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

(*The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.*)

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Mr. Clerk, would you call the roll.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Good morning, Mr. Presiding Officer.

(*Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature*)

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Here.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
Here.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Here.

**LEG. HAHN:**
(Not Present)

**LEG. ANKER:**
Here.

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Present.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**
Here.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**
(Not Present)

**LEG. CILMI:**
Here.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
Here.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Here.

**LEG. TROTTA:**
Here.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**
Here.
LEG. STERN:
(Not Present)

LEG. D’AMARO:
Here.

LEG. SPENCER:
(Not Present)

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
(Not Present)

P.O. GREGORY:
Here.

MR. LAUBE:
Thirteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn, Martinez, Stern, Spencer and Schneiderman)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right. We're going to start off our meeting with the newly-elected Legislator Leslie
Kennedy, who will be given the ceremonial oath of office by the Honorable John J. Toomey, Suffolk
County Court Judge, Acting Surrogate Judge and Presiding Judge of the Suffolk County Veterans
Court.

(*Legislator Leslie Kennedy was administered the
Oath of Office by the Honorable J. Toomey*)

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. On behalf of the entire Legislature, I extend our best wishes to Legislator Kennedy for her
success in her in new position.

Right now, we will have our Salute to the Flag, led by Legislator Kate Browning.

(*Salutation*)

Okay. The invocation will be given by Pastor Greg Sawyer from the Grace Lutheran Church in Mastic
Beach, guest of Legislator Kate Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:
Good morning. It is my pleasure to introduce Pastor Gregory Sawyer of the Grace Lutheran Church
in Mastic Beach. Pastor was born in Torrance, California, which is a suburb of Los Angeles. He
attended Concordia University in Irvine, California, and then to the Concordia Seminary in Saint
Louis, and he graduated in 1991.

Pastor Sawyer is relatively new to Suffolk County, having been installed as Pastor in May 2014 at the
Grace Lutheran Church in Mastic Beach. As he approaches his first year as Pastor in Grace Lutheran,
I wanted to give him a warm welcome. So it's only appropriate that he opens our meeting today.

Pastor Sawyer is married with three children. Prior to serving at Grace Lutheran Church, he served
at the ministry -- a ministry in Montana, South Dakota and Michigan. He served as Dean of
Students, and is a high school -- was a high school principal at the Hong Kong International School.
He was also Education Developer for Asia for LCMS World Missions, and the Associate Pastor at Church of All Nations. And I believe you are in charge of over 100 schools in Hong Kong.

Pastor Sawyer loves preaching and teaching. He has a passion for sharing the message of God's word with others. He also believes it is a calling to working with our youth. Working with middle school and high school students brings him great joy. Lastly, he believes prayer is a powerful spiritual force, loves praying with others for the hand of God to be made evident in the community around us.

Pastor Sawyer is extremely dedicated to fulfilling the needs of the church and the community, and I want to thank him for being here today, and welcome to Suffolk County and the Third Legislative District.

(*Applause*)

PASTOR SAWYER:
It's an honor to be here. In my faith tradition, Martin Luther thought that elected officials held one of the highest callings one could have, giving tirelessly of their time. Not always liked, not always favored, but, certainly, he believed that elected officials were there by the hand of God. Voters vote, but God decides, and you are here because God has a role for you to play right now in Suffolk County, not by mistake, but by design. And so he was always one to say support elected officials, because God allows them to be in place.

So, from Psalm 127, "Unless the Lord builds the house, those who build it labor in vain. Unless the Lord watches over the city, the watchman stays awake in vain. It is in vain that you rise up early and go late to rest eating bread of anxious toile, but He, the Lord, gives his beloved rest and sleep."

From a hymn written in 1941, the verse reads, "Thus, Lord Jesus, every task be to you commended. May your will be done, I ask, until life has ended. Jesus, in your name begun, be the day's endeavor. Grant that it may well be done to your praise forever."

We pray. Lord God, you have called your servants to ventures of which we cannot see the ending, by paths as yet untrodden, through perils unknown. Give us faith to go out with good courage, not knowing where we go, but only that your hand is leading us and that your love is supporting us. This we pray through Jesus Christ, your son, our Lord, who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God now and forever. Amen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Please remain standing for a moment of silence in recognition of Worker's Memorial Day. Let us remember workers who lost their lives due to a workplace injury or illness. We mourn their passing, honor their memory, and commit ourselves to the struggle to ensure a safe and healthy workplace for all.

