deal with essentially everything that doesn't fall within Patrol and Detectives. So that's communications, that's 911, that's budget, that's asset forfeiture, that's grants, that's payroll, research and development, all of our stats. And that's a huge area that I've been focused on, because I'm bringing essentially a CompStat model to the Suffolk County Police Department. And we have people who work tirelessly to collect these statistics in our Records Section, our Central Records Section, and, again, that's probably close to 1,000 employees, if I had to estimate.

LEG. CILMI:
And this position, will it be in charge of all that — all those communications staff, or just the PIO?

COMMISSIONER SINI:
So the position that's in the resolution, when I say Communication Section, that's 911, okay? That's totally different. The position that's in the resolution, that deals with PIO, and so that is —

LEG. CILMI:
How many staff members are in there?

COMMISSIONER SINI:
Seven.

LEG. CILMI:
Seven staff members. Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINI:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I thought you were going to ask him the name of the Prime Minister of India.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. TROTTA:
Just a follow-up question. I mean, I agree that you should be able to pick who you want. I -- you know, reading his resume, he just started with the County Executive in 2014, so you probably knew him for about a year. And if you feel comfortable, I'm okay with that. I just want assurance that he will not be working on campaigns. It says until present. I don't want to, you know, hear that he's out, whatever, as our, you know, Police spokesman, because quite honestly, that doesn't go over very well.
COMMISSIONER SINI:
And it's very important that the Police Department remain apolitical, and I -- you know, I don't think there's any question that we've -- that it has been over the years, and it certainly is now. This is -- you know, I work with each one of you, I work with all the different Town governments. Whether Democrat, Republican, it does not make a difference. And I'll ensure --

LEG. TROTTA:
I don't want him working on Democrats or Republicans, anybody. I mean, he should be independent, because, you know, you know anybody -- better than anybody that you can twist stories to make them the way you want to make some people look good and some people look bad. And I want someone who's going to tell the truth and be honest and transparent, and I don't want a public information person who's going to be spewing his stories to benefit a certain person. I want him to be fair and equal. And I'm a little concerned based upon his resume that --

COMMISSIONER SINI:
I wouldn't be concerned, if that's your concern.

LEG. TROTTA:
That's my concern.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Fleming.

LEG. FLEMING:
Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. Just very quickly, because it's been a long discussion. Commissioner Sini, good to see you.

COMMISSIONER SINI:
Good to see you.

LEG. FLEMING:
I know at least one of my colleagues asked you whether you had interviewed the particular candidate for this position. I just want to say that since you've come on board, I have noticed a really marked improvement with regard to communications to the local police departments in my district, as well as some community efforts, and I applaud you for that. I'm just wondering if this particular candidate in the Strategic Communications position would -- might be -- might be helpful to your efforts with regard to outreach to the community and your overall communication strategy with local departments, and if so, how that might be the case.

COMMISSIONER SINI:
Absolutely, and it's multi-pronged. It's dealing with mainstream media, such as News 12 and Newsday, it's dealing with social media. So prior to my team coming on board, we had virtually no social media footprint in Suffolk County. We had a Facebook page, but, essentially just regurgitated Nixle posts. So now we have a Facebook page that has more activity on it than any other Facebook page of any law enforcement in the state, other than the NYPD. We
get out a lot of information through the Facebook page. We also have a Facebook page that advertises crime tips and wanted posters and the like. We've also rolled out a comprehensive Twitter plan, so that each precinct has their own Twitter account. And many precincts have been utilizing that and they're getting tremendous community feedback.

We also, obviously, engage the community through our monthly precinct meetings, through community events and community round-tables and fora. And our Strategic Communications Plan, all of that is certainly part of our Strategic Communications Plan. And when we have those meetings, what we typically do is we follow up with communications, whether it's through mainstream media, social media, or both, to get the message out. And one thing that -- the feedback that I'm getting from communities around the County is that they feel they have more access to the Police Department than they ever had before, and that they're hearing our message much clearer, and I think that goes to our Strategic Communications Plan.

LEG. FLEMING:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right. So we have a motion and a second to approve. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. BROWNING:
Opposed.

LEG. TROTTA:
Opposed.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Opposed.

LEG. BARRAGA:
The guy next to you is a three-star Chief.

COMMISSIONER SINI:
He should be a four-star.

("Laughter")

MR. RICHBERG:
Fourteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. I.R. 2091 - Extending benefits of the Suffolk County Correction Officers Association (SCCOA) to certain individuals in the Sheriff's Office (Co. Exec.). Do we have a motion?

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Motion.
P.O. GREGORY:  
Motion by Legislator Calarco, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

06:34PM  
MR. RICHBERG:  
Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

06:34PM  
P.O. GREGORY:  
I.R. 2094 - Amending the hourly rate for temporary positions in the Suffolk County Classification and Salary Plan (Co. Exec.).

06:34PM  
D.P.O. CALARCO:  
Motion.

06:34PM  
P.O. GREGORY:  
Motion by Legislator Calarco, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

06:34PM  
MR. RICHBERG:  
Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

06:34PM  
P.O. GREGORY:  
I.R. 2103 - Appropriating funds for acquisition of Land for Workforce Housing (CP 8704) (Co. Exec.).

06:34PM  
D.P.O. CALARCO:  
Motion.

06:34PM  
P.O. GREGORY:  
Same motion, same second. All in favor -- oh, I'm sorry. Uh-oh, what's this?

06:34PM  
LEG. CILMI:  
So this is $2.5 million?

06:34PM  
P.O. GREGORY:  
Yes.

06:34PM  
LEG. CILMI:  
For workforce housing where?

06:35PM  
D.P.O. CALARCO:  
This is -- this just appropriates the money to preserve it for future projects, and the projects will come to us on a case-by-case basis for final appropriations.

06:35PM  
LEG. CILMI:  
We can’t appropriate it as we -- as we get requests for those future projects?

06:35PM  
D.P.O. CALARCO:  
No. They're in the 2016 Capital Budget, and if we don't do an appropriation now, that that money basically goes away. So this just preserves the ability for us to appropriate that funding in the future for specific projects.
LEG. CILMI:
Can't we just put it into the next budget?

D.P.O. CALARCO:
No.

LEG. CILMI:
What do you mean no? Of course we can.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
We can't put it in the 2017, because the 2017 Capital Budget is done. The only way to amend that Capital Budget would be to do an amendment that would take the money from someplace else in '17. So this money cannot roll over into '17 automatically. We can certainly in '17, while doing the '18 Capital Budget, put a bigger number there, but can't roll this money into '17.

LEG. CILMI:
Do we have -- do we have money in the '17 budget, Jason?

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
Yes, we do.

LEG. CILMI:
How much?

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
It looks like for 6411, it would be 6 million; in 8704, 5 million.

LEG. CILMI:
So, in total, $11 million?

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
That's correct, in '17.

LEG. CILMI:
And so why -- are you in support of this? Why do we need to -- why do we need to move this bill today to appropriate another $2.5 million if we already have $11 million scheduled for '17?

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
Compared to the request, the amount of money we currently have, our request very highly outweigh the amount of money that we have.

LEG. CILMI:
How is it that we didn't appropriate this money for specific projects, then, this year?

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
Because the projects are not ready to move forward, but they're getting earmarked for those specific projects. As we've learned, these projects take a long time until they're ready to come before this Legislature --

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. But then there's nothing -- but there's nothing, then, that
suggests that projects that would be envisioned for next year are going to come any quicker. So the likelihood is that we're going to be pushing next year money down to -- back to 2018. So --

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
Again, the money will get earmarked and then come before us. So once the money is earmarked, we try not to keep earmarking projects with the same amount of money. We need access to the money to have it to earmark it for the projects, so that when we -- when they are ready to come forward, we actually have real money to be able to move forward with.

LEG. CILMI:
But you have access to $11 million for next year.

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
That's correct. And I have outstanding requests of -- I have currently about 5 million. I have requests for over 13 million for 6411, so that's a large gap we have right there.

LEG. CILMI:
And you would expect that all of those requests would be fulfilled in terms of individual funding resolutions for next year?

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
Maybe, maybe not, but they may be earmarked next year at that point. Where they are earmarked, we're ready to try to bring it before you. It depends. These projects take a long time, and if we don't have the money there, these developers aren't going to be comfortable moving forward. They do apply --

LEG. CILMI:
I have news for you, we don't have the money anyway.

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
Okay. That's for this Legislature to decide.

LEG. CILMI:
If we already have $11 million that's scheduled for next -- for next year, I just assume leave it at the $11 million. If we didn't have an opportunity to spend this $2.5 million this year, then, oh, well.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you. So it's just sort of a -- and I think Legislator Cilmi asked a lot of the same questions. But if you have -- you know, it's been well established, I guess, this evening that there's $11 million already -- is it earmarked for specific projects? Can you name those projects?

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
Yes. I mean, some of the requests that we have earmarked -- hold on. I just got to go through a couple of documents. Yes. We have
that Sandy Hollow project, which we had Dave Gallo here, the
developer who -- where we came before this Legislature to get the
authority to appraise the property. That includes with the Speonk
Commons. We also have the Riverhead Apartments that we have an
intent to award with. We have AMG 531.

Now, again, these funds that we earmark and send out Intent to
Award letters, it is used to help structure the entire funding of
these projects. Without us committing any type of intent to award
and us -- and having access to the amount of money, they won't get
their other funding sources to be able to build the project, to get
the economic development here and build the affordable housing that
this Legislature spoke about earlier.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Are you -- are sure about that? I mean, how do you award the
specific dollars per request? You get a request in. Now, if I'm a
developer, I'm going to come to you and say, "If you don't give me
a million dollars, I just can't do this, and you won't have any
affordable housing built in the country. You need to give me a
million dollars." So how do you go through and vet that request to
say how many units are you going to build, how much are we going to
subsidize each unit? And is there -- is a formula based on other
taxpayer subsidies, or how do you -- how do you filter the
information that you're getting and make a decision for the -- for
the award?

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
Well, we receive applications and they provide kind of their other
projected funding. We like to consider this as a gap-filler. If
they have a gap in the project of getting it built, we will try to
then fill that gap to get the project over the finish line. We
never fund a project, really, where they're requesting an amount
and we don't -- we just say yes. We go through a full evaluation
of the request.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
But as far as the gap-filler goes, who does the analysis, the
financial analysis on it to --

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
We do it inhouse with working with outside consultants as well.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
And, see, you know, we vote on these projects, but it is the
chicken and the egg scenario. We should just vote the
six-and-a-half million dollars here on these two bonds, and that
would be just six-and-a-half generic dollars that would be
available for your use. But then you're going to come back with a
specific project or --

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
That's correct, with a specific amount requested to fund that
project.
LEG. KRUPSKI:
Why -- that seems backwards. Why wouldn't we do it the other way?
And then we can actually vote on the merits of the project based
on, you know, what we all think here.

06:42PM

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
As we've heard during the Capital here before the Legislature, when
we had all of the developers here and all of the municipalities,
they explained that without us having the funding ready, they can't
use the funding to then support their other funding they're
requesting, so the project won't be built. So I can't just say,
"I'm going to give you $2 million, $3 million," and us not have it.
That will be a problem.

06:42PM

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Do you require a certain amount of money to be used on these
projects from either local municipalities or the developer
themselves?

06:42PM

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
Every project is structured differently. You know, again, there is
normally some type of private investment that goes into the
project, as well as a public investment.

06:43PM

LEG. KRUPSKI:
There's no -- so there's no -- you don't make any decisions, say
no, there should be more private investment here or more public
investment projects?

06:43PM

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
We absolutely do make -- we absolutely do make recommendations like
that in regards to private investment.

06:43PM

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So -- well, do you know of any projects that have said, "We're not"
"You're not giving us enough money, we're not going to do this
project"?

06:43PM

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
You're saying any ones that have said if you don't give us this
amount --

06:43PM

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Any applicants who come in, who come in the door and say, "I need
public funding to do this project," and then you say -- you go
through your analysis in your department and say, "We're going to
give you $10," and they're going to say, "No, $10 isn't enough, I
need 12," and you're going to say, "No, we can only give you 10
based on analysis." Has that ever happened?

06:43PM

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
Well, again, a lot of times what happens is the developer comes
forward with the application, we review it, we have a
recommendation of an amount that we counter with, and depending on
the amount, you know -- again, because we use it as just the
gap-filler, we try to find that true gap. So individual may say,
"Yes, that's fine," an individual will say, "That might not be enough, let me see other type of revenue sources I can access."
And, also, the committed amount could change, depending on the other funding sources he gets. So until the project becomes before this Legislature, that number could change.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
And it's your people that true that gap up?

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
Yes, us working with outside consultants as well.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Anyone else? Okay. So we have a motion, a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Opposed.

LEG. CILMI:
Opposed.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Opposed.

LEG. TROTTA:
Opposed.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Opposed.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I.R. --

MR. RICHBERG:
Twelve. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
Did you call it?

MR. NOLAN:
He called it, 12.

P.O. GREGORY:

(Roll Call by Mr. Richberg, Clerk of the Legislature)
D.P.O. CALARCO:  
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:  
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
Yes.

LEG. STERN:  
Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:  
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:  
No.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:  
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:  
No.

LEG. MARTINEZ:  
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:  
(Not Present)

LEG. ANKER:  
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:  
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:  
(Absent)

LEG. BROWNING:  
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:  
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
No.

LEG. LINDSAY:  
(Not Present)

* Index Included at End of Transcript
MR. RICHBERG:
Thirteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

06:45PM
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I.R. 2064, appoint --

MR. NOLAN:
2104.

06:45PM
P.O. GREGORY:
Oh, I'm sorry, I skipped it. All right. I.R. 2104 - Appropriating funds for Infrastructure Improvements for Workforce Housing/Incentive Fund (CP 6411) (Co. Exec.). Same motion, same second. On the motion, anyone?

06:46PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion.

06:46PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

06:46PM
LEG. TROTTA:
What is this, 2104?

06:46PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
Hi, Jason.

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
How are you doing, Legislator Krupski?

06:46PM
LEG. D'AMARO:
You don't have to be nice to him anymore.

("Laughter")

06:46PM
ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
Thank you, appreciate it.

06:46PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
So this is for infrastructure improvements. Can you give us an example of what type of improvements that you have in mind?

06:46PM
LEG. D'AMARO:
Just say no.

("Laughter")

06:46PM
ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
So I took a picture of the section of the code that speaks to it, so I'm just going to go right to that, if you don't mind.

06:46PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
Well, I'll be more specific. What types of improvements that you funded in the -- in the list of projects that you mentioned that have earmarked -- that have earmarked that 11 million?
ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
It could be for, you know, all the different projects, roads, parking, sewers, sidewalks, street lighting, certain landscaping on the project site.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Anything specific to those projects?

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
Again, it depends on the actual project. If you'd like, you know, we could have a discussion and we could speak to the individual projects and what the money is actually going towards, but it's all those types of categories onsite, the code's pretty general when it comes to it, so it gives a lot of flexibility.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you. Thank you, DuWayne.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right. We have a motion and a second on **2104**. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. CILMI:
Opposed.

LEG. TROTTA:
Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen. (**Actual Vote: Fifteen - Absent: Legislator Muratore**).

P.O. GREGORY:

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

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
No.
LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
No.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
(Absent)

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:
Fifteen. Sorry. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

HEALTH

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 2064 - Appoint member to the Wellness Program for County Employees (Amy Marie Ellis) (Lindsay).

LEG. LINDSAY:
Motion.

LEG. ANKER:
(Raised hand)

LEG. SPENCER:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Lindsay, second by Legislator Anker. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

LEG. SPENCER:
Cospansor.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Don't get mad at me, Doc, I heard you. You were just a little too slow that time.

I.R. 2069 - Appropriating funds in connection with the Environmental Quality Geographic Information and Database Management System (CP 4081) (Co. Exec.).

LEG. SPENCER:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Spencer, second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:

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

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:
Stern -- sorry, D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
No.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.
PARKS & RECREATION

P. O. GREGORY:
I.R. 1972 - Appropriating funds in connection with improvements to North Fork County Preserve (CP 7189) (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Krupski, second by Legislator Fleming.

LEG. TROTTA:
On the motion.

P. O. GREGORY:
On the motion. Who was that, Legislator Trotta?

LEG. TROTТА:
I know there was a lot of talk about this in the past year. What exactly are you going to be doing there?

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
I was hoping I could rub Commissioner Anderson's head first before I get up here for good luck. Sorry.

(*Laughter*)
LEG. TROTTA: We're not through with him yet, don't worry. (*Laughter*)

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT: Thank you. This is to appropriate funds for the master plan for the North Fork Preserve, and we're looking for the 200,000 to move forward with the master plan. This will be -- help develop the Management, Conservation, Preservation Plan for the 130-plus acres of the wetlands, and also to do a study for potential uses of the facility and the grounds, research, recommend how to bring the potential partners in to foster a relationship to help utilize the facility. And that will -- that's for the other 160-plus acres that we're looking to develop as active parkland.