Our thoughts and prayers go out to the people of Nepal as they mourn and struggle to heal from the effects of the recent natural disaster.

And also, please keep in your thoughts and prayers all those men and women in the military who put themselves in harm's way every day to protect our country.

(*Moment of Silence*)
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D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. We're going to move on to proclamations. We'll start with our Presiding Officer. DuWayne Gregory will be presenting a proclamation on behalf of the Suffolk County Legislature to Vito Dagnello on his retirement as a Correction Officer of Suffolk County Sheriff's Office, and the longest serving Correction Officer Association President.

P.O. GREGORY:
It's a pleasure -- come on up, Vito. It's a pleasure to stand before you today to make this proclamation on behalf of the Legislature to Vito Dagnello, who has since retired recently. And Vito is not only a long-serving member of our law enforcement community, but I consider him a close friend. We had some good times, and, you know, we fought the good fight together, as I like to refer to it. But he's always a person that's fair, and someone who's willing and always puts himself out in front of his members to advocate for them and their best interest, and for that, you have earned the respect of not only myself, but all of my colleagues and everyone in Suffolk County government. And we congratulate you for your service and wish you the best in your endeavors.

MR. DAGNELLO:
Thank you.

(*Applause*)

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Hey, Vito, I understand you're not going to be a stranger to this horseshoe, right?

MR. DAGNELLO:
No.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Vito will be working as an Aide to our newest Legislator, Legislator Leslie Kennedy, as well.

(*Applause*)

All right. Next, I'd like to invite Legislator Tom Cilmi up to the podium to present proclamations to Probation Officer Trainees Britney Grasman and Aaron Ferretti.

LEG. CILMI:
Thank you, Mr. Deputy Presiding Officer. Britney and Aaron, could you join me at the podium, please? Also, I'd like to extend a special welcome to the newest member of the Probation Officers' Union family, the new President of the Probation Officer's Association, Matt Porter is here today, so welcome, Matt, good to see you.

(*Applause*)

As I have done many times before, it's a pleasure to congratulate and say some special words for our Probation Officers. In this case, it's somewhat different, because the Officers who stand before you all today are actually not even Probation Officers yet, they're trainees. So Probation Officer Trainee Aaron Ferretti and Probation Officer Trainee Britney Grasman were -- let's see, 12th -- December 14th of 2014 was the start date of these officers, and they're assigned to the Criminal Court supervision out in the Probation Department's Coram office.

On March 25th of this year, Officers Ferretti and Grasman were conducting home visits in the morning and stopped for lunch at a bagel store in a shopping center on the southeast corner of Route 112 and Horseblock Road. While walking out of the bagel store, they noticed three individuals
standing against the building, one of whom was leaning against the building and looking quite ill. Probation Officer Trainees Ferretti and Grasman entered their vehicle and drove to the location of the three individuals to check on the welfare of them, and as they approached the group, the individual who looked ill started to slump to the ground, and they noticed that he was foaming at the mouth and looked in quite a bit of distress. So Probation Officer Ferretti went to assess the welfare of this individual while Probation Officer Trainee Grasman radioed the Suffolk County Police Department for rescue and assistance. Officer Ferretti observed that the subject, again, had foam around the mouth and a weak pulse, and was gasping for air and was cyanotic. Probation Officer Trainee Grasman retrieved her Narcan kit from her field bag and gave it to Officer Ferretti, who then administered the Narcan. Subject did respond to the treatment and was placed in the recovery position until the Police Department and rescue arrived, and the subject was apparently responsive as he was placed into the ambulance.

And so, not even Probation Officers yet, these two fine Suffolk County employees saved a life, and that's worthy of a great round of applause for both of them.

(*Applause*)

Now, you know, in a very, very real way, our Probation Officers are saving lives every day. The work that they do with clients, those who are recovering, truly recovering from criminal acts in our County, are saving lives, not only the lives of those individuals, but the lives of other individuals who may be impacted by the things that those folks could do in their future, but don't do because of the work that our Probation Officers do. They put themselves literally in harm's way. They're working with criminals every single day, and for that, we are eternally appreciative of the work. You are an integral part of our law enforcement team here in Suffolk County.