LEG. TROTTA: Okay. So you're -- you know, end up with a booklet that tells you what you should do. Okay.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT: Correct.

LEG. TROTTA: Do you have anybody in your office who is the planning, the -- whatever we have over here, the -- what do they call it? The people who plan for us, the planners? (*Laughter*)

I mean, is it -- here's $200,000 that we could probably hire a great, you know, college kid who's, you know, really into this and could really, you know, benefit from the experience and pay him 100 grand, and he'd be happy as anything, and be able to afford to live here. But, no, we're going to spend it to some corporation who's going to -- you know, I cannot support $200,000 for a plan when we can hire someone to do it.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT: Some of the instances, I do agree with that. But in this particular instance, I think that it's a little bit more than just one person that's involved in this, and there's a lot of expertise that goes into it.

LEG. TROTTA: Great. They got something called the internet. He can make contacts, he can meet other people, he can reach out to other people and do this. I cannot support $200,000 for just another plan.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT: Okay.

P.O. GREGORY: Legislator Krupski.
LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you. I have to thank the Commissioner. This has been a --
this is obviously a big -- it was a big County acquisition. I want
to thank the Administration, because we did put off the planning on
this. I think two years ago this was -- this was before us, and we
actually had a Citizens Advisory Committee meet for a whole year to
try to get some more local input that would be a little more
meaningful than the plan that we saw when we -- when the park was
acquired by the County.

There's a big drainage liability there. I'm very happy meeting
with the Commissioner. He's coming up with something that --
working with DPW to handle the drainage problem that we have there.
This is -- this is something that I think the community would
support, as long as there's continued input from the community on
this. There's always concerns about how this park is going to be
developed. It is a -- I mean, this is a big investment. It's
almost a $20 million investment.

Right now, the park is getting overgrown. I think there's been
some effort made to keep it open. There's some use of it right now
for -- you know, for hiking, and bird watching, and hunting, but
it's not heavily used like it was intended to use, and that's the
purchase -- original purchase, was to use it in a much more active
fashion.

So I would -- I would support this, and with a continued
relationship with the Commissioner and -- you know, and the local
community as to moving this plan forward.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
And that's part of the master plan, also, to get the community
input.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Spencer.

LEG. SPENCER:
It was asked and I'm satisfied.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
Thank you. Commissioner, I tend to agree with Legislator Trotta on
this, but I want to delve into that a little bit, a little bit
further. So what is your gut as to what, you know, we're going
to -- we're going to see recommended in that -- in that plan?

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
Well, I think when this property was purchased, it was before I was
employed by the County, in 2011, the general purpose was to create
the wetlands and keep that preserved with some natural trails that
go through it as a passive park. Also, like Legislator Krupski
said, to address the drainage issues there. And, also, the other
end of it, we were looking to -- you know, anywhere from camp sites
to tennis, baseball fields, camp store, everything that's involved in camping and to make it a very active park.

LEG. CILMI:
So would you -- but would you expect that what we -- the deliverable on this would be more of a conceptual document?

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
It is, but it also would continue to -- whoever we get for this would also be involved in the next phase, which would be the plans that were needed to actually develop and build the structure.

LEG. CILMI:
Right, so which means we would have to pay more.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
Yeah, oh, yeah.

LEG. CILMI:
Which leads me to my next -- my next question. So we're going to hire somebody for $200,000 to come up with a conceptual plan, and it's entirely likely that that firm that we hire for the $200,000 to develop a conceptual plan could potentially benefit from the very plans or the very concepts that they propose in their conceptual plan?

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
Quite possibly. I mean, it makes sense, because they've already done a lot of the groundwork and they'll have a lot of the information already available to them, than hiring another company to come in and -- or another consulting firm, engineering and architect firm to come in and actually develop what they've already outlined.

LEG. CILMI:
So given what you've described in terms of what you envision for this park, why is it that we need to spend $200,000 with a --

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
We're just going on -- this is based on other plans that have been developed that's right in the price range. The last one we did was --

LEG. CILMI:
Yeah, but we can't -- we can't keep writing $200,000 checks just because that's the way we've always done it.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
I don't set the prices from the consultant.

LEG. CILMI:
I understand.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
That's what they come in at. And I do agree with you like that, yes, I understand that. But, you know, if I could set the prices
lower, obviously I would, but I have no control.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right. No, and I understand that. I'm not -- I'm not placing that blame on your shoulders. All I'm saying is that it sounds to me like what you're suggesting they're going to come up with is something relatively rudimentary with a lot of fluffy language in it about, you know, how this would be great, and blah, blah, blah. And, ultimately, they're going to tell us what we more than likely already know, with maybe a few sketches and nice drawings, and maybe some dazzling numbers about, you know, how, you know, this is going to benefit "X" number of people, and, you know --

**COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:**

I'm sure --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Ultimately -- what's that?

**COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:**

I was going to say, I'm sure there's going to be fluff, as in any project that they do. But, you know, with what we're looking for in this and the expertise I think that they'll need to get this done, between, you know, ecologists, environmentalists, botanists. You know, I mean, there's a lot that gets involved in this project, also, when they reach out to the different communities, and do charrettes, and then they come back and they redo their work out of the information that they get from the public. So there is -- there is a little bit more to it, but, yeah, I get it.

**LEG. CILMI:**

You get it.

**COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:**

Yeah.

**LEG. CILMI:**

You hear what I'm saying.

**COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:**

Absolutely.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And I think we could -- as Legislator Trotta said, I think to accomplish what you're trying to accomplish here, we could do it for a lot less money if we did something inhouse. We could probably allow somebody to spend a lot more time on it than a contract agency would spend on it. And we can save the bigger bucks for what we ultimately want to actually do with the park, as opposed to what we -- you know, as opposed to somebody giving us some, you know, fluffy ideas about what they think we should do, which we already know the answer to, basically.

**COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:**

Yeah. I just don't think that we could get the right amount of
staff for that price. But then, obviously, after it's done, we'd have to continue hiring these people, unless we just hire them and then say, "We're going to let you go in a year after the project." But, I mean, to bring on full time --

LEGG. CILMI: We have a lot of planning. And I still haven't gotten a final -- a final report that this Legislature passed years ago, at this point, I think, Robert Lipp and Gil Anderson, with a full analysis of the differences in costs and value associated with hiring outside contractors to do planning and engineer, and us hiring folks to do them -- to do that inhouse. But you've answered all my questions, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT: Thank you.

LEGG. CILMI: I appreciate it.

P.O. GREGORY: Legislator Krupski.

LEGG. KRUPSKI: Thank you. One more question, Commissioner. On the 200,000, isn't there already 100,000 allocated for this?

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT: Correct.

LEGG. KRUPSKI: All right. So if there -- if you get a bid -- the way you write the bid, I mean, I don't know, it might come in at less money. Can any of this money be reallocated towards the maintenance of trails?

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT: Absolutely. You know, once we get the final -- when the bid packet comes back and there's an award, whatever is left over we can put towards construction, so to speak.

LEGG. KRUPSKI: Yeah, that would be -- that would be -- that would be very helpful, because there are -- there is a -- there has been a lack of maintenance there over the years since we -- how long since we bought it, and it would be good to let people, you know, the public access it as much as they could, as soon as they could. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY: Legislator Fleming.

LEGG. FLEMING: Thank you. Commissioner, I'm just wondering if you would agree that professional planning with regard to a project that's as significant and wide ranging as this goes beyond fluffy language?
Yes, it does.

LEG. FLEMING:
And I'd also just like to ask my colleagues in the Minority Caucus if they recognize that if you're going to strip the Public Works Department of all its senior engineers, that you can expect this kind of planning to come out of them without giving them some kind of consultants? And I would also ask that any professional on this body who thinks that you can give your job to a college student with a laptop might want to rethink what professional planning is with regard to precious community assets like this, the natural resource that we're talking about here.

LEG. TROTTA:
I'm going give a Minority response.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
Well, you know I heard Commissioner Anderson come up here with one of his great plans that missed a $2.7 million fudge that we had to fix. So I don't consider any planner better than another.

LEG. FLEMING:
I would like to know if you think Police Officers can be -- can come out of college with a laptop and just do their jobs. We're talking about very, very complicated planning of ecosystems, with community impacts, and lots of stakeholders and lots of moving parts.

LEG. TROTTA:
And I'm sure that if the County was proficient of hiring one or two people, and having some type of step system, we could teach each other how to do it and we wouldn't be spending --

LEG. FLEMING:
I would just like to ask somebody in DPW --

LEG. TROTTA:
-- so much money on consultants.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, one at a time.

LEG. FLEMING:
-- how many of their senior planners they've lost, how many of their senior engineers they've lost over the course of the last couple of years, and then you think they're going to be able to do this work.

LEG. TROTTA:
Ask them.

LEG. FLEMING:
Commissioner Anderson.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
The question being asked is how many staff have we lost?

**LEG. FLEMING:**
(Nodded yes).

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
Through attrition over the years? Without question, when I first --

**LEG. TROTTA:**
That have left for high paying jobs in the private sector.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
Actually, you know, a lot of guys, most of it's been through retirement. Very few guys have left to go on to public sector that haven't come back.

**LEG. TROTTA:**
Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
So --

**LEG. FLEMING:**
But where does that leave you, Gil, with regard to, you know, major planning efforts like this? Is it something that can be done inhouse? And even overseeing consultants that we hire is straining your staff, according to the Chief Engineer.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
When I started in '06, we had over 1,000 staff in DPW, including engineers and blue collar workers. Now we're a little over 600. Without question, it has impacted our ability to work inhouse. We have significantly increased the usage of consultants, and we need those consultants. It's not just a matter of doing the work inhouse, it's -- you know, you have to monitor the consultants, make sure they're doing their job, you know, with the -- if you look at the Capital Program that we have, it's large.

**LEG. TROTTA:**
I don't -- so you and I are in agreement. You wish you had a staff that you could talk to every day and say, "How's it going, what's going on?"

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
Even we had that staff. Yeah, we do have staff, I do have staff.

**LEG. TROTTA:**
And I'll give you an example. I have a Kings Park plan that we did in April of -- excuse me, in January of 2014, that was supposed to be ready in March of 2014, that I still haven't seen. There's no product, zero. Now if that was in your -- inhouse with your guy
down the hall, you'd be checking on it. So now we have -- almost
two years later, we have nothing, zero.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
What plan are you speaking about?

**LEG. TROTTA:**
The Kings Park RDA, whatever, which has just disappeared into
Never Never Land.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
Keep in mind that with the current Capital Plan -- Program that we
have, it's extensive. Our staff has to monitor --

**LEG. TROTTA:**
I want you to have more staff, and, certainly, you could hire some
people with every $200,000 we kick down the road.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
With all due respect, I think that would be great if we had more
staff.

**LEG. TROTTA:**
Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
You're always going -- but you're always going to need consultants
for the specialty work, for the large work. You're always going to
need, you know, to bring in folks from the outside.

A long time ago, probably over 20 years ago, a majority of the work
was done inhouse. It was a much smaller Capital Program. And as
the budget has, I guess, gotten worse, we've had to, you know, make
do with the staffing that we had. I agree with you, it would be
great to get more staffing, but we have a budget that has a huge
hole in it, too. So as much as I admire and appreciate everybody's
effort to try and get us more people, we're trying to make do with
what we have and our ability --

**LEG. TROTTA:**
I sympathize with you, I really do.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
And I appreciate that.

**LEG. TROTTA:**
You cant borrow money to pay salaries, which is what we're about
to do to borrow to do this, and that's why this County is in the
shape it is.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
But in a specialty item such as this, when you're dealing with
parks and with the potential for, you know, environmental issues --
I mean, North Fork Preserve, I was very instrumental in the
discussions that went on there, and getting in the acquiring of
that land, and it's not just a matter of an open field. There are
so many things that go on in that facility, and that's why --

**LEG. TROTTA:**
I've been there, I know.

07:05PM

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
Yeah. So, I mean, that's why you need somebody, the specialization that this requires out of a consultant.

07:05PM

**LEG. TROTTA:**
It's nothing that we couldn't hire someone to do. There's a qualified person out there who I'm sure would be -- love to have a job doing that, but, unfortunately, we have to borrow money to do it, and we can't do that to hire people, and that's what the problem is.

07:06PM

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay. All right. So where are we? All right. So we have a motion and a second on I.R. 1972. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

07:06PM

**LEG. TROTTA:**
Opposed.

07:06PM

**MR. RICHBERG:**
Fourteen -- 15. *(Not Present: Legislator Browning/Absent: Legislator Muratore)*

07:06PM

**P.O. GREGORY:**

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

07:06PM

**LEG. ANKER:**
Yes.

07:06PM

**LEG. FLEMING:**
Yes.

07:06PM

**LEG. SPENCER:**
Yes.

07:06PM

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Yes for fluff.

07:06PM

**LEG. STERN:**
Yes.

07:06PM

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**
Yes.

07:06PM

**LEG. TROTTA:**
No.

07:07PM

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

* Index Included at End of Transcript
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
(Absent)

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 2079A, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.
LEG. D'AMARO: Yes.

LEG. STERN: Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY: Yes.

LEG. TROTTA: No.

LEG. KENNEDY: Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA: Yes.

LEG. CILMI: Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ: Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY: Yes.

LEG. ANKER: Yes.

LEG. HAHN: Yes.

LEG. MURATORE: (Absent)

LEG. BROWNING: Yes.

LEG. FLEMING: Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI: Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO: Yes.

MR. RICHBERG: Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY: I.R. 2084 - Appropriating funds for improvements to Cupsogue County Park (CP 7080) (Co. Exec.).

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. FLEMING:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Fleming.

LEG. CILMI:
On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
On the motion, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
Commissioner, what is this for? I thought we decided what we were going to do with Cupsogue and what was there was fine and --

LEG. HAHN:
Grrrr.

(*Laughter*)

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
No. No.

LEG. CILMI:
Am I remembering that wrong? I thought somebody said to us that although we were going to build this really expensive facility, that it turned out that the one that we were using there is working out just great and --

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
A lot of it is. This is to -- the main part of this is to create an ADA staircase, excuse me, right in the center that will go up to the deck, because right now the two ramps that bring you into the -- up to the beach are nowhere near ADA compliant.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. And how much of the -- how much of the money that we're spending here is for that purpose?

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
We're looking at about 800-plus for that part of it.

LEG. SPENCER:
Eight hundred-plus.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
And then there'll be alternates to extend the deck.
So this is a $1.3 million --

**COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:**
Right 1.35, I believe.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Yeah, 1.350, right, right. So you said about 800,000 for the ADA. And then what's the other 500?

**COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:**
And there -- also, we're bidding it out as alternatives, and there is going to be an extension of the deck up there to create more space up on the top.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Do they need more space?

**COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:**
Yeah, I believe so. It gets pretty crowded up there. It turned out to be a big gathering point. And if you've ever been up there --

**LEG. CILMI:**
I know it's a very popular beach.

**COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:**
Right, right. And this way, if at all possible, later on, it can house any other facility that we decide in later years to put up top.

**MS. HORST:**
If, if, if.

**COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:**
If, if.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Yeah, you just -- you had me at, you know, hello, there, but then you lost me.

("Laughter")

What other -- what other facility?

**COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:**
Don't ask me if you don't want to know.

**LEG. CILMI:**
What other facility?

**COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:**
Well, and we're also --

**LEG. CILMI:**
Is that why we're putting this deck -- extending this deck in
another facility up there?

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
No, no, no. There's a need for it, because the deck does get crowded up there. Occasionally, that the lessee, the Beach Hut has a band up there and it's just -- there's just not enough room. It was -- it is a little small, so we feel that this is going to create a better area for the park.

LEG. CILMI:
So my next question was going to be, though, is this the last investment in terms of construction, other than, heaven forbid, we have another catastrophic loss? Or, obviously, there needs to be maintenance, but is this the last major expense that we're going to incur for this facility?

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
No. We're also looking to get, maybe, possibly, a maintenance building out of it, depending how the bids come in.

MS. HORST:
With this money.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
With this money. With this money.

LEG. CILMI:
With this money?

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
Correct, right.

LEG. CILMI:
But you're not going to come back to us for more capital money, unless it's maintenance related, or, heaven forbid, you know, something happens?

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
Yeah. I can't, I can't answer that right now, you know.

MS. HORST:
There's been no --

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
There's been no --

MS. HORST:
-- consensus.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
That's a good answer.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
Right, there's been no consensus on it so far on building anything additional.
LEG. CILMI:
All right
P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
I was looking at the picture of the $800,000 ramp. I mean, how did you come up with that number? It's a ramp, it's switchbacks.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
Right. Well, the difference -- I think the main part -- I'll let the engineer speak a little bit more on that. But I think there's over 135 pilings that need to be put in. And now, right there alone, just for the price of the piling is probably 1,000-plus per piling to have a company come in and actually put them in, because we're going from ground level all the way up to a height difference of 17 feet.

LEG. TROTTA:
My question is -- you know, I don't know about this ADA -- what about a lift? I mean, 800,000. Don't they have these things in a pool, like an elevator to come up? I mean, you're talking about $800,000 to go 50 feet on a deck. Has anybody given any thought into an elevator, like one of these --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The cost, honestly, the cost of an elevator or some type of unit like that would be well above this, just a stand-alone.

LEG. TROTTA:
I just put a chair lift in my mother's house, it was $1,000.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
And I appreciate that. But given the parameters that we have to work with in --

LEG. TROTTA:
Well, that's my question. Do you know if something --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Can I just finish one statement before --

("Laughter")

Don't forget, you're going to build -- okay. You may not do the switchbacks for that elevator system, but you're still going to have to get from point A to point B. So that whole system has to be developed and built. So short of the wood going back and forth, you're still going to have to build some kind of platform that's going to extend from wherever this elevator is over to where the decks are right now. So you're going to have those costs on top of an elevator system, which is a huge cost. You've got -- it has to be somewhat weather proof, it has to be -- you know, it's got to be salt resistant, because, I mean, you're exposed to a wicked environment out there.
LEG. TROTTA: There's already a ramp there, there's already all this stuff there.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Which doesn't comply to ADA.

LEG. TROTTA: Yeah. But my question is will some type of trolley, you know, thing that you could put next to it be ADA compliant? I mean, I've seen it in other locations where, you know, there's like a chair you sit on.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Right. And again --

LEG. TROTTA: And it moves you up to the top. I mean, $800,000 for a ramp is a lot of money.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: And it's the most -- it's the simplest of any proposals that we would come up with. We do look at this. It's not just we all of a sudden say an ADA ramp. We try to do -- get the most cost effective that a product that we can come up with. We also have to maintain it, the timber --

LEG. TROTTA: But you could take it down in the winter. What about --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Who's going to do that?

LEG. TROTTA: What happened last year?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I mean, you're talking about taking down an entire elevator, or some type of tram system, or some type of chair?

LEG. TROTTA: It's not hard. What happened, were we out of compliance last year?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes, we are out of compliance currently, we were out of compliance before. We have a plan. The plan includes building an ADA ramp to get into compliance so we're covered. But we have to -- we have to act at some point, and this is -- you know, we have funding to move forward with this and that's what we're proposing to do.

LEG. TROTTA: It just seems to me that, you know, I've seen these things in other places. I can't think of where the heck I was, but there was some kind of thing on the beach that you like pushed a wheelchair in and it went up.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
Well, that's at -- when you get down to the beach. That gets you from the stairs --

LEG. TROTTO:
It was the other way, it was coming up.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
-- to your spot. Anyway, I think that, also, I mean, I understand what you're saying about the elevator, but I think the sheer volume of people that this beach services, there is no system we could put in that would be able to handle it.

LEG. TROTTO:
Not an army, for handicapped people.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
I mean, there are thousands and thousands of people there during the day and --

LEG. TROTTO:
What you have now, I walked on it a couple of times this year, it was great. Got right up, no problem. My question is --

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
I think it could put us in -- if we're out of compliance, we could be liable for fines way greater than the 800,000.

LEG. TROTTO:
Okay. I'm asking did someone look into some kind of tram, chair thing that moves the people that could be substantially cheaper and keep what we have? Let's say it cost $50,000, you know.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It would not be substantially cheaper, experience, my own experience in any type of construction. And once you have to get into mechanical systems, you have to get into some kind of enclosure, you're going to have to protect whoever is going from point A to point B on some system like that from the environment to a certain extent.

LEG. TROTTO:
The switchbacks aren't --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, but they're much -- they're not -- again, it's a much simpler system.

MR. NOLAN:
But the park is -- I'm assuming it's closed in the winter where you don't have to have it out there in the winter.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
For the -- I believe the park's open year-round. So once you -- once you make a site accessible to the public, it has to be open to the entire public.
LEG. TROTTA:
I just can't see $800,000 for a ramp.

P.O. GREGORY:
Think huge. All right. Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:
Okay. I apologize to the Parks Committee members who have heard me sort of rant about this already, but the rest of you haven't. This is just -- this whole project is very upsetting to me.

This is one of our two oceanfront jewels that we have at Suffolk County. We only have two oceanfront beaches that, you know, have lifeguards, that people can come from all over the County. Some of you folks on the South Shore, you know, have your Town beaches, you have State parks that are on the ocean. And there are two County beaches, there's Smith Point and there's Cupsogue that are on the ocean. This is one of our flagship locations, whether you're thinking tourism, whether you're thinking recreation for the purpose of County residents and County parks perspective. And right now, we have trailers that house the bathrooms. We have trailers that house the food service. I'm going to send you pictures of these trailers.

And to say that you hope there won't be anymore investment in what is one of our two flagship beach locations in Suffolk County is really sad to me, because this is -- the location with a view of the ocean and the view of the bay, this jewel of a park that we have deserves better than what is there. And they did a bang-up job, and I thank the Parks Department and the Public Works for getting a temporary structure up as soon as possible after the fire, but they are temporary structures.

And I'm sorry that Legislator Trotta convinced everybody way back when, whether it was in June, and I can't remember what the real issue was, but he convinced everybody not to build a new pavilion at the time, and I think that was just more, you know, the sticker shock of the cost. But now we cannot allow this to stand as what will happen at this park.

And so while I very much hope that folks on wheelchairs can get up to -- I'm going to abstain, because I'm very frustrated that we don't have a comprehensive plan for something great at this park. And nobody say, "Make Cupsogue great again,‖ because it's (laughter) -- it's really sad to me that we have to struggle to fight to get a real true rebuild here. It's so deserving.

Our residents, I mean, they come from my district. I hear all the time, my sister and my friends, and they all go to Cupsogue, and it's really something people come from all over the County to visit. And we have trailers right now, and I'm going to send you the pictures. And I just -- maybe I'm -- I mean, I get it, that we have to bring it up to ADA compliance, but I can't believe it costs that much, but I really think we need to be planning for a vision of something great here, and this is not it. And I'm sorry that I feel that way, but I feel that way, and I feel strongly
about it. And I'm sure I'll have more to say after people comment.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Kennedy.

07:20PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. Having discussed this already in the Parks Committee, I
empathize with my neighbor to the left. We cannot afford to do an
escalator to an elevator to a gondola, and I don't think that would
work for ADA compliance.

07:20PM

To Kara, it's kind of ugly, but an ADA compliant -- what is it
that, a 17-inch incline? I know that there --

07:21PM

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
Seventeen foot.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Seventeen foot? There's a -- what is it, an inch per -- I know
there's some kind of equation.

07:21PM

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
One inch per 12.

07:21PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yeah, that's it.

LEG. TROTTA:
One inch per what?

07:21PM

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
Per 12.

07:21PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yeah. That you have to work so that it gradually rises, and,
hence, the angles in there.

07:21PM

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
Right, yeah.

07:21PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
Eight hundred thousand, I think that alone is a large amount of
money, other people's money. But if we don't do this, we'll be in
another Executive Session within less than a year, because we will
be sued because we are not compliant on a lot of our things. And
this is a young person's beach that they attend all the time, and
I'm sure that there are handicapped people attending. Enough said.

07:22PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Cilmi.

07:22PM

LEG. CILMI:
Not enough said.

07:22PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
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Not enough said.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. CILMI:

07:22PM

Apparently. So, Legislator Hahn, I'm curious about your statement. The -- my question was -- part of my question was exactly because of what you just said. And I didn't know that you were going to say it. I didn't look at the Parks Committee testimony or know of your concerns at all. But I want to make sure we're not throwing money away here. You know, I mean, if we're going to spend $800,000 now and they're going to come back to us in two years and say, "Okay, we're ready to build a bigger facility," then what the heck did we spend $800,000 -- you know, $800,000 for today? So that was my point.

07:22PM

And I guess to Gil and Phil, Gil, we had a -- and I hate to -- I hate to bring this up even, but there was a proposal, which passed, ultimately, to spend a quarter million dollars on a rain garden a few weeks ago, which we talked about on the record, and we talked about, you know, the expense of that and the value associated with what we were getting for the quarter of a million dollars. And one of the things that I said, and that you seemed to agree with, and, in fact, you said to me, "Well, that's government," when I suggested at a quarter million dollars seemed like an awful lot of money to do what it was that you were describing. I need for you guys to tell me that that's not the case in this particular case. I need for you to tell me that we're not spending $800,000 because that's government. Is this --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

07:23PM

No. This is -- this is an intricate construction effort that has to take place, where, as Commissioner Berdolt mentioned, the piling issue. There's significant structural framing that has to go through, you know, to build that switchback, as well as the staircase, the central staircase through that. The hand railings alone, I believe the handrails alone are over 800, you know, in number. So it's a substantial structure that we're building, only because of the effort to do those switchbacks back and forth and with the grade change that we have out there.

07:24PM

LEG. CILMI:

And the switchbacks are necessary because of the grade change and because of the requirement of the ADA.

07:24PM

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, you have -- essentially, it's one-on-twelve maximum slope for 30 feet, and then there has to be a rest area, and then, you know, you basically work your way back up that way.

07:24PM

LEG. CILMI:

Now, I mean, what about Legislator Hahn's concern here? I mean, that concerns me, that at some point we may be facing a resolution to basically knock this whole thing down and start from scratch and build something bigger and better.

07:25PM

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
One of the main reasons we’re proposing this the way we are is that previous discussions centered around, you know, a central entrance into the -- into what would be the pavilion, if a pavilion was constructed, or will be the decks, if the decks are constructed. But that would not have to be torn down as much as built around, if you will. So that’s why we -- why we came forward with this plan, is because, depending on which --

LEG. CILMI:
So it allows for a modular type construction effort?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Essentially, yup.

LEG. CILMI:
Which we could build as we -- as we can plan for and as we can afford and --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right, yes.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
And either way, the ramp would be needed, no matter what's there.

LEG. CILMI:
Right. Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Trotta.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
What did you find?

LEG. TROTTA:
I've been going there for years. I mean, it was never ADA compliant? It didn't have to be?

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
I'm sure -- well, I think when the law --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It's not that it doesn't have to be. There has to be a plan for compliance, and bringing the County as a whole into compliance, which there has been. In this particular -- at the time, and I can't remember, there was another way to get folks that were wheelchair bound to the beach, and it's from another point, which was lost during Sandy. So now we have the -- I think, if I remember right, there was another entrance where people could be brought, but it's not there anymore, and it was lost during the storm.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
Yeah. And I think the original ramps that are there predate the ADA compliance.
Yeah, they were there forever.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
Right, so that's why.

LEG. TROTTA:
So my question is, they're allowed to -- you were never ADA compliant. If you leave it alone, you don't have to be, is that the way it goes?

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
Well, no, we didn't leave it alone, though, we've already -- we've done work there.

LEG. TROTTA:
No, but let's at Smith's Point.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
No, you have to eventually -- New York --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
You know, what lends it -- what happens is, is that there's the threat of a lawsuit hanging over your head. There has been a group that's been going around to municipalities --

LEG. TROTTA:
I heard about that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
-- and actually walking on streets, walking on -- in parks and actually measuring.

LEG. TROTTA:
I think that was on 60 Minutes or something.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Oh, maybe. Maybe. I don't know. I've heard it through, you know, literature that I read. But they're out there and they're looking to basically make sure that all municipalities are in compliance with ADA.

LEG. TROTTA:
Now, did you get like a -- did you get like an estimate for this, contractors? How did you come up with that? You haven't spent the $350,000 for the design money, did you?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
What?

LEG. TROTTA:
Remember, you took $350,000 for the design of the new building? Did we ever spend that?
COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
No, just the plans for this.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Just the plans, that's all we -- you know, we've --

LEG. TROT TA:
The plans for the building that we're not building.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, no, no, no. For this, for this.

LEG. TROT TA:
Okay. So you spent the 350,000 that we --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It was less than that. I can get you that information, but I don't know it off the top of my head.

LEG. TROT TA:
Okay. But you remember it was $400,000 to rent the things and 350?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The reason that a ruckus was made was because we had the $3 million for the estimate.

LEG. TROT TA:
So who drew this up?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This was developed by our consultant, who was brought in to look at the ADA compliancy, the possibility of the other --

LEG. TROT TA:
This is -- what consultant is this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It should be Cashin Associates.

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
Cashin Associates.

LEG. TROT TA:
And where are they out of?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
They're out of, actually, Hauppauge.

LEG. TROT TA:
Okay. And they went out there and -- who are they, architects or something?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, they did the survey work, they've done the review, they've done the analysis. And we've been meeting with them on a regular basis to make sure we don't get job creep and --
LEG. TROTTO:
And this is the product, this is what they gave us?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, this, to get funding, yeah, conceptually. We need funding to be able to move forward.

LEG. TROTTO:
One piece of paper?

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
Well, they're developing plans, architectural plans.

LEG. TROTTO:
No, but this is what they gave you now.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, this plan that I sent by email, is that what --

LEG. TROTTO:
Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, that's the plan that we have to date. Once we get the funding and we know the funding is in place, we move forward with the actual design, documents, or construction documents, which will detail, you know --

LEG. TROTTO:
But how much is that going to cost?

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
It's already --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It's already -- this is part of the previous funding. This has nothing to do with the funding that we're having --

LEG. TROTTO:
Okay. So you don't know what we paid for this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I think -- I'll get that for you. I think it's about 125.

LEG. TROTTO:
Thousand dollars?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
For their entire scope, though, not just for this. So that's -- that is from start to construction, essentially.

LEG. TROTTO:
So $125,000 to design a ramp, is that what you're telling me?

COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:
There's more to it. If you can see on it, there's a lot more to
it. There's also the extension of the deck. There's another
staircase. There's a design of our maintenance building.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Hahn.

07:30PM

LEG. HAHN:
I'm okay.

07:30PM

P.O. GREGORY:
No? Okay. All right. We have a motion and a second. All in
favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

07:30PM

LEG. TROTTA:
Opposed.

07:30PM

LEG. HAHN:
Abstain.

07:30PM

MR. RICHBERG:
Fifteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 2084A, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

07:30PM

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

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yes.

07:30PM

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

07:30PM

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

07:30PM

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

07:30PM

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

07:30PM

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Yes.

07:30PM

LEG. TROTTA:
No.

07:30PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

07:30PM

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

07:30PM

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.
LEG. MARTINEZ: Yes.
LEG. LINDSAY: Yes.

07:30PM
LEG. ANKER: Yes.

07:30PM
LEG. HAHN: Yes.

07:30PM
LEG. MURATORE: (Absent)

07:31PM
LEG. BROWNING: Yes.

07:31PM
LEG. KRUPSKI: Yes.

07:31PM
P.O. GREGORY: Yes.

07:31PM
MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

07:31PM
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I.R. 2085 - Amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Improvements to County Marinas (CP 7109) (Co. Exec.).

07:31PM
LEG. LINDSAY: Motion.

07:31PM
P.O. GREGORY: Motion by Legislator Lindsay, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

07:31PM
MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

07:31PM

07:31PM
LEG. LINDSAY: Yes.

07:31PM
P.O. GREGORY: Yes.

07:31PM
LEG. SPENCER: Yes.
LEG. D'AMARO:  Yes.

LEG. STERN:  Yes.

LEG. MCAFREY:  Yes.

LEG. TOTTA:  Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:  Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:  Yes.

LEG. CILMI:  Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:  Yes.

LEG. ANKER:  Yes.

LEG. HAHN:  Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:  (Absent)

LEG. BROWNING:  Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:  Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:  Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:  Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:  Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:  Okay.  I.R. 2090 - To amend the user fee schedule for Suffolk County Parks (Co. Exec.).

LEG. LINDSAY:  Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:  
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Motion by Legislator Lindsay.

**LEG. HAHN:**
Second.

07:32PM

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Second by Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

07:32PM

**LEG. TROTTA:**
Opposed.

07:32PM

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Opposed.

07:32PM

**LEG. CILMI:**
Opposed.

07:32PM

**LEG. ANKER:**
Opposed.

07:32PM

**MR. RICHBERG:**
Fourteen. No, 13. Sorry. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

07:32PM

PUBLIC WORKS, TRANSPORTATION & ENERGY

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I.R. 1891 - Amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program to change the title and funding source of Capital Project 8154 and appropriating funds in connection with planning (CP 8154) (Hahn).

07:32PM

**LEG. HAHN:**
Motion.

07:32PM

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Motion by Legislator Hahn.

07:32PM

**D. P.O. CALARCO:**
Second.

07:32PM

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor?