And I would be remiss if I didn't ask everybody to recognize the great work that those in law enforcement do across our country day in and day out. I'm wearing blue today. I've sort of deemed Tuesdays Blues Days in Suffolk County, and, in fact, throughout the country, and I wear blue every Tuesday to show my support for law enforcement throughout our country. These men and women put themselves in harm's way every single day to protect those of us who are law-abiding citizens, and we appreciate everything they do. So God bless the both of you for the work that you've done. Good luck in your future here in Suffolk County. We hope it's a long productive future, and certainly a successful future for each of you. And God bless the great work of our law enforcement community. Thank you, everybody.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Thank you. Next, we will have Legislator Schneiderman, who will make several presentations.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Good morning, and thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. The Second Legislative District has some serious bragging rights this morning. We're going to start, and I guess the theme for today is teamwork. We're going to start with the Killer Bees from Bridgehampton. I'm going to ask to invite them up. They were New York State Basketball Champions Class D this year, 2015. Killer Bees.

(*Applause*)
This is for the school. This is their, believe it or not, their 9th State title. On March 21st, they defeated defending champions New York Mills 62 to 49, which I guess we could say that it was quite a stinging defeat by the Bees. Of course, like the bee jokes, right? All the buzz in the Hamptons about these guys right now, it's the Bees. Seventeen turnovers, they forced ten steals. Charles Manning, Charles you want to put your hand up? Charles Manning won Tournament MVP, scoring 31 points, eight rebounds, five steals. Manning was also named First Team Long Island; Coach Carl Johnson, right beside me, named Suffolk County Coach of the Year.

And, boy, you've made -- you know, we talk about County Champions, Long Island, these are New York State Champions. You imagine the excitement of doing that. It's really a remarkable accomplishment.

(*Applause*)

And from a small school. But right now, I'm feeling small, because you guys are so much taller than I am. But I'd like to actually invite Coach Johnson to say a couple of words about the team. And we're all -- we're all really proud. This is your Legislators, your County Government. We're proud at the Town level, I know Supervisor Throne-Holst is here, and, of course, at the State level as well. You've made a lot of people, your whole state proud of you, so congratulations. Coach?

(*Applause*)

COACH JOHNSON:
First of all, thank you for inviting us here. I remember being here about four years ago, when we had -- we were one step away from going Upstate, and it's great to be back four years later and accomplishing our goal. And without, you know, hard work and determination, we would have never, ever accomplished that goal. And we have a saying now, "I am because we are." So, and that's from the great late Nelson Mandela. So thank you for having us.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Thank you.

(*Applause*)

So, Coach, I'm going to hand you a proclamation on behalf of myself and Suffolk County, but we're going to have proclamations for all of you guys as well. But for today, we're going to give it to the Coach and we'll follow up with proclamations to all of you.

COACH JOHNSON:
Thank you.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I want to bring up Josh, Josh Lamison, if you want to step forward. So, you know, it's hard to single out one member of this team, it's really an important team, but I do want to bring Josh up for kind of some special recognition.

Josh scored his 1000th career point. It was in a game over Stony Brook early in this year. Now, you don't get a lot of kids scoring 1000 points in high school, that's unusual to begin with, but this guy's a sophomore, sophomore year. Yeah, really, it's really an extraordinary accomplishment. He is the fourth player, believe it or not, in the school history reaching 1000 points. Oh, I'm sorry, is it junior year? I messed that up. Right, junior year. It's still great, junior year, 1000 points, still one more year to go. He's the fourth player in the team's history to do 1000 points in their junior year. One game, get ready, 50 points in one game, and that was as a sophomore. That's where I got the
sophomore thing mixed in.

He was, obviously, a huge part of the undefeated League 7 season, along with their Class D State Championship. Josh is looking to play college basketball. Obviously, he's got a path to do that. And he wants to major in sports management. Maybe we'll see him in the NBA one day. Josh, great season, great career, and keep it going. You've got one more year, one more year of high school and then college, and we look forward to a lot more baskets from you. So congratulations on a proclamation for you as well.

(*Applause*)

Did you want to say anything?

MR. LAMISON:
No.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
A little shy. He's not shy on the court, though, so all right. One more round of applause for both Josh and the entire Killer Bee Team.

(*Applause*)

Now, if you guys do this one more time, you'll be what, tied all time --

COACH JOHNSON:
Mount Vernon.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Mount Vernon also has how many champions?

COACH JOHNSON:
They have ten.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
They have ten. You're one behind, so there's motivation for next year.

COACH JOHNSON:
Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
And then the following year, you've got to make it through to be the number one, right, for all time?

COACH JOHNSON:
Exactly.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
You got it. All right. Well, thanks for coming out. I know you guys are in a hurry to get back to school, right? No, I know.