07:32PM

**LEG. TROTTA:**
On the motion.

07:32PM

**P.O. GREGORY:**
On the motion, Legislator Trotta.

07:32PM

**LEG. TROTTA:**
Just, again, briefly what this was.

07:32PM

**COMMISSIONER BERDOLT:**
I'd just like to also -- Happy Holidays to everybody. Thank you very much.
P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Same to you.

LEGAL TROTTA:
It's another feasibility study. Okay, I got. This is connecting --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
After I opened my book?

LEGAL TROTTA:
I forgot what this was.

LEGAL MCCAFFREY:
Leave it open.

LEGAL TROTTA:
What was this for?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This was -- essentially, this looks through -- this is 1891. So let me just go to it, just so I make sure I speak correctly. All right, this is -- this project is within the 2016 Capital Program. In the program, the resolution we're seeking to appropriate $500,000 for planning of the map and plan for sewering The Hamlet of Port Jefferson Station. As the feasibility study has identified, the connection of these sewers to Tallmadge Woods Sewer District, which is Sewer District 2, may be more feasible than connection to Port Jefferson Sewer District, Sewer District 1. This resolution seeks to revise the title to more accurately reflect the nature of the project within Port Jefferson Station.

Lastly, the resolution looks to correct funding source from "X" bonds, which are sewer bonds, to general obligation serial bonds. Once the district is created and the annual billing begins, the district will begin paying back the --

LEGAL TROTTA:
All right. That was my question. It's going to be general obligation, but if it's created, you're paying it back.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right. So -- oh, Legislator Krupski.

LEGAL KRUPSKI:
And thank you, Commissioner. We had this conversation in committee also. Any idea of timeline of pay -- you know, this money being paid back? Has there ever been a history of money being paid back to the General Fund coffers from something like this by a sewer district? And it would be -- I take it it wouldn't be a lump sum, it would be more of a payment plan?
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah. Essentially, the GO bonds would be repaid, or the General
Fund would be repaid for the initial outlay. Once the district is
formed, as connections occur, or as the district -- let me try this
again. Once the district is formed, the annual billing would begin
after construction is completed, and those annual sewer rates would
be -- would be -- would go back towards paying for not only the
construction, but any initial GO bonds that were -- that were paid
for the -- you know, for the construction.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Over what time period?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
That I can't say at this time. I mean, a mapping plan alone takes
a year or two, then you got to go to construction, so you're really
looking at -- generally, it was -- our rule of thumb, it was about
a seven, eight-year period from the initial feasibility study to
the actual completion of construction of a sewer project. So
within seven years you begin to get the payment back.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you for that. No. I mean, what time period would it --
would the repayment period last for?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It would -- until it was paid back.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
But, I mean, is it a dollar a year, is it $1,000 a year? I mean,
that's --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, that I don't honestly know.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
You're welcome.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Anyone else? All right. We have a motion and a second on
1891. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. I.R. 1891A, bond resolution, same motion, same second.
Roll call.

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

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.
D.P.O. CALARCO: Yes.
LEG. SPENCER: Yes.
LEG. D'AMARO: Yes.
LEG. STERN: Yes.
LEG. MC CAFFREY: Yes.
LEG. TROTTA: Yes.
LEG. KENNEDY: Yes.
LEG. BARRAGA: Yes.
LEG. CILMI: Yes.
LEG. MARTINEZ: Yes.
LEG. LINDSAY: Yes.
LEG. ANKER: Yes.
LEG. MURATORE: (Absent)
LEG. BROWNING: Yes.
LEG. FLEMING: Yes.
LEG. KRUPSKI: Yes.
P.O. GREGORY: Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 1931 - Approving extension of license for Sayville Ferry
Service, Inc. for Cross Bay Service between Sayville, New York and Fire Island (Pres. Off.). Motion by -- is this your -- I'll make a motion.

LEG. CILMI:
It's bill. It's all right, I'll make it.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Lindsay/Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 1968A, bond resolution, same motion, same second.

MR. NOLAN:
You have to do 1968.

P.O. GREGORY:
Oh, I'm sorry, I'm jumping ahead. All right. I.R. 1968 - Amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the rehabilitation of Guggenheim Lake (Deer Lake), Towns of Babylon and Islip (CP 8716) (D'Amaro).

LEG. D'AMARO:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. HAHN:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Stern.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So, you know, we've had this conversation, I think, for a years about whether it's Deer Lake or Guggenheim Lake. That's not the conversation, though. But what is this going to mean? And I really do recognize the importance of waterfront access for County residents. And I made it clear to Legislator D'Amaro that I would be happy to support this if public access were provided. And so, Commissioner, you know, what -- how is this -- how is the public access component proceeding?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The -- once we have the SEQRA portion completed, we could begin the land acquisition of the southerly lot around Deer Lake. And once
we have that lot, we've acquired that lot, then we can continue
with the construction and complete a fishing pier off of that.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
And that would provide for safe off-the-road parking?

07:38PM
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It would -- at this point, we're anticipating on-road parking, but
it's right in front of the -- it would be like one or two cars
along the road that fronts that lot.

07:38PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
Is that -- are you coordinating -- what town is that in?

07:39PM
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
That would be -- that portion, I believe, is within Islip.
The lake is split between Babylon and Islip.

07:39PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
So are you coordinating with the Town --

07:39PM
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We would be.

07:39PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
-- as far as the parking for this?

07:39PM
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah. And we would also be coordinating with public safety,
because we do not want the park to be open in the evening. So
anybody parking there would be ticketed. You'd only be able to
park during operating hours.

07:39PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
So if I wanted to go night fishing, digging for --

07:39PM
LEG. D'AMARO:
No night fishing.

07:39PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
-- frogs?

07:39PM
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
You would --

07:39PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
Star gazing?

07:39PM
LEG. D'AMARO:
Set hours on that.

07:39PM
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Maybe Smith Point Park for that.

07:39PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
Oh, man, where are we going to go at night, guys? Okay.
Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
You're welcome.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. We have a motion and second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. BARRAGA:
Opposed.

LEG. TROTTA:
Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:
Fifteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:

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

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
No.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
No.

LEG. CILMI:
Yeah.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.
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LEG. HAHN: Yes.

LEG. MURATORE: (Absent)

LEG. BROWNING: Yes.

LEG. FLEMING: Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI: Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO: Yes.

P.O. GREGORY: Yes.

MR. RICHBERG: Fourteen.

LEG. D'AMARO: Thank you.

MR. RICHBERG: Sorry, 15. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY: I.R. 2002 - Approving the Vector Control Plan of the Department of Public Works Division of Vector Control pursuant to Section C8-4(B)(2) of the Suffolk County Charter (Co. Exec.). I'll make a motion.

D.P.O. CALARCO: Second.

P.O. GREGORY: Second by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. KRUPSKI: On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY: On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI: I have some question for, I guess, the Commissioner, or else Vector Control either, one. We get asked these questions quite a bit, and it mostly centers around the use of Methoprene, and how the County treats for mosquitoes in general. And one of the big questions, is there a nontoxic alternative to Methoprene, and if there is, you know, why
isn't it used exclusively?

AUDIENCE MEMBER:
Who are you?

MR. KAUFMAN:
I know who I am. My name is Michael Kaufman. I'm Vice Chairman of
CEQ. We spent $5 million trying to find those answers. And what
it boils down to is effective mosquito control unfortunately does
require some chemical use to keep it under control. There are
nontoxic alternatives; they're not all that effective. They are
preferred where possible. And, again, I'm talking about general
mosquito control. The nontoxic methods basically are marsh
management, and that's talking about what the gentleman was asking
from the Sierra Club. In terms of chemicals, there's nothing
really out there. In terms of marsh management, to basically
control mosquitoes, that's really the preferred way to go and that
has the most bang for the buck, if you will.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So I guess the question, then, to follow up on that, to Vector
Control or DPW, are you committed towards marsh management in order
to reduce -- and I know it was done with the Town in a location at
Hashamomuck to reduce or to eliminate the application of
Methoprene.

MR. KAUFMAN:
That's part of the basic plan, and Tom can answer that a little bit
more in terms --

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yeah. Could you kind of outline your commitment to that, and
that's reduce -- reduce the use --

MR. KAUFMAN:
That plan itself -- the plan itself definitely calls for marsh
management wherever possible to try and repair the marshes, to try
and maintain them better, both in terms of marsh health, and also
in terms of mosquito control. And there are active plans out there
at this point in time, and there have been in the past to, again,
repair marshes. There are three that I can recall right now,
Gardiner's -- actually, I'm spacing on that a little bit. It's
been a long meeting, unfortunately. What were the other two? I
was promised a short meeting.

MR. IWANEJKO:
Good evening. My name is Tom Iwanejko, Director of Suffolk County
Vector Control. We have right now about 1.5 million in wetland
restoration grants through the National Fish and Wildlife
Foundation, and through the EPA, the Coastal Hazard Mitigation
Grant. They're all for coastal resiliency, where we're also not
only building up the coast, building up the marshland, restoring
the salt marshes, but also looking at integrating mosquito control
wherever possible, building a safe refuge for the killifish, access
channels for them. We're looking at partially filling in some of
the ditches to restore marsh hydrology that was lost over time with the grid ditches. So we're kind of integrating a whole suite of different techniques to bring back the marsh, bring back the birds, the fish, and also reduce pesticide use by bringing back the killifish.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
And we know that is very effective. Another question was the effect of the current Methoprene use on dragonflies and their life cycles.

MR. IWANEJKO:
All the studies to date have not found any effects from the -- we use a dosage rate of from one to ten parts per million, and all of our products that are used out in the marshland is short residual, within a week. USGS has gone out within a day or two after application, they can't find the product. So these products only are put down in very minute quantities that last only for a few days, if that. Dragonflies require at least 1,000 parts per billion for an effect, that's a thousand times or more greater concentration, so it shows no lethal effects to dragonflies.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Anyone else? Okay. So we have a motion and a --

LEG. HAHN:
Bridget.

P.O. GREGORY:
Oh, that's right. I'm sorry. I forgot Bridget. I didn't write it down and I forgot. Legislator Fleming.

LEG. FLEMING:
You wouldn't have forgotten me if I were Trotta. I just wanted to thank the Commissioner, and Tom in particular, for holding off on asking for a vote on the plan until the East Hampton Town Trustees had the opportunity to be heard on it. I know that there is wetlands management in the plan, but I appreciate the additional language that was inserted after the meeting with East Hampton Trustees. That really does speak to the commitment of Vector Control to work -- to use them as human resources, because, you know, County staff is so limited, to try to identify pilot locations where you might be able to lay off the Methoprene, to educate folks who are actually inviting the mosquitoes around their homes, rather than in the wetlands, by not recognizing the dangers posed by standing water and other bad practices.

So it's not much in terms of the language, and it was watered down after we spoke, but I do appreciate it, and I think it does speak to a certain commitment. And I know that the Trustees, both in East Hampton and Southampton, are committed to working with you, so I hope we can continue to do that. But I look forward to supporting the plan today. Thank you.
P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator --

MR. IWANEJKO:
I look forward to working with the Towns of East Hampton,
Southampton and Southold, beside all the other towns in Suffolk.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:
You know, I want to thank you for your work. However, I do not
believe Methoprene is what we should be using. I'll be sending you
a 44-page document that I received from Dr. Charles Bevington, and,
again, his great concerns, as well as mine, with this very toxic
chemical.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed?
Abstentions?

LEG. ANKER:
Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. We did 2073. I.R. 2088 - Amending the 2016 Capital Budget
and Program, authorizing $75,000 in funds for the purchase of
office machines for the Department of Public Works Transportation
Division and accepting and appropriating Federal and State Aid and
County funds (CP 5662) (Co. Exec.). I make a motion -- motion by
Legislator Krupski, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed?
Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 2089 - Amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program,
authorizing $250,000 for the purchase of additional equipment for
the Suffolk County Transit Automated Vehicle Locator (AVL) system
and accepting and appropriating Federal Aid and State Aid and
County funds (CP 5648) (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Fleming,
second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. KENNEDY:
On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:
What is this, Gil?
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is for the purchase of additional equipment for the County's Transit Automated Vehicle Locater System. Since we've been putting in the new system, we're looking to add some modules that will allow us to better plan and optimize routes, and, you know, better plan for the future service changes that we know we're going to -- we're going to wind up making. It also would be used for additional work stations and licenses for the equipment, licenses for the software that we're looking to obtain. It's federally funded. The Federal Government will provide a grant at 200,000. The -- which is then matched by the State of 25,000, and the County's only cost is 25,000. It's a 10% match.

LEG. KENNEDY:
So, if I was to be operating one of these, I could find out exactly where my vehicle is?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The AVL will provide that eventually.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Follow the driver?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is really more of a program to allow us -- once we get, and which we will have soon, all the buses onto the Automatic Vehicle Locater System, we'll then be -- we're working -- the I.T. Department is working on an app that will allow you to basically, you know, from anywhere, see, okay, where's your bus, when's it coming in, that type of thing. This enables us to take the ridership information, the routing information, and better plan where the bus -- where we get the biggest bang to our buck, if you will.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. Thanks.

LEG. TROTTA:
My phone does that.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 2089A, bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

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

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

07:49 PM

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

07:49 PM

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Yes.

07:49 PM

LEG. TROTTA:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yup.

07:49 PM

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

07:49 PM

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

07:49 PM

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

07:49 PM

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

07:49 PM

LEG. MURATORE:
(Absent)

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

07:49 PM

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yes.

07:49 PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

07:49 PM

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

07:50 PM

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 2092 - Authorizing execution of an Intermunicipal Agreement
and Ancillary Agreements with the Village of Patchogue in connection with the Suffolk County Coastal Resiliency Project pursuant to 119-o of the General Municipal Law (Co. Exec.).

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Calarco, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

P.O. GREGORY:
Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 2101 - Amending the membership of the Tick Control Advisory Committee (Fleming). Motion by Legislator Fleming.

LEG. SPENCER:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second. Who was that? Second, Legislator Spencer. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

P.O. GREGORY:
Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

I.R. 2107 - Accepting and appropriating New York Empire State Development grant funds and amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program in connection with Improvements to Suffolk County Farm Agricultural Visitor Center (CP 1796) (Co. Exec.).

LEG. HAHN:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. ANKER:
Second.

LEG. SPENCER:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Anker. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

I.R. 2107(A), bond resolution, same motion, same second.

Roll call.

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

* Index Included at End of Transcript
LEG. HAHN: Yes.

LEG. ANKER: Yes.

LEG. SPENCER: Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO: Did you call me? I'm sorry, yes.

LEG. STERN: Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY: No.

LEG. TROTTA: I'm shocked. Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY: Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA: Yes.

LEG. CILMI: Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ: Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY: Yes.

LEG. MURATORE: (Absent)

LEG. BROWNING: Yes.

LEG. FLEMING: Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI: Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO: Yes.

P.O. GREGORY: Yes.

MR. RICHBERG: Sixteen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)
P.O. GREGORY: Okay. I.R. 2081 - To approve the lease of one (1) replacement fifteen (15) passenger van in the Suffolk County Department of Labor, Licensing and Consumer Affairs in compliance with Local Law No. 20-2003 (Co. Exec.).

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Happy Holidays, everybody.

P.O. GREGORY: Thank you. You, too, Commissioner. I'll make a motion. Do I have a second?

LEG. LINDSAY: I'll second it.

P.O. GREGORY: Second by Legislator Lindsay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG: Seventeen. (Absent: Legislator Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY: I.R. 2052 - A Local Law amending Local Law No. 26-2016, to increase tax map verification fees for mortgage instruments. (Co. Exec.)

D.P.O. CALARCO: Motion.

LEG. TROTTA: Motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY: Motion by Legislator Calarco, I'll second. Did you say something?

LEG. MC CAFFREY: Yeah.

LEG. TROTTA: Motion to table.

LEG. MC CAFFREY: Second on the table.

P.O. GREGORY: Who was the motion?

LEG. KENNEDY: Trotta.
P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Trotta, and second by Legislator McCaffrey? Yeah, right. Anyone on the motion? All right. Motion to table goes first. Roll call.

LEG. TROTTA:
On the motion. I just want to say that this is insane. It's driving our children off this Island. It's probably illegal. Through Counsel, I'd like to ask you. I've done a little research on this. Other municipalities have shown that -- I think Nassau County is being sued right now; that the money for fees should be used for something to do with those fees.

And I have a letter from the County Comptroller saying she's not asking for this. She -- excuse me, the County Clerk. She's not asking for this, she doesn't want it and she's against it. So we're going to be raising $32 million that's going to go into our General Fund that has absolutely nothing to do with this.

We've been sued for the solar panels, we've been sued for a variety of other things. I don't want to see this coming down the pike, when three years from now, when we've collected $90 million, and all of a sudden we've got to pay it back. This is nothing more than kicking the can down the road, and we have a spending problem, we don't have a revenue problem.

You know, every -- Kevin Law, every building association is against this, and there's no way we should be doing this. Our children, my children are trying to live here and this is putting an undue burden on us. You know, we just spent money for the Long Island Music Hall of Fame and here we are, you know, borrowing money for it, and we're going to pay for it by taxing the very people. It's ridiculous, and I think that -- you think about what we talk about all the time here, it's keeping our children here, the "Brain Drain". We have 17,000 houses in foreclosure, 25 -- 2500 abandoned houses, and what are we going to do? We're going to make it harder for our children to stay here. It's absurd and I could never support this.

LEG. BARRAGA:
I certainly understand my colleague's concern, and I can easily understand for someone who voted against the 2017 budget to vote against this, it's logic. I voted against the 2017 budget because I didn't think it was aggressive enough, assertive enough in dealing with the deficit. That was my reason.

So I could logically vote against this bill, but I choose not to do so, because the 2017 budget is in play. If we vote against this, if it doesn't pass, you've got a $33 million hole in your budget, and that hole will encompass programs that we put in place to be of help and assistance to the people of Suffolk County. It will increase if we don't pass this, the three-year deficit. The structural deficit will also be increased dramatically. It puts us...
further in the hole. There is no off -- you know, monies coming
someplace else to offset this, it's a $33 million hole.

("The following testimony was taken & transcribed
By Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer")

LEG. BARRAGA: (Cont'd)
Now, I remember years ago -- and I have empathy for the real estate
industry, I understand where they're coming from. But I remember
years ago listening and having visits in my office, one real estate
group after another dead set against what was happening on the East
End, what was potentially going to happen on the East End as far as
the fee, the welcome to the community fee, that one or 2% they put
aside, and this goes into environmental, that the whole real estate
industry on the East End would be destroyed. It just never
happened. Last time I looked it was pretty good, pretty solid.
And it's not going to happen here either. You know, it's a fee
like any other fee. But the reality is we have to -- for selfish
reasons, we have to almost pass this. We have to pass it,
otherwise we have this huge deficit which is just going to
exacerbate a very, very serious situation to begin with.
So I'll be voting in the affirmative.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you. We had this -- it came up at the last meeting that we
had in Riverhead and I reached out to the Administration and I
said, you know, a lot of the concern -- yes, it's a fee. What
Legislator Barraga has rightly said is it's in the budget --
whether we supported the budget or not, it is in the budget -- and
it will address the structural deficit going forward. But -- and
you also referenced the 2% tax, the CPF. The Community
Preservation Fund in most of the towns has a provision for
first-time -- has an exemption for first-time homeowners, and
first-time homeowners is qualified by you have to not have owned a
home for three years, the home has to be under a certain value; and
there's a third one. What's the third qualification? Oh, your
income, you can't be over a certain level. So you can't -- you
know, it's really for first-time homeowners, right? And all the
towns passed it because even though the five East End towns have
taken in, since 1999, over a billion dollars, that first-time
exemption hasn't eroded that fund, it enhances the community by
letting first-time homeowners not pay that.

And the Administration seemed very open, and we are going to put a
bill in to exempt first-time homeowners from this fee. Maybe not
the whole fee, but certainly from the -- at the very least from the
increase, because those are the people who need it at the very
beginning when they're starting out. You know, and a small break,
when you're starting out like that, is a big break. So while this
is important to the budget, I think we should all consider a
first-time home buyer exemption with qualifications seriously next
year.
P.O. GREGORY: Thank you, Al. I appreciate it and I certainly would support that. Legislator McCaffrey.

07:58PM Thank you. I, too, voted against the 2017 budget, but I don't agree that the deficit that was caused in that budget is going to be fixed by approving these fees. I believe unless we are forced to make difficult decisions, we are not going to make any difficult decisions here, and that's what needs to get done. I mean, we sit around here, we talked about affordable housing, the need for that. And I, against my better judgment, went along with additional costs to my sewer district so we could fund affordable housing. I can't look at this and say that our young people are not going to be hurt when they go to buy a new house when these additional fees add up. And you're saying, Oh, it's only an extra $200, another $200 here, $300 there, but people are tired of being razor cut. And these fees are adding up and up and one day it's just going to hit a point where people are just going to start saying I've had enough, and I think we're there.

07:59PM And every time we pile on another one of these fees, it makes it harder and harder for people to stay here and it makes it easier for people to make decisions to leave here if they're thinking about it. And so we need to make the difficult decisions. And if we keep padding the budget with these fees that are unnecessary -- New York City does that same work for $177, okay, and we're going to be charging well over 500. So it's crazy. There is no relationship between the fee we're charging and the services that we're delivering, and people are going to see that and they're going to start leaving here in droves faster than they are. We need to start sitting down and making serious decisions, and if we keep adding on these fees that are needless, we're not going to be forced to be in a position to do that.

08:00PM Okay. Doc.

LEG. SPENCER: I agree with the concern with regards to fees, and I don't like fees and I think we should do everything we can to lighten the burdens on our family. But I also believe that we provide an essential service and we've made some difficult decisions. I think that worldwide there's been impossible economic conditions and I will continue to look for opportunities, including changing this bill in the future.

08:01PM When I look at this particular issue and the idea that I saw the young people here, it broke my heart that we're saying, you know, we want an opportunity to realize homeownership. But I also think it's important that people understand in connection with this particular issue, when I went to my closing, and I think I shared this experience with other people who said they had a similar experience, I was told to bring my checkbook and be prepared to write a lot of checks. And when you look at a home, a $200,000 home and you just start to go down the list of fees that come from the industry -- and again, I do not deny anyone in the industry the
ability to be able to make a living -- but there are a lot of arbitrary fees that are tens of thousands of dollars. An average closing will cost 12 to $15,000; there's application fees, there's loan origination fees, there's points, there's appraisal fees, there's lenders inspections fees, there's an assumption fee, broker's fee, homeowners insurance which I understand, but there's personal mortgage insurance and if you get less than 20% down you've got to pay PMI.

And I get that some of these fees are necessary, but what was interesting is that as I went through the process and was given one interest rate, that arbitrarily the institution could decide what that interest rate was based on my credit history and my income. But I saw other institutions that could give you a completely different offer and impact my life by tens of thousands of dollars just based on the decision that they came to. And in this country it's a fact that if your name is Smith versus if your name is Sanchez and you come to the table with the same income and the same credit score, those closing costs are going to be different, substantially different, and they impact those in lower social economic communities a lot more.

So my concern is that when you look at closing costs in general and me in Suffolk County, that I want to put up street lights and I want to give roads and I want to do sewers, and I want to do things that are very expensive and I want to be able to pay the people that do them, it's a difficult job. And I realize that we'll always be able to say, you know, it's the same old thing, but I take it seriously. And when I look at this and when someone says Well, you're going from two to $500, that's a 100% increase in fees, when I can sit across a table with eight people at a closing that I don't know and someone, just with the wisp of a hand, waives the bank fee, just $895 out the window; or the difference between a tenth of a point in a mortgage costing someone tens of thousands of dollars over a lifetime, I have to say give me a break.

You know, God bless the industry. I hope that they do well, I don't begrudge them that. But when I'm here very seriously looking at the future of Long Island and looking at an opportunity to make those difficult decisions, then I see this as something that I have to support in the process of closing that budget gap. And I think it's not a short term process, it's a long-term process. We've eliminated our work, 10% of our workforce, we've gotten out from under State mandates. The sales tax isn't as reliable, but it's not like we're sitting up here like a bunch of drunken sailors.

I run a tight business. I run a business of 20 people that every two weeks rely on me for a paycheck. And I try to run government like I run my business, but we have too many obligations and responsibilities and sometimes we do have to make these choices, we do have to bond things, we do have to spend money because people are relying on us. And I don't like this, I'll be looking for ways to maybe graduate it over -- you know, over a larger spectrum. But when I see that person that buys a home for $200,000 versus someone that buys a home for $2 million and I look at a broker's fee for 5%, that one person can walk away, for the same work, with $5,000
versus $50,000. Well, I think that when I, as a bona fide representative of the people, I'm trying to do the right thing. And we make a difficult choice to propose a $300 increase, although it's very serious money and I don't take it lightly, I still have to say, when you look at the overall picture, give me a break. You know, we have to do -- we have to make these decisions and I have to support this and I'll continue to look for other ways to take the burden off the back of the people.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thanks, Doc. And I -- I'm going to chime in. I certainly appreciate your comments and the comments of our colleagues. I don't like these fees as well. This is an existing fee that we're increasing. And I just look at, you know, my experience; I just closed on a house December 1st, I paid $16,000 in closing costs, I'll be paying $15,000 and something in taxes every year. I'm certainly worried about if I -- well, hopefully I'm going to live to pay off my mortgage, but, you know, I think about my experience when I was a young Lieutenant and living in Texas and some of my soldiers would buy a home, you didn't have all these fees, you didn't have to get an engineer, you didn't have to get an attorney. I mean, it was scary how easy it was to get a home. You could buy a home with your VA loan, zero money down and there were new developments all over the place where I lived. And you come to New York and they're telling you you've got to have -- you've got to get an engineer, you've got to get, you know, an attorney. And as Doc said, there's all these people sitting around the table, you don't even know who they are and you're just writing checks. You know, it's a very -- it could be intimidating, I could see that very easily, but certainly overwhelming with all the fees that exist.

You know, I heard the argument that our young people, we had students from Stony Brook that are here, they're saying, Well, I want to buy a home, and, you know, This increase is going to move me off of Long Island; I don't buy that. I don't think a kid at 19 years old, one, is going to buy a home; God bless them if they can. And I don't think anyone is going to move to Florida, Virginia, North Carolina, Arizona or anywhere else because of $300. I think it's going to cost more to relocate than the increase in this fee.

But having said that, I certainly appreciate people's frustration when they feel like they're getting hit over the head constantly with fee increases. It's not just the tax map verification fees. You know, they'll say the park fees, they'll say all these different things in culmination, it can be overwhelming. But, you know, again, this is a fee that exists, we're increasing it.

I certainly like what Legislator Krupski had mentioned, some relief for first-time home buyers. I think we need to be smart and strategic in how we apply certain changes, certainly where we don't like these types of fees, but we also have to be cognisant and responsible to the budget that we passed. You can't go into it knowing that we're going to put a -- potentially put a $33 million hole in our budget; that is not responsible. Because it's more in those kids that were here earlier, there are going to be many
people that will be hurt by that cut. Potentially hundreds if not
couple of thousand employees could lose their jobs and whoever
else could be impacted by it with the services that are provided.
I mean, you know -- so in a global and generic picture, I don't
like these fee increases, but I think it's necessary given the
budget climate that we're in. But certainly as -- my intention
would be as our fiscal situation gets better, certainly look at
opportunities that roll back these types of fee increase wherever
we can, and that certainly would be my goal. So Legislator
Krupski, you wanted to say something.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yeah, just to mention what you said there. The first-time
homeowner -- home buyer relief, you know, we're going to file it
tomorrow. But I would -- if this passes we'll file it tomorrow,
but I would look for bipartisan input and support.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Thank you. And Legislator Krupski, let me be the first to say I
would support that, some type of exemptions to the fee, if you
will, for those that are least able to pay and afford any fees.

So the point is that when the industry comes here and testifies
against the $300 or a $200 increase, whichever it is, I understand
the frustration. But the reason for the high cost of purchasing a
home on Long Island has nothing to do with this fee, nothing. It
is not about this fee. And frankly, it's a red herring. This
issue -- tying this fee increase, this particular fee increase to
the high cost of purchasing a home in Suffolk County is a red
herring. It's just reflecting the frustration of the industry with
these very, very high closing costs, but the County is a very small
part of those closing costs. And I think that the public, when
they contemplate what we do here tonight, because I am going to
support this bill, needs to hear loud and clear that we all agree
that it is very costly to purchase a home, we understand that. But
they also need to understand that what we're doing here tonight is
not the reason for that, it is simply not the reason.

This is a fee that homeowners, when they purchase, will pay maybe
once or twice in a lifetime, maybe three times in a lifetime. It
is not a tax increase, as many have characterized it, it is
definitely not a tax increase. In fact, some would argue that
we've been very good here in the Legislature in avoiding those
types of tax increases which drive even more people off Long Island
by trying to do things that are not recurring in the sense of, you
know, more than once or twice maybe in a lifetime. So I think
that's effective.

I understand the anger. I understand that it's very costly here on
Long Island. But this few hundred dollars is not the reason for
the high cost of purchasing a home in Suffolk County. So one of
the speakers throughout -- during the testimony for this bill
handed out a closing statement, and I took the opportunity to take
a look at that closing statement. And I am by no means saying that
the mortgage industry and the real estate industry and the title
industry shouldn't be earning their fees and making a living like
everybody else, but if you really take a look at that closing
statement and if you really take a look at brokers fees and
appraisal fees and bank fees and points, mortgage broker fees, real
estate fees, title search fees; they go on and on and on and on and
that's where the closing costs are all generated.

Now, no one has come up here and said in connection with this bill
that, Look, we understand that this is a small fee increase and
we're really angry about the cost of purchasing a home here in
Suffolk County. And by the way, the reason that it's so expensive
is because maybe all of the other parts of this industry should
roll their fees back $300 or $600 or $900 and give homeowners a
real break, because that's where the high closing costs are coming
from. The County of Suffolk charges you to record your deed, they
charge you to record your mortgage and they're increasing this one
fee, that's it; it's maybe going to cost you six to $800, if that,
when you purchase a home. That pales in comparison to just the
title insurance premiums alone that you're paying when you purchase
your house. You're looking at 2500 to $3,000 for the title company
just for the insurance. You know, and I won't even go into
mortgage broker fees, real estate fees; real estate broker fees; 5%
of the purchase price of the home, you know, could run 20, $25,000
if you're talking about a 450,000 or a $400,000 home.

So I think it's very important that the public understand that the
-- that what we're doing here today, if this bill passes, is not
the reason why it is so costly to purchase a home in Suffolk
County; it simply is not. And anyone that makes that argument
should really just look at the fees that they're charging before
they come in here and make that accusation. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
And I agree. And I failed to mention, I wanted to mention
previously that there's a lot of talk about the fees and the cost
of living in Suffolk County, but there are plenty of studies that
show that millennials just aren't buying homes, because they're
seeing -- you know, their parents went through the foreclosure
crisis, so they're adverse to buying a home. And that's why we
have the Ronkonkoma Hubs and Wyandach Rising, because developers
realize that these young people aren't buying homes. They don't
want to -- they already have, you know, 50, 60, $100,000 in student
loan debt, they're not looking to take on a mortgage, they already
have a mortgage. So, you know -- so there's a lot of factors that
go into why our young people are not buying homes, I think the
least of which probably is a fee like this; although it is of some
core, it certainly is not a major concern.

08:16PM

LEG. D'AMARO:
Legislator -- Presiding Officer Gregory, if I can just say. You
know, over many years I have voted against many, many fee
increases, I really have. And I agree with my colleagues who have
spoken previously that, you know, you cannot nickel and dime -- or
what was that term, razor --

08:17PM

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Razor cut.

08:17PM

LEG. D'AMARO:
Razor cut, I like that; you can't razor cut people with these fee
increases. But this is something that's been included in the
budget so we can continue to deliver services in a very difficult
economy. It is a modest increase, it is not a recurring increase,
it's something you only pay a couple of times maybe in a lifetime
and it's certainly, in comparison to all the other closing costs
that go into buying a home, this is negligible compared to the
other closing costs. So I agree with you that, you know, we don't
-- we are making tough choices here. We don't always want to pass
fee increases, we don't want to always increase taxes, but the
public needs to understand that we are in a very difficult position
here because we have to continue to deliver these government
services, we have to fund them and we have to do it in an economy
that we didn't create, that we didn't melt down, that was caused by
many other factors that are completely beyond our control. And yet
even though that economy melts down and our revenue goes down based
on our sales tax, we have to continue to deliver essential services
to the residents of Suffolk County. So I hope that the residents
will appreciate that the approach that we're taking here this
evening is really -- goes towards protecting them more than doing
any harm or driving them off the Island.

08:18PM

I suggest that there are many factors that go into the high cost of
living in Suffolk County. There are -- there's certainly -- many
of those factors we have no control over, but I hope the public
understands that we're doing the best that we possibly can in
solving those problems without having to dig deeper into their
pockets, especially through tax increases. So I'm going to support
this bill.

08:18PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Absolutely. Legislator Calarco.

08:18PM

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. And, you know, I don't think I
can say it much better than Legislator D'Amaro and Legislator
Barraga have in terms of what we're talking about and why this is
an unfortunate but necessary resolution that we need to approve.