(*Laughter*)

All right. Thank you.
COACH JOHNSON:
Thank you. Thank you, Legislator.

(*Applause*)

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. One more team effort ahead. Westhampton Beach High School, their 4-by-400 Relay Team, Coached by John Bass, they placed third in the New York State Class Championship. This was the best showing at States by Westhampton Beach High School track and field. They have five total metals. Senior -- I'm going to bring them up. We've got senior Lauren Lorefice, juniors Grace Gilbakian, Nora Murphy, and sophomore Jenny Jordan. They crossed the finish line in 4 minutes, 2.72 seconds. It's the second fastest time ever by a Suffolk County team at the State's Championships. In the final leg of the relay match, Grace passed a runner, resulting in that third place finish. So great work, guys. I have a proclamation for you. You guys are a little shy, come closer. Yeah.

(*Applause*)

So this is from myself and the County. It talks about your great season and your great third place finish at the State's. This is for you. We can also produce copies for all of you, so you don't have to share one. And does anybody want to say a word or two? Too shy. Okay, they're good. All right. One more round of applause.

(*Applause*)

Is the coach here today, or not able to be here?

(*Negative Response*)

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
No? Okay. Okay, great job, everybody.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Thank you. Congratulations. Next, we have several local elected officials, first being Anna Throne-Holst. She's here to make a statement. Sorry, Supervisor Anna Throne-Holst.

SUPERVISOR THRONE-HOLST:
That's all right, DuWayne. Good morning, everyone. How are you? Good to be here. Good to see all of you in Riverhead, and that's what I'm here to speak on.

Legislator Krupski has a proposal before you that would move some of your committee meetings out east to this location, and create a little more of a balance between what you -- the business that you conduct further west and the business that you conduct out east. And for those of us who legislate out here, and for the public who would like to be heard, as part of your business, it means a lot to us. We try to take as much time as we can out of our busy schedules to work together on things, and we know that there are constituents that work very hard to be part of the Legislative process, and having to travel up to Hauppauge is often very hard with working schedules and families, and all of that. So would very much appreciate your consideration for Mr. Krupski's initiative. I think it's a good part of improving government for this local district. So thank you, Al, for bringing it forward, and I hope you all support it. Thank you all.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.
P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Supervisor.

(*Applause*)

Next, I have Supervisor Scott Russell.

SUPERVISOR RUSSELL:
Thank you for letting me address this Legislature today. I’m going to echo the sentiments of my colleague from Southampton, Public Motion Number 4, which would bring committee meetings to Riverhead.

There’s a mantra on the East End that discusses, perhaps we get overlooked. Sometimes the issues of the East End get eclipsed by the more populated communities to the west. I’ve been working in Town government for 25 years, I’ve never found that to be the case. I think this Legislature and our County Executives in the past and now have tried hard to represent the interests of the East End, and I’m asking for support to have some of the committee meetings here for that purpose.

I think when you have an initiative that’s on the table that’s going to be beneficial to the East End, you deserve the right to have the public come out and support that. Let the elected officials from the East End come out and offer their support as you propose these.

There are other initiatives that from time to time perhaps conflict with the interests of the East End. Let the East End come out and provide it’s insight, guidance and direction on some of those initiatives, and perhaps we’ll produce a better Legislative product. There’s a lot of talent and there's a lot of knowledge on the East End of Long Island, and I ask that you move some of these meetings to Riverhead so that you can share in that talent and knowledge, and benefit from it, like we all do on the East End. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Supervisor.

(*Applause*)

That’s all I have for elected officials. We will go to the Public Portion, first being Jim Datri, and then on deck, Ann Carter.

MR. DATRI:
Thank you. Since I only have three minutes to speak with you, I preface this by saying that I spoke before Dr. Spencer’s group last Thursday and explained more fully about the health concern that I will speak to you about today.

If anybody wants to reach me further, Kate Browning is my Legislator, and I give her the permission to give out my email, my telephone number, whatever.

You have a law in the Health Code which expands on what a temporary residence is. It’s called the Extended Family Temporary Residence. It’s something that no other county in New York State has. It's a degradation of the New York State Law. It gives an exemption that no other county gives. And the Health Department has taken this law and adopted it to mean that any kind of club that has a temporary residence can have a food service that's not regulated in any way by the Department of Health. So one club in particular that it’s ruled on recently has tens of thousands of members, and they have a temporary residence on Fire Island. And the Health Department says that even though they sell food in their -- in their lodging, and the people serving it are compensated with room and
board, that they do not come under the regulation.

By not changing this law, or at least by explaining the law in memo, or whatever, so it's interpreted differently by the Department of Health, in other words, by doing nothing, what you do is allow any motel or hotel in the County to start a food service for a fee without a regulation of the Department of Health. So any motel, say that even doesn't have a food service now, can form a club, they'll call it the Traveller’s Club, and anyone automatically belongs to that club if they stay there for one night. And so they have a club, and if they choose to sell food, and serve food, and cook food, I'm not just talking about wrapped candy, but food, they can do so without being -- without coming under the regulation of the Department of Health. I think this is a dangerous situation that you've left open.

Thank you. I'll be back again to speak on this further.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Thank you, Mr. Datri. Okay. Ann Carter, and then on deck, Michael Craig.

MS. CARTER:
Good morning, Mr. Presiding Officer and Members of the Suffolk County Legislature. My family and I support the acquisition and preservation of the over five acres of property on the east side of Landing Road in Miller Place in the Town of Brookhaven to add to Cordwood Landing Nature Preserve, which abuts it. This matter is on your agenda today.

This environmentally sensitive and scenic property is part of a contiguous 80-plus acre greenbelt of spectacular open space, highly valued by our community and visitors from all over Suffolk County that come to enjoy nature, hiking, photography, outdoor education and other passive uses. Development of the subject property would significantly degrade the scenic views from the abutting County preserve and from our beautiful Christmas Tree Farm, also adjacent to it. The farm has been in our family since at least the 1700s, and is one of the last working farms in our community.

Families from across Long Island, from all of your districts, escape the malls and traffic during the holidays to enjoy cutting their own tree in our beautiful rural setting in the heart of the Town's first Historic District. A new dense housing development crammed up against and towering over our field will seriously degrade and compromise the viability of our farm business.

The proposed acquisition more than fully meets all of the goals, policies and natural resource protection criteria outlined in your Open Space Acquisition Policy Plan for Suffolk County. And next to Cordwood Landing Nature Preserve, it contains at least four habitat cover types. It is a designated critical environmental area. It contains at least four habitat cover types, and is home to New York State protected species, and it lies within the Long Island Sound Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan area, meeting its criteria for preservation as well. The Town views this property as a high priority for protection, and has pledged to contribute for acquisition. The site lies within the Long Island North Shore Heritage area, and it drains into Long Island Sound, affecting water quality in our National Estuary. It’s an area of great cultural significance, near many sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Its proximity to schools and a library provide great educational opportunities to adults and children alike. The property also lies adjacent to a designated historic trail, the Cordwood Path, for which the abutting County preserve is named.

We implore you, do all you can to preserve this property, and thank you for the opportunity to speak.

(*Applause*)
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P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Ms. Carter. Okay. Michael Craig, and then on deck, Amanda Roth.

MR. CRAIG:
Hello. Thank you for your time. I, too, am here to talk about the acquisition of the piece of property next to Landing Road.

As a resident of Miller Place, I feel very strongly that this parcel of land should be kept in its natural state. This piece of property, running down to Cedar Beach, helps preserve the rustic feel of Miller Place, and it helps define the historic character of the area. If the property could be attained and kept as a nature preserve forever wild, I feel that would be best for the animals that live there, for the area in general, the people of Miller Place, Brookhaven and Suffolk County. I think this would be a tremendous asset for everybody. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Amanda Roth, and then on deck Pauline Salotti.

MS. ROTH:
Hello. Good morning. My name is Amanda Roth. I'm a 35-year-old mother two. I live with my husband, my seven-year-old daughter, and my five-year-old son in Dix Hills. I'm here today because I have to share with you the importance of the Toxin-Free Toys Act.

As a mom, I read every label of every food and health care product I buy, even the ones I buy on a regular basis, because you'd be surprised how often the ingredients change. I'm highly selective about the fish I serve my family to avoid mercury exposure. I buy organic rice and apple juice to limit our exposure to arsenic, but there are no ingredient lists on toys and clothes. I cannot protect my children and keep them safe from toxins in their prized possessions, a favorite toy, a lucky shirt, a best friend necklace from their playmate. When my children were babies, I sought out wooden toys and natural alternatives to try and keep them safe from toxins, but as they get older, they want to have the same toys as their friends. I need to know that what I am buying them and what they are playing with is safe, and not going to put them at risk for exposure to dangerous chemicals that can have long-term adverse effects on their health, as we know to be true for arsenic, mercury, cadmium and lead. These toxins read like a list of hazardous materials not safe for human consumption, yet they're still in our children's toys.