08:19PM

You know, we have a budget that is tougher and tougher every year
and this is -- if we don't approve this, this is a $33 million hole in that budget, and I don't know of any other way of plugging that dollar amount. And my colleagues who sit around here and say that we shouldn't approve this because it's too much and it's too painful, Legislator D'Amaro's right, it's a once, twice, at most maybe three times in your lifetime type of thing that you're going to pay. It's not increasing people's property taxes on a yearly basis, which they are paying year-in and year-out, and I haven't heard of any of the better ideas of dealing with this $33 million. I would have been happy to take it out of the budget, but nobody offered a $30 million fix to fill it, including cuts.

LEG. TROTTA:
I did.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yeah, you did, a control board. So let's go there. So over the last five years since I've been in office we reduced our County payroll by 1200 employees, 1200 employees. We have merged departments, we have privatized our health centers. The first one next year is coming completely off-line; Coram will no longer receive a subsidy from the County to operate. And in 2018 many other health centers will no longer receive a subsidy from the County to operate. We have continued to find ways to provide the services that this County is expected to provide, do it as cost effective as possible. We heard from Commissioner Anderson earlier; when he started with the County he had a thousand people working for him, he's down to 600; that's 400 people less, that's a 40% reduction in his staff that has occurred in the past seven years. To say that we aren't trying to find better ways of controlling our spending I think is unfair and unreasonable.

Even when we talk about our Capital Budget, and I keep hearing about bonding and bonding and bonding, our Capital Budget almost every year is a smaller budget than it was the year prior. We have shown restraint. In fact, we already earlier today approved a resolution that eliminated $27 million worth of Capital Projects because they are -- we either over budgeted or they were not necessary. So I think we are trying to meet it from the expense side, but unfortunately we also have to meet it from the revenue side. And if we don't want to be reasonable and be responsible, it is a control board that we would get. But maybe that's the plan here. Maybe the idea here is to run the County into the ground, vote against these things when we have to so that we can continue to provide the services so then we can have a control board, because that works out great for Nassau County. What are they on, 20 years now with a control board? How great has that worked for them? Fifteen years in, they're still -- they still have double the amount of debt that we have.

LEG. TROTTA:
No, they don't.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes, they do.
D.P.O. CALARCO: Actually, they do. They have double the amount that we do. They can't meet their operating expenses. They have one problem after another, and that's with all the great help they get from the State. I mean we trimmed $10 million out of our buses. I have to say, you know, earlier this year Legislator Barraga put out a statement about the need to cut back on our transportation budget. And as much as I hated saying it, I agreed with him, because until we send a message to Albany that we can't keep providing these services if they're not going to come in and help, they're not going to come in and help. But we can't sit here and say we're going to just throw up our hands, advocate our responsibilities to make this County work and ask for a control board as our solution because we don't want to pay our employees what they're contracted to be paid. That's what you get from a control board, right; pay freezes?

LEG. TROTTA: Nassau County saved $250 million in salaries.

D.P.O. CALARCO: Yeah. You want to freeze their salary and pay -- yeah. You want to freeze salaries, I understand.

So, you know, unfortunately this is something that was in the budget, nobody offered a constructive idea how to take it out of the budget. I would have been open to that. And so at the end of the day this is something that we have to do. And for those people who are walking into their closing, that extra $300 tacked on to their already high closing costs, it is not going to make them say, You know what? I could have handled 15,700, but 16,000, I'm outta here. It's not going to happen. Nassau County raised this fee last year and their home sales and their home values have increased over the course of that year. The real estate market is actually doing very well right now, and I don't see this as being the big drain on that market. They're going to continue to do well because interest rates are low. People have backed up the van. People have backed up supply. The real estate market's going to be okay and we're going to have to continue to make very hard decisions, both on the revenue side and the expense side, over the course of not just this year but going into the 2018 budget and probably going into the 2019 budget. And I wish I was here during the days when you had good money coming in, and hopefully some day the economy will get better and maybe Trump will make America great again. But until that time comes, we're going to have to keep making tough decisions like this one.

P.O. GREGORY: Okay.

LEG. TROTTA: Yeah. You know, I just want to say this is -- I disagree with Legislator D’Amaro. This is nothing more than a tax disguised as a fee. It's death by a thousand knives. It's not just this, it's the car registration, it's the red light cameras, it's one thing after another that we keep hitting the taxpayers with. And there's
17,000 houses in foreclosure and 2500 abandoned houses, and this is the reason why. It's not just this one thing, it's the things that add up, the cumulative factor, and we're not addressing it. And you want to talk about what we did here? We got ourselves involved in a $400 million police contract, 28%, three times the cost of living that I didn't vote for and I was a cop. They deserved a cost of living increase, they do not deserve to bankrupt the County. That's what's happening here. No one wants to talk about it, everyone puts their heads down, but the reality is people at this horseshoe voted for that contract, probably because the County Executive made up some excuse when he was in cahoots with the prior Chief, and you'll hear about this.

The bottom line is I have a question to the Counsel here. Are we in trouble that at some point, if someone brings a lawsuit against us because this fee is not going to that, to the structural, the personnel and when it occurs, because I've read about this and it's very troubling to me, that if someone brings a lawsuit to us, this could cost us millions of dollars, very similar to the lawsuit against the red light cameras for the $30 administration fee. I'm very concerned about that. So this is something that probably won't happen for four or five years, and a lot of things that go -- you know, decisions are made here, people won't be sitting here then. So I would like, you know, your opinion on the probability that this may happen.

MR. NOLAN:
I guess maybe the probability of somebody suing us over this fee?

LEG. TROTTA:
Yeah, because, you know, it's fairly clear, I've talked to prior Counsel to the Legislature and other lawyers and they've said, Yeah, it most certainly happened, there's case law that says it. Mitch Pally, who signed a letter against this, and Kevin Law said this is a big problem, you've got to be careful about this.

MR. NOLAN:
Well, I think what you're saying is there is a general principle that -- not that this particular fee would go to the Clerk and to fund their operations, but the fees are -- as a general proposition, are supposed to be commensurate with the cost of providing the service. And I assume that's what you're talking about.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yeah, I'm very concerned about that. If it's -- you know, we added $200 last year, $300 this year; how can you justify that that's commensurate with the service? I mean, and what happens to us a year from now when the lawsuit comes in and we sit here in executive session and we owe, you know, $50 million? That's irresponsible. And we owe it to the taxpayers to make sure this isn't going to happen. And you know, based upon your response and the response of lawyers I spoke to, we shouldn't even be discussing this. This is terrible. This is horrible government. This is the equivalent of a 60% tax increase on the General Fund tax, and we try to sneak it through the week before Christmas and hope no one
P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator D'Amaro.

08:27PM

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah, I'd like to respond to my colleague, Legislator Trotta. I
don't agree with you that this is in any way, shape or form akin to
a tax increase.

08:27PM

LEG. TROTTA:
It's a 60% tax increase.

08:28PM

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. Well, we can say it ten more times, but it doesn't make it a
tax increase, okay. The fact of the matter is this is a fee -- you
know, I've been closing real estate myself for 30 years and I can
tell you that this fee will get paid maybe twice in a person's
lifetime, maybe three times, okay?

08:28PM

LEG. TROTTA:
That's not my argument.

08:28PM

LEG. D'AMARO:
I'm just going to ask you to hold off, all right? So, you know,
we've heard that testimony during the public hearing, we've heard
that testimony during debate, we've heard that testimony from my
colleagues, but this is not a tax increase. In fact, I just got my
tax bill, because I'm a homeowner in Suffolk County, and my County
tax -- and I'm going to say this really loud -- was $98 on my tax
bill. So, you know, we have been protecting taxpayers for my
entire tenure here trying to do our part to not make it so costly.
You want to look at the rest of your tax bill? You can complain
all you want, but when it comes to your County portion of your tax
bill, the Police District is higher, I understand that, but I have
always found that my constituents are willing to pay for police
protection, it's important to them. But the General Fund portion
of my tax bill was $98, so I am not going to be -- I'm not going to
sit here and be told that by passing a fee increase that's
someone's going to pay twice in a lifetime is a recurring tax
increase of 60%. That is false information, that is false news and
you should not ever repeat that.

08:29PM

LEG. TROTTA:
It's not false news. And I can say it any time I want.

08:29PM

LEG. D'AMARO:
And I take -- I have to tell you, it's inappropriate. Listen, it's
inappropriate. You can talk all you want, but the people of this
County need to know, the fact of the matter is it's not a tax
increase, it is falsely being labeled as such. It is not a 60%
increase in property taxes. In fact, for my entire tenure in this
Legislature, the General Fund property tax has never increased, not
one time.
LEG. TROTTA: And that's --

LEG. D'AMARO: So for you to sit here now and tell me, after being here for 11 years, that this is a 60% tax increase is just patently false, and it's that type of false information --

LEG. TROTTA: It's not false.

LEG. D'AMARO: -- that's misleading County taxpayers and that's why you have angry people coming up to this podium and blaming this Legislature for not doing our job, when the fact is over the last 11 years we have been doing our job and we have been protecting County taxpayers.

LEG. TROTTA: Really? Because we took a $153 million out of the Sewer Stabilization Fund in the past three years. You borrowed $300 million from the Pension Fund; is that doing your job?

LEG. D'AMARO: Yeah, absolutely.

LEG. TROTTA: It's not doing your job.

LEG. D'AMARO: It absolutely is.

LEG. TROTTA: No, it's not doing your job.

LEG. D'AMARO: It absolutely is; I'm protecting taxpayers.

LEG. TROTTA: It is a --

P.O. GREGORY: Okay. All right.

LEG. TROTTA: -- $32 million, equivalent to a 60% increase which --

LEG. D'AMARO: You can make up all the numbers you want and label it any way you want.

LEG. TROTTA: I'm not making them up.

P.O. GREGORY: All right, all right, all right.
LEG. D'AMARO: The fact of the matter is when you talk about this fee, it is not a 60% increase in property tax.

LEG. TROTTA: It is a hundred -- it's a 62% increase in your General Fund property tax. It's the equivalent of a 62% --

LEG. D'AMARO: Well, you know what? We've laid the arguments out there for the people of Suffolk County, I think they're smart enough to make the decision.

P.O. GREGORY: Okay. All right, so we have two motions; a motion to table and a motion to approve. Motion to table goes first; roll call.

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

LEG. TROTTA: Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY: Yes.

LEG. SPENCER: No.

LEG. D'AMARO: No.

LEG. STERN: No.

LEG. KENNEDY: Yes. To table, yes.

LEG. BARRAGA: No.

LEG. CILMI: Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ: No.

LEG. LINDSAY: No.

LEG. ANKER: No.

LEG. HAHN: No.

LEG. MURATORE: (Absent).
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LEG. BROWNING:
No.

LEG. FLEMING:

LEG. KRUPSKI:
No to table.

08:31 PM

D.P.O. CALARCO:
No.

P.O. GREGORY:
No.

08:31 PM

MR. RICHBERG:
Four (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Motion to approve. Roll call.

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

08:32 PM

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

08:32 PM

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

08:32 PM

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
No.

08:32 PM

LEG. TROTTA:
No.

08:32 PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
No.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

08:32 PM

LEG. CILMI:
No.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.
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LEG. LINDSAY:
No.

LEG. ANKER:
No.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
(Absent).

LEG. BROWNING:
No.

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:
Ten (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right, the fun is over. All right, IR 2052 that was. 
IR 2063-16 - Authorizing the reconveyance of County-owned real 
estate pursuant to Section 215, New York State County Law to Peter 
Fullan as Heir at Law of the Estate of Judith Carlson (Presiding 
Officer Gregory). I'll 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 Muratore).

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 2065-16 - Authorizing the reconveyance of County-owned real 
estate pursuant to Section 215, New York State County Law to 
Barbara Horak (Calarco).

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 Muratore).
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P.O. GREGORY:
IR 2080-16 - Approving list of real estate appraisers as designated by the Division of Real Property Acquisition and Management (County Executive).

08:33PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
Mr. Presiding Officer?

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
I'm going to recuse myself on this, 2080.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Please note my recusal and I'll file it with the appropriate parties. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Duly noted. Okay, motion by Legislator Calarco. I will second.
All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 2118-16 - Waiving reverter right to a parcel, Town of Babylon (SCTM NO. 0100-039.00-01.00-033.000) (Presiding Officer Gregory). I'll make a motion.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Can we get an explanation from Real Estate on this?

MR. NOLAN:
Well, I will start the explanation --

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Oh, thank you.

MR. NOLAN:
-- and I'll call in Jason. But this is a parcel in Babylon, it was conveyed many years ago to the Town of Babylon from the County, a 72-h transfer for affordable housing purposes. Now it's 25, 30 years later, the current owner went to sell the house, there are some restrictions on the deed that are quite onerous and that are making it impossible for the current owner to sell the property. The title insurance companies won't insure the property and the sale and the title unless the County waives its right of reverter. I've had conversations with Mr. Smagin about this, and I don't want to characterize it for him, but it was his opinion that the restrictions that were in the deed were not really rightfully applicable to this particular person, and so at that point we prepared a resolution to waive the right of reverter to allow the current owner to sell the property. So that's the purpose of the resolution.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Well, what was the nature of the restriction on the deed?

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
I do apologize, I do not have any of the documents with me on this. This was filed, I believe, on behalf of the Presiding Officer. But generally I believe the restrictions were they can only be sold for a certain amount of price. We had read that the deed had restricted when it was transferred to certain non-for-profits. The title companies, on the other hand, objected and felt that the restriction disallowed it from being transferred to a private individual.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah, if I may. I'm just curious how -- you're the sponsor of the resolution, how the owner of the property came to own it if it was part of an affordable program; I'm not quite sure of, you know, the history. Was it conveyed in the past out of the program and it just wasn't picked up kind of thing, or --

P.O. GREGORY:
Yeah, that's my understanding. There was a covenant that you can't sell it for over $100,000, the title company won't insure it now, so she's --

LEG. D'AMARO:
So this is not in any program right now.

P.O. GREGORY:
No.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Just a single-family, privately-owned dwelling.
P.O. GREGORY:
Right, right.

LEG. D'AMARO:
And the person wants to sell and got stuck with this deed restriction.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right, right, absolutely.

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
Yeah. Legislator, if you don't mind, it was one that was transferred to the town in the 80's, actually.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah, and I think back then there was maybe less -- the programs were more new and they weren't thinking through the ramifications of such a restriction, you know, 20, 30 years later.

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
I would agree.

LEG. D'AMARO:
It's not done today like this.

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
No, not at all. This is not how the program's done.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah. Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:

LEG. KENNEDY:
Jason, did we research to see if any HUD money was used for this particular woman's purchase? That's the only thing that I can think of that might preclude this from going on.

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
I'd have to -- we didn't look into that factor. But again, it was our responsibility transferring it to the town and then the town transferred it to the individual. At that point it had had this restriction on it, the County restriction; the town had no such type restriction on the property when they did that transfer. It's only the County restriction that had this restriction that it can only be sold for 100,000, and it really speaks to, in my opinion, a transfer to a certain type of non-for-profit that the reverts clause would then come into effect. But, you know, again, the title companies did not agree.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Presiding Officer, would you be okay to -- well, I guess we can't table it around -- put it in back in in January so that it can be researched if HUD money was used at any time?
P.O. GREGORY:
It's my understanding that she's in the process of closing and this is holding it up; that's my understanding.

MR. BRAUN:
Legislator Kennedy, if I may. I read this deed and what it said was that the County was transferring it to the Town of Babylon with a restriction that if the Town of Babylon sold it to -- or transferred it to a not-for-profit to build and resell, that the house ultimately not be sold for more than a $100,000 in 1985, and that that restriction applied to the town and to the non-profit that the town might transfer it to for sale to a home buyer.

The way I read it, and I was asked to try to convince the title company of this, it didn't apply to the home buyer, it never was intended to. It was only intended to restrict what the town could do with the property, either sell it itself to a home buyer for $100,000 or less or transfer it to a non-profit who would sell it to a home buyer for $100,000 or less. And once that was done that was it, or at least that was my reading of the deed. And that's -- Jason and I both had conversations with the title company, we provided the title company with a list of other similar transactions from the same time period in which other title companies did ensure the transfer from the home buyer to somebody else years later; this particular title company was unmoved by that. And so the homeowner went to her Legislator, who is the Presiding Officer, and said Help, and so here we are.

LEG. KENNEDY:
I understand what you're saying, and it could just be that it was a title company that's being OCD. But did this woman -- this woman purchased her home from the town? Do we even know 25 years ago, was this a raffle kind of thing?

MR. BRAUN:
Whatever the program the town had at that time --

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yeah.

MR. BRAUN:
-- she appeared to qualify for. And the title company wasn't raising any issues about HUD or any other thing, they were just saying it's the County's restriction that prevents this new transaction from going through.

LEG. KENNEDY:
I understand the semantics. I'd just be concerned if HUD money was used in either redoing that house 25 years ago, and you see nothing in any deed that says --

MR. BRAUN:
Not the deed from the County to the town and not the deed that the home owner at that time got; no, nothing.

LEG. KENNEDY:
So did anybody do a chain of title?
MR. BRAUN:
Well, as I said, yes, we had the deed from when we transferred it --

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yeah.

MR. BRAUN:
-- to the town, and then we had the deed that the buyer got when she bought it from them.

LEG. KENNEDY:
The same buyer.

MR. BRAUN:
You know, the 25-year ago buyer.

LEG. KENNEDY:
And the town, nobody looked to see if any HUD money was used.

MR. BRAUN:
Not that I know of, no.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Because HUD had all sorts of little things that had to be done once they went to an individual.

MS. MAHONEY:
I cannot hear you.

LEG. KENNEDY:
HUD had all sorts of rules back then, 25 years ago, 30 years ago, as to what restrictions were put on homes.

MR. BRAUN:
But if they -- they may have had rules, but there are apparently no restrictions of record at this point.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay.

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
Again, we're only speaking for the County's deed and revertas that exist in the County's deed, nothing to do with any restrictions applied by HUD, we're only speaking to the restrictions that we controlled at that time.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right. Okay, all right. So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, if you look in your manilla folder, we do have several resolutions, the first being *Procedural Resolution 24-2016 - Setting land acquisition priorities in accordance with “AAA Program” requirements (2016 -Phase IV).*

LEG. HAHN:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Hahn. I'll make a second. Anyone on the motion? If you look in your manilla folders? Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

P.O. GREGORY:
*IR 2130-16 - Amending Resolution No. 985-2015, determining equalized real property valuations for the assessment rolls of the 10 towns (Presiding Officer Gregory).* Do I have a second? Second by Legislator Spencer. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

P.O. GREGORY:
*IR 2133-16 - Resolution amending and restating Bond Resolution No. 1099-2016, adopted on December 6, 2016, relating to the authorization of the issuance of $250,000 Bonds to finance the cost of Construction of Improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 16 - Yaphank (CP 8158.313)(County Executive).* 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 Muratore).

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, red folder, we have several *CNs*:

*IR 2119-16 - Appointing Theresa Ward as a member of the Suffolk County Economic Development Corporation (Lindsay).*

LEG. SPENCER:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Hahn. Second by Legislator Anker. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
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MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 2128-16 - Authorizing the reconveyance of County-owned real
estate pursuant to Section 215, New York State County Law To The
Eugene Lauro revocable living trust, Carlo Lauro, Trustee (SCTM No.
0200-295.00-01.00-004.000)(Presiding Officer Gregory). I'll make a
motion.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
On the motion.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion here also.

LEG. KENNEDY:
And here.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Yeah, I think we're all in receipt of a letter from Supervisor
Romaine and he's questioning, as we probably should be, why there
should be a CN. He raised some very serious concerns here about
this motel which appears to have been an ongoing problem. They're
saying that "Nowhere in this resolution is there a requirement for
the property to be secured, improved, cleaned up, or any things
that should be a prerequisite for the transfer of this blighted
property." It says, "Furthermore, your CN states that the Ridge
community needs this hardship application to get approved as soon
as possible"; he's saying this is untrue, "The Ridge community does
not want to see the property transferred. He wants to see this
property, which was condemned by the Town of Brookhaven, torn down.
The motel is a blight on the community and contrary to the CN
message, 2115, redemption is not what the community needs." He
goes on to say, "I would ask the Legislature to resoundly reject
the Certificate of Necessity, particular since this property lies
in the core of the Pine Barrens." So I would recommend that we
reject the CN. If anything else, that this should go through the
committee process and allow it to have its hearing and allow
further comment on this by the parties that are involved in this.

MR. NOLAN:
If I may, since this is a -- was a hardship application on the 215
and it came in like any other hardship application. And I took
documentation, it was submitted over the 60-day period and
ultimately we received a doctor's note stating that this individual
who's making application had, you know, a medical condition that
explained why the taxes were not paid timely. So at this point, you know, as is typical, if a hardship application is approved by my office, a resolution is prepared and put before the Legislature. And if we approve the resolution, the applicant has 60 days from the time the County Executive signs the resolution to pay us the back taxes, penalties and interest which amounts to about $235,000. If the applicant fails to pay the money within that time, then the County will retain ownership, obviously.

So it just -- I understand the people in Ridge are -- you know, have their certain opinion about the property, what they want to see happen with the property. But I would just for myself say that either in 60 days, the County will retain ownership and then can take the appropriate actions to deal with the property, or the property's going to be sold to somebody else who will have a motivation, presumably, to do something to improve the property or clear the property; and of course in that latter case, the County would get the $235,000 of its investment. So it just -- you know, from my perspective, you know, I've dealt with probably every office here in hardships, I try to call them as I see them; do they meet the language of the statute? And if they do, I approve them and that's where we're at.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

No, I don't disagree with what, you know, you've done and whenever -- and it was asked you to do that you prepared those. I just think that there's a serious question here about this. I mean, this isn't even in my district, but this is something where, you know, the Supervisor has contacted us and said, Hey, this is a real problem, and I think all of us live with these issues within our districts, wherever they are, and he's concerned about giving this property back to someone who owned it that did not take care of it and it was a blight on the neighborhood. And so he's saying, please, for the public good, do not give this person back this property because they can't handle it. So I'd have to agree with him.

MR. NOLAN:

Just so you understand, the way the back taxes and penalties and interest are going to get paid is they have a contract of sale. They're selling the property, there's going to be a simultaneous closing, and if it all happens, the County will get its money at that point and there's going to be a new owner of this property who, again, presumably has the incentive to improve the property. We all understand it's in bad shape, the building's dilapidated, you know, but surely, you know, Legislator -- Supervisor Romaine was a County Legislator and he's familiar with our hardship process and, you know, we just treat them -- they come in and there's a statute and there's criteria which I try to apply, you know, liberally, I try to be fair to people if they make a prima facie showing that they have a hardship, it explains the non-payment, they show that they can pay the taxes owing us, then the application is approved and I put it before you, the Legislature, and as a general rule we approve them.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Why does it have to be a CN, though, George?

MR. NOLAN:
I think that was really in response to the concern of the community because it has -- because this is a long process. We give people a long time to redeem their property, so it's been going on for a couple of years. And the thinking was if we didn't do it tonight we'd go to February and we'd lose six weeks, where the property would probably just continue to languish because even though the County has ownership, maybe you don't demolish the structure yet since you have potentially somebody else coming in to own the property, redeeming the property with a new owner. So the thinking was start the clock running; pass the resolution, they have 60 days to pay us or not.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
But apparently then the Supervisor of the town in which this is located went onto detail in great length about the violations that have occurred there and the fact that this owner has not been a good neighbor, and he's asking for time just to go to the committee process so that they get proper comment from the Ridge community and also from, obviously, from his office well. So I don't know why we would want to push this through as a CN.

MR. NOLAN:
I think -- I really do think the thinking on the CN was just what I stated, it would be better for the community, for everybody, for the County and everyone, to either pass or not pass a resolution, but if you pass it you start that 60-day clock running where they have to come up with the money or not. But again, it's a call for the Legislature.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:
I would just -- I would support what Counsel is saying. It gives us an opportunity to recapture the delinquent taxes that are on the property if it does go -- if it doesn't go back to this individual, give him the opportunity to sell it, we have no opportunity to collect those taxes. And at this point, this has been going on for years, so what's 60 days? So start that clock running as soon as possible, let it -- give them the 60 days and if they can't sell at that point, what's another two months after how many years of going back and forth with this property owner. So, I would be voting in favor of this, just to try to recapture the money that the County has invested in it.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Fleming and then Krupski.

LEG. FLEMING:
Thank you. Mr. Nolan, I don't want to intrude on anybody's privacy, but the gentleman -- the property owner mentioned that he -- his medical condition was connected with combat, his combat
service, and I'm wondering if the medical hardship is consistent with, you know, injuries that would have been suffered, whether Post Traumatic Stress Disorder or anything that might have been connected with combat service. I think it's a very important consideration.

MR. NOLAN:
Well, the medical -- the doctor's note was from a VA doctor, and it was along the lines you just discussed; it would be consistent with what you just stated. I don't want to disclose too much if I don't have to, but yes.

LEG. FLEMING:
Yeah, I think we get it and I think we should take that into consideration. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you. I have to say that I've been in -- our office has been working on this for three years. This is in no way something that -- I think it's odd that it's a CN and that we've been working on it for so long; the file is this big.

There's -- unfortunately, in the language of the CN it says, "The Ridge community needs this hardship application to get approved as soon as possible." There's nothing -- there's nothing further from the truth in that because the Ridge community is dead-set against this. This is a piece of property that's been a blight on the community for decades and we have numerous letters from the community, you know, complaining about it. This is an owner who stopped paying taxes in 2007. We kind of picked up the trail in 2013 when he was on a payment plan with the Treasurer, an on-and-off relationship with paying the taxes and not paying the taxes.

In the meantime, the building became more dilapidated, it became -- besides an eyesore, apparently it was somewhat open to the public, also at that point animals, the weather. Last week Real Estate went and they did a very good job of boarding the place up, because it was open, really, to anybody who walked in. It's right up the road right on 25, anyone could walk in. So the community is in no way in favor of passing this. If we don't pass the hardship, then we own the building. And I had reached out to the Supervisor earlier, he has generously offered to waive the tipping fees.

Now, having said that, a little more of the history. So he owed over $220,000 in back taxes and he lost his right for a regular redemption in August. So he had till Monday, December 5th, to submit information for the medical hardship and he came in at 3:20 on Monday afternoon and submitted the information. And so, you know, George reviewed the information and found that it was valid enough to put in for a hardship. If the property -- if we vote on this the clock starts now for 60 days. If he redeems it -- I mean, and I have no -- I can't say, Oh, absolutely, he needs to redeem
it. We do a lot of redemptions in our office, and most of the time we really fight to have these properties redeemed and you fight for people to get back. You know, to me it's a matter of private property rights and you should have every opportunity afforded to you under the law to redeem your property, and this is one of those steps. But I just want to make it clear, no way do I want to -- does the community want this at all. They want the County to own it, to tear down the building. It's in the Pine Barren Core, so if we own it we can't auction it off; it's not like a regular parcel that we could auction off. I mean, it's buildable because it's high and dry, it's not wetlands but it's in the Pine Barren Core so we'll own it forever. And it's adjacent to preserved land.

So I don't want to push anybody in one way or another saying, you know, you've got to do this. This is something that I feel is just part of the process. It's been a long, painful road for the community. You know, I've been there to talk to them, certainly I've corresponded with them enough, and it's an unfortunate situation.

08:56PM
P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Hahn.

08:57PM
LEG. HAHN:
So how many times did the town clean this property up? It's been this way for like a long time.

08:57PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
It has been, as far as I know, deteriorating for quite some time. The County took ownership, I believe, in 2015 and I don't know what took place at that point. I don't know if the County went in and boarded it up or anything; I know they did the other day, but I don't know if they're taking any other steps.

08:57PM
LEG. HAHN:
But did the town go in and clean it up? You know, the Town --

08:57PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
The town condemned it in 2010 for bed bugs. I don't believe it was a structural condemnation, I believe it was more of a health issue with bed bugs.

08:57PM
LEG. HAHN:
But did they clean -- it was such an eyesore and so deteriorated, you know how they go in and they clean it up and then it gets put on -- attached to the --

08:57PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
I believe they did that at one point years ago --

08:58PM
LEG. HAHN:
One?

08:58PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
-- and attached it to the tax bill. I don't -- I mean, I'm sure if we looked through here we could find out when that happened; it was a number of years ago.
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LEG. HAHN: Would anyone from Real Estate or somebody know if part of like what's owed is town liens for their cleaning it up?

08:58PM

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN: I do believe Legislator Krupski is correct. There's evidence on the tax bill that shows a real spike in that year of taxes, which goes to show evidence of the town going in, cleaning up the property and, therefore, adding it to the tax bill. So I believe there's a spike on one year.

08:58PM

LEG. HAHN: One year?

08:58PM

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN: One year where it's like $90,000 for that one year.

08:58PM

LEG. HAHN: One year, okay.

08:58PM

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN: Correct.

08:58PM

LEG. HAHN: And that was five years ago?

08:58PM

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN: That was prior --

08:58PM

LEG. HAHN: Six years ago?

08:58PM

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN: That was prior to the County taking ownership of it. As Legislator Krupski had mentioned, the property was in bad shape, it was working out different payment plans and everything. And until prior to that clean-up, I don't believe that would have gone through Brownfields Committee and approved for the County to take.

08:59PM

LEG. HAHN: Okay. And will -- are their costs part of what will be paid back when they redeem; are the town's costs?

08:59PM

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN: Yes. So the County investment, because we've made the town whole, that all goes into what --

08:59PM

LEG. HAHN: Oh, so we've already paid the Town back.

08:59PM

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN: We've made the Town whole and now, you know, we have a County investment of around, as George had noted, 235,000. If the individual does redeem here, the County is, therefore, paid that 235,000.
LEG. HAHN:
And when speakers had said this individual has no right at this point to this redemption, what did they mean? Because speakers had said there's no as-of-right, or I can't remember the words they used.

MR. NOLAN:
Well, it's not a Local Law 16, which we always refer to as the matter of right where a person makes an application, within six months we basically treat those as-of-right; they are entitled to get the property reconveyed. What the speakers meant when they said they had no right, I don't know. Everybody has a right to make an application under the hardship law. You know, certainly the Legislature has discretion; if they determine they don't want to approve the hardship, I think that's within the right of the Legislature to turn it down. I would just note that in my 11 years here, I don't think we've ever turned down a hardship application, we've always typically approved them unanimously.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
And, you know, I get Legislator McCaffrey's concern about it not going through committee, and I think it's a fair point. If that's going to be the will of the horseshoe, either, one, turn it down completely and say it's not relevant; or two, say, you know, send it to committee and vet it more thoughtfully there. I mean, that's a very fair point, give him his day -- his chance. It sets the clock back further. The building's currently boarded up, but, you know, that's not unreasonable to put it to the committee to let everyone take a harder look at it.

LEG. HAHN:
How unusual is it to have -- I would imagine this is how a lot of redemptions happen, is they are selling the property -- because one of the things that was said in the letter from either with the civics or the Supervisor was how outrageous it was that they were allowed to put a real estate sign on the property. Is that because technically we own it right now and we're letting the owner try to sell it to get the money to pay? Is that --

MR. NOLAN:
That's exactly right. And that's pretty typical in these hardship situations where the way they get the money to pay us is by flipping the property.

LEG. HAHN:
So that's typical.

MR. NOLAN:
Yes. I'd say that probably happens 25, 35% of the cases, maybe more.

LEG. HAHN:
And it's illegal for them to put a real estate sign on what is technically our property but not our property, they have the right to get it back. It's kind of confusing.
MR. NOLAN: I don't think they can put a sign up, but they find, you know, a way to get a buyer for these properties, but it's conditioned on the County reconveying it to them.

LEG. HAHN: Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY: Okay, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI: Thank you. So typical in terms of the process of redemption, with the exception of the atypical portion of this which is the CN. It's not typical that we have a CN on something like this; is that correct?

MR. NOLAN: Correct, right.

LEG. CILMI: It's also atypical that we get such a strongly worded letter from a Town Supervisor who presumably knows the wishes of the community, or the concerns at least of the community; I'm not sure that the wishes of the community are necessarily important, but the concerns of the community are certainly important. I was going to look to Legislator Krupski representing that community and he sort of echoed the concerns that were expressed in Supervisor Romaine's letter in that the community is substantially concerned about what's going to happen with this property given where it is now. So we have that.

I have to say, I was quite compelled by the previous owner of the property, and I think it was his son that made a presentation. The fact that he was a combat veteran and the issues that he may be experiencing as a result of that, you know, certainly are part of the equation, I think. The fact that the County could get this money quicker if we approved this tonight is a factor, I think. So, I mean, ultimately I'm not sure. If the -- there's no as-of-right with this application; correct?

MR. NOLAN: Correct; the Legislature has discretion.

LEG. CILMI: But we have discretion over when we do Local Law 16s as well.

MR. NOLAN: Yeah, even though we refer to them as a matter-of-right, it's not like -- we wouldn't take the vote if it was automatic.

LEG. CILMI: Right.

MR. NOLAN:
We'd still have discretion, but we've always treated them as a matter-of-right.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right. So what I'm getting at, though, is if we're going to wait two months, come to committee with this, have, you know, a dozen or so members of the community come out and speak about out against redeeming this property, but yet just do -- you know, do what we would otherwise do tonight, then we should do what we're going to do, ultimately, tonight and get the money quicker and get the property back on the tax rolls quicker. And potentially, by the way, get it cleaned up quicker, because if this -- if the previous owner intends to sell this property and can sell it quicker, then the property would probably be cleaned up quicker than if the County took it and the County had to then deal with it.

**ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:**

Yes. I would also want to -- just to emphasize your point, Legislator. If it comes into where this individual, his time expires in regards to his redemption and he's not able to redeem, or if this Legislature decides to vote against allowing this person to redeem, the County would also have -- as it is in the Pine Barrens Core, it gets transferred into Parks. We would have the cost of the demolition of the structures which is estimated, you know, between -- a very soft estimate between 300 to $500,000, on top of the County investment we already have on making the town whole.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right. How sure are we that, you know, there will be ultimately a sale, relatively quickly I suppose, of this property to another owner, and do we know what that other owner might do with the property?

**ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:**

I would actually defer that one to George as this is a 215 redemption application.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yeah. I mean, there's a contract of sale. So what happens with these, typically people, if they have a contract of sale and they've demonstrated that they can pay, most of them go through. Most of the times we get our money; sometimes at the last minute, not without hitches, but typically we end up getting our investment back.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Legislator Krupski, do you have any personal knowledge of this contract of sale and whose is the buyer and what they expect to do with the property, how quickly, etcetera?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

No more than you do.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

(Inaudible).
LEG. KRUPSKI: No, I don't. It's not like -- and if I had assurance that this is a real deal, I would say, Yeah, this is for real. I know the owner and I know the buyer; that is not the case at all, I don't know either. So I can't say -- like I said, we've been through this for years and he's been struggling to pay the taxes, every year of course it gets worse. Every year, you know, somebody has to come in, whether it's the town years ago or the County last week, to board the place up and to make it safe. So I can't with any assurance say this is going to happen or not. This is not -- you know, we do these sometimes and we're like you've got to help these people, they had a medical problem, they had an estate problem or whatever. I don't -- I can't give you any assurance that this is going to be redeemed.

LEG. CILMI: Have you -- have you any feeling one way or the other as to, you know, the testimony of the previous owner and, you know, the issues that he was facing and why the property may be as neglected as it is?

LEG. KRUPSKI: No, this is -- this is since 2007 it's been an issue. And like I said, we picked it up in 2013 and it's been an ongoing issue. So it's a long time. I'm not -- like I said, if I was sure I'd say let him do this, let him do what he needs to do, but I can't say that at all. Because you heard him today and I heard him today.

LEG. CILMI: So are you -- I mean, I hate to even ask this question, but are you planning to vote to recommit this to committee or --

LEG. KRUPSKI: If it goes to committee, I would still consider, because he has property rights and there's a process, a legal process set up they could follow, I would be supportive of letting him follow out the process and exercising his property rights because he has that. But I don't know -- you know, and I understand if you want to commit it to committee, obviously it's generated a great deal of attention here. Look at the facts more closely, or certainly you can take a look at the file. You can certainly have an opportunity to hear from the community about the hardships they've been placed under because of this and maybe get a better sense of whether it can be redeemed -- don't forget, if it's redeemed, this is Pine Barrens Core, it's a hotel so it's a non-conforming use in a residentially-zoned parcel. So I don't know -- then you can vet it with the town and say, okay, what are -- if, in fact, he does redeem it, he is -- what would the uses be on the parcel? I mean, I couldn't --

LEG. CILMI: Because for all we know the buyer, the prospective buyer could back out of the deal.

MR. NOLAN:
If that happens, he's got to pay us in 60 days, and at the end of 60 days --

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Then we own it.

MR. NOLAN:
-- it's all over, we own it and then we proceed. We own it now, but that puts it to bed.

09:10PM

P.O. GREGORY:
You know, and as a veteran myself, I certainly am sympathetic to this gentleman's cause and, you know, he wants to redeem his property. He has stated on the record that he is in the process of selling the property, so his ownership should no longer be an issue. I certainly am sympathetic to his cause. I think in the worst case scenario, if the sale was to be consummated, we have 60 days, you know, it becomes ours. And I think unfortunately for us that that's probably more of an issue because of the cost, we won't be able to sell it because of where it is. And we just talked about how we're raising fees and we have all these budget issues, but yet here we are, we have $250,000, potentially, coming to us and we're second-guessing that. I understand the Supervisor's concerns, but I think the Supervisor's concerns will be addressed once -- under new ownership, I hope so anyway. I think we should give this gentleman and his family the opportunity to redeem their property back and let's all move forward. And the in worst case scenario, we do have a fall back of the 60-day notice where we'll have to take care of it at that point.

LEG. FLEMING:
I'll second it.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Kennedy and then Legislator D'Amaro.

09:12PM

LEG. D'AMARO:
Just a question.

09:12PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
This is a question for Counsel. We took it in '07, in '13 what happened?

MR. NOLAN:
No, I think he stopped paying taxes in '07 or '08 and we took the tax deed about two-and-a-half, three years ago.

09:12PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
Then we contracted with him to pay over time.

09:12PM

MR. NOLAN:
I think that the Treasurer at a certain point tried to do an installment type of a plan with the former owner, but, you know, he couldn't pay the taxes.
If we send this back to committee and we don't get to see it till February, does he go past any time?

MR. NOLAN:
I'm sorry? I didn't catch the last part.

09:12PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yeah, sorry about that. If we send this back to committee, does he go past any timeframe for doing a 215?

09:13PM

MR. NOLAN:
No, no, he's applied timely. You know, my office made a determination, now it's just waiting Legislative action up or down.

09:13PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. Just getting all this information today is not enough. The Supervisor sent a letter, there were five e-mails, a couple of them were kind of forceful and hostile. But I understand that if you have a vacant property by your home, you might be forceful and hostile.

09:13PM

MR. NOLAN:
Right.

09:13PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
This gentleman is a veteran with a medical condition. I really think we should get more information.

09:13PM

MR. NOLAN:
Well, I guess the issue is typically when we -- when I look at an application, I just look at the statute to see if they meet the criteria, and in no prior case can I think of the Legislature considering extraneous considerations like, you know, what the community thought. Now, the Legislature's free to do that, but we've never done that up to this point; that's all I'd point out. We just look at if you meet the hardship law, in my opinion this applicant did, and now it's up to the Legislature to decide if they want to move forward with it. You know, I think Legislator Romaine is raising other type of issues like community opposition -- Supervisor Romaine.

09:14PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
I'm done. Thank you.

09:14PM

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Legislator D'Amaro.

09:14PM

LEG. D'AMARO:
I just had a quick question. If the property gets redeemed and the owner has a contract to sell, who's buying the property if it's in Pine Barrens Core? How can it even be developed; how is that a real contract?

09:14PM

MR. NOLAN:
Well, there is a contract, which I received a copy of. Those questions have been -- people have said that to me, that they don't
think the sale is ultimately going to go through.

LEG. D'AMARO:
What's the purchase price on that contract?

MR. NOLAN:
It's over $2 million.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Two million dollars?

MR. NOLAN:
Yeah.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So --

MR. NOLAN:
You know, I get a contract of sale I go with it, Lou. I know that some people have said to me, you know, they don't know necessarily if this is ultimately going to happen, but I have contract of sale so on its face, you know, the application is sufficient. And again, if it doesn't go through in 60 days it's ours.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Well, it could just be a ploy to buy more time, though; right?

MR. NOLAN:
I guess.

LEG. D'AMARO:
I mean, a contract of sale for $2 million for a property that cannot be developed?

MR. NOLAN:
Well, I don't know. Some people have said it can't be developed, I don't know that to be true.

LEG. D'AMARO:
I don't either.

MR. NOLAN:
Yeah, so I don't know.

ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
Legislator, if I may. There is preexisting structures there. There is a footprint, so, you know --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah, but it's fallen out of use, though. I mean, how long do you maintain rights in the Pine Barrens? And even, you know, I don't know if the zoning has changed. I really -- it's a non-conforming use. Usually under town codes, if you go more than six months you lose your non-conforming use.
ACTING DIRECTOR SMAGIN:
Again, I don't believe it to be, you know, a guarantee either way, I just wanted to point out the fact that there is --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Thank you. George, did the applicant sign an affidavit swearing to the facts that were presented and that this is, in fact, a redemption and, you know, this is, in fact, a bona fide contract of sale?

MR. NOLAN:
Not to the -- not to the fact that the contract is a bona fide contract of sale. They provided me -- his attorney, he has an attorney and they provided me with a contract of sale, it was fully executed; I always accept that, to be perfectly blunt with you. The real question was -- for me was was he going to be able to satisfy the hardship requirements.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right; no, I understand.

MR. NOLAN:
And he went down to the wire on that. He made a lot of claims in his application, but he really, at the end of the day, could only document the medical condition. You heard him today, he said there were a lot of different hardships he went through and bad things happened; he didn't document any of those, but he had a note from a doctor.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah, because what if the contract is a ploy to buy 60 days just to have the present owner maintain their non-conforming use to get financing to rehabilitate the property and put it back into the non-conforming use?

MR. NOLAN:
That's -- you know, I don't go there when I look at a hardship applications.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So then -- but my point -- and I'm not debating you, but my point is that the way we're -- like if I were to support this bill, I'm doing it because I believe that the person that will redeem the property is not going to own it very soon and that the community then will be satisfied because there'll be a new owner. As the Supervisor pointed out, this particular owner was delinquent in their responsibilities, but the new owner would most likely, you know, rehabilitate the property properly, which I don't even know that can be done. So I'm concerned about putting title back into this owner just maybe for the purposes of this owner preserving their non-conformance status.

MR. NOLAN:
Well, we won't put title back into him until we are getting our money.
LEG. D'AMARO: Well, but if they get financing in place in 60 days --

LEG. FLEMING: But how could they close on financing in 60 days?

LEG. D'AMARO: Because -- well, you can do that; of course you can. Especially hard money; I could close tomorrow if I needed it. So the point is that -- the point is that if it's true that only the applicant can maintain the non-conforming use, then I would find it difficult to believe that that contract is real, because no one would pay $2 million for property they can't use, right? Or if it's a ploy to buy time until you can just get some funds to pay the back taxes, get the title back and somehow, because you were always in title, you don't lose your non-conforming status, then you have -- you're stuck with the owner. Just throwing it out there.

P.O. GREGORY: Legislator Calarco.

D.P.O. CALARCO: If I understand the situation with this property, you know, there were residents from the community here two weeks ago asking for us to tear the building down, they've been looking for that to happen for some time; they believe that it has been something the County could have and should have done by now. But it's my understanding that because there was still the potential for a hardship redemption, we really legally couldn't tear the property down without exposing ourselves; is that accurate, Counsel?

MR. NOLAN: I think it might have exposed -- I mean, it's in our ownership, so we --

D.P.O. CALARCO: But, I mean, if we tore the building down and the property owner could argue in court that he had the -- met the criteria for the hardship redemption, would we not be liable to him? Because we would -- in effect, because it's the Pine Barrens, completely eliminated any property rights he had on that property.

MR. NOLAN: I'm not a hundred percent sure. You know, it's in our ownership, giving it back is discretionary. So I'm not sure if we'd have legal liability, but I couldn't say for sure, Legislator Calarco.

D.P.O. CALARCO: And if we tell him, No, we're not going to give it back to you, we're probably -- he has a case.

MR. NOLAN: Well, he can bring a case, you know. And if there was litigation, obviously that would just drag the thing out longer. I think we'd ultimately --
D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay.

MR. NOLAN:
-- prevail, but it would just drag it out.

CHAIRPERSON BROWNING:
So the property owner owes us $230,000. If we take this property, we refuse to let him redeem it, it'll probably cost us another $300,000 to tear the structures down because it will have to go into our Parks property because it's in the Pine Barrens, which puts the County $530,000 in the hole, minimum. And we just sat here arguing over a whole host of different things about how our budget is in such horrible shape. It's easy for somebody on another level of government to tell us what we should or shouldn't do when it doesn't cost them anything. That same Supervisor urged us to sell the Foley Nursing Home to Brookhaven Hospital and then refused to work with us on the $600,000 impact fee that the Town of Brookhaven imposed on us for selling the building to the Foley -- to the Brookhaven Hospital. So I think it's incumbent upon us to at least take the chance of getting our money back. And if in 60 days this property owner -- and I think it's actually better to do it quickly for the community. Because if this guy really is just balking, then let's get the 60 days over with. Let's clear the issue of whether or not he has any case of getting this property back, and if in 60 days he can't get the property back, great for the community; we'll tear the building down, it'll go into the Parks inventory and we'll move on with life. And if in that period of time he manages to redeem the property, then we get our money back and the chance at having a property owner who really will take care of the property and fix it up. I don't see why we shouldn't just pass this and, at minimum, in 60 days have a solution.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right, so we have a motion and a second. Roll call.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Can I just ask one more question? I'm sorry. We don't do an appraisal on -- George, we don't do an appraisal, right?

MR. NOLAN:
No, we do not.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So -- oh, man. Can we put conditions on our approval? Can we condition our approval on that he must convey the property?

MR. NOLAN:
The law, our hardship law --

LEG. D'AMARO:
I mean, just to finish the thought. If it's being presented to us that there is a contract of sale to sell the property for $2 million, then would it be a reasonable condition to say, Sure, we'll approve it, but subject to that contract being closed.
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MR. Nolan:
There's nothing in the statute currently that talks about placing
conditions on a hardship reconveyance. And in this particular
case, I'm not sure it's really necessary because that's the only
way the taxes are going to get paid.

Leg. D'Amaro:
I don't know how you could say that.

MR. Nolan:
Well, because no where else --

Leg. D'Amaro:
If the property is worth $2 million, the loan-to-value ratio is so
low he could get a loan approved in 24-hours. Am I thinking wrong
here? I mean, of course you could. So he buys his 60 days, he
goes to the bank tomorrow, he says I have a property worth $2
million, make me a loan of 250, and of course the bank's going to
make that loan.

Leg. Cilmi:
If he was going to do that, why wouldn't he have already done it?

Leg. D'Amaro:
I don't know the answer to that. I don't know.

Leg. Trotta:
Is there a mortgage on the property?

P.O. Gregory:
Okay. All right.

MR. Nolan:
Let's call the vote.

P.O. Gregory:
All right. So we have a motion and a second. Roll call.

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

P.O. Gregory:
Yes.

D. P.O. Calarco:
Yes.

Leg. Spencer:
(Brief pause). I know, I'm thinking. Pass.

Leg. D'Amaro:
Pass.

Leg. Stern:
Yes.
LEG. McCAFFREY: No.

LEG. TROTTA: Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY: Pass.

LEG. BARRAGA: Yes.

LEG. CILMI: Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ: Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY: Yes.

LEG. ANKER: No.

LEG. HAHN: Yes.

LEG. MURATORE: (Absent).

LEG. BROWNING: No.

LEG. FLEMING: Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI: No.

LEG. SPENCER: Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO: No.

LEG. KENNEDY: Although I don't like it, I'm voting yes.

MR. RICHBERG: Twelve (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

LEG. D'AMARO: Merry Christmas.

P.O. GREGORY: Our veterans thank you, Ms. Kennedy.
All right, IR 2129-16 - Accepting and appropriating additional Federal pass-through funding in the amount of $350,000 from the New York City Police Department in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Homeland security Sponsored Securing the Cities Program with 79.15% support (County Executive).

LEG. TROTTA: Motion.

P.O. GREGORY: Motion by Legislator Trotta. Second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG: Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

09:26PM

P.O. GREGORY: IR 2134-16 - Authorizing certain technical correction to Adopted Resolution No. 960-2016 (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 Muratore).

09:26PM

P.O. GREGORY: IR 2135-16 - Authorizing certain technical corrections to Adopted Resolution No. 958-2016 (County Executive). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

09:26PM

MR. RICHBERG: Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

09:26PM

P.O. GREGORY: IR 2136-16 - Amending Resolution No. 571-2016, authorizing use of Smith Point County Park for a Holiday Light Show Fundraiser (Lindsay).

LEG. BROWNING: Motion.

09:26PM

P.O. GREGORY: Motion by Legislator Browning.

D.P.O. CALARCO: Second.

P.O. GREGORY: Second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

P. O. GREGORY:
**IR 2137-16 - Amending the 2016 Operating Budget to provide funding for the Star Playhouse At Suffolk Y JCC (County Executive).**

LEG. STERN:
Motion.

P. O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Stern. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

P. O. GREGORY:
Okay. And the yellow folder, **Late Starters**: Waive the rules and lay the following resolutions on the table:

**IR 2131 to Health; IR 2132 to Health.**

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

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Absent: Legislator Muratore).

P. O. GREGORY:
Okay, that is our agenda. Everyone have a Happy Christmas, Hanukkah, Kwanzaa, holidays. Please get home safely. And we stand adjourned. Thank you.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 9:27 P.M.*)
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