There is a famous poem I received from my daughter's first pre-school teacher when she began school, just shy of her second birthday. It's called "Just Play" by Anita Wadley, and I'd like to read you a few versus.

When I'm building in the block room,
Please don't say I'm "Just Playing".
For you see, I'm learning as I play.

When I'm getting all dressed up, setting the table,
Caring for the babies,
Don't get the idea I'm "Just Playing".
I may be a mother or a father someday.

When you see me up to my elbows in paint.
Or standing at an easel,
Or molding and shaping clay,
The poem continues for several more verses and closes with this line, "Today, I'm a child and my work is play," but what if those blocks were filled with mercury, the finger paints flowing with arsenic, and the doll's blushing cheeks painted with cadmium? The possibility that the play that is so important to their young developing brains and neurological systems could be potentially dangerous and causing more harm than good is terrifying, but it's easily avoidable. Toxic chemicals which may cause neurodevelopmental disorders and cancer have no place in the manufacture of children's toys, especially when alternatives are available.

I am active in many groups on Facebook and in my local community. I see, hear and read every day the lengths my fellow parents will go to keep their children safe. We all work as a village to keep our own and our neighbors' children safe. We are all concerned, but this is beyond our control as parents and it is in your hands. Please keep your village, our village safe. Please support the Toxin-Free Toys Act and keep toxic chemicals out of toys in Suffolk County. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY: Thank you, Amanda. Pauline Salotti, and then on deck, Richard Green.

MS. SALOTTI: Good morning, Presiding Officer. Good morning, County Legislators. Thank you. It's good to be here. I'm Pauline Salotti, I live in Patchogue, and I'm here today to ask you to pass the bill on the Toxic-Free Toys Act. Thank you, Legislator Hahn, for sponsoring this bill.

There are children's products containing toxic chemicals being sold right here in Long Island. These chemicals are unnecessary, and even if they were needed to obtain a certain color or texture, how necessary are they really, while causing cancer, cognitive impairments, hyperactivity, organ damage, genetic disorders, and more? Anyone should be able to walk into a toy store and purchase a toy that is not going to make anyone sick.

We have technology today to be able to easily test the presence of most heavy metals, which should get us on our way to protecting our children from hazardous chemicals, like mercury, lead, cadmium and arsenic. Now we need you to pass this bill so everyone else can do their parts -- their part on this next step toward caring for our children's safety.

Another quick topic that I would like to bring forth to your consideration is that we, the residents, are looking forward to watching the Riverhead County meeting also in live stream. And just as easy, both Hauppauge and Riverhead meetings can be made available through the access channels, so that residents who don't have access to a computer, like a lot of senior citizens, may watch and become active participants in Suffolk County government. Thank you so much for your time today.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY: Thank you. Richard Green, and then on deck, Paul Negron -- Raul Negron, excuse me.

MR. GREEN: Good morning, and thank you for letting me speak here today. I have to apologize that I didn't do my homework and read all the instructions on how to present my plea. If needed, I can also email each one of you what I am going to talk about.
You are looking to enact a ban on drones. I happen to be a member of an association, which is nationwide, of over 150,000 members, including our military in Europe and overseas. I am in favor of you looking to ban drones because of some of the unauthorized way that people are using these planes. We belong to about 20 clubs here in Suffolk County. There's maybe 2,000 to 3,000 members that belong to the Academy of Model Aeronautics. We fly at sanctioned fields. We cover insurance to the landowners and the governments that we work with. I happen to have a field in Babylon and we are covered by insurance, and we cover the Town of Babylon for any possible accidents or misfortunes.

I would like to propose that before you pass this ban, that we can sit down and define what drones are. This is very important, because you may put a lot of club members out of a hobby. So, please, before you go ahead and pass this ban, let's get together and sit down, define what a drone is and how they can be used without infringing on the public's privacy.

We fly at sanctioned fields that are -- we restrict our fliers from going outside of these areas. So, before you go any further, please reconsider and let's sit down and talk about this, so that we can come to a workable situation. I want to thank you very much for your time, and that's basically it.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Thank you, Mr. Green. Okay. Raul Negron, and then on deck, Raymond Fuoto.

MR. NEGRON:
Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. My name is Raul Negron, and I'm here to speak on an introduced bill, I think it's I.R. 2160. I am the owner and President of USA Emergency Board-Up. I've been in the industry now for 15 years.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Can you pick it up?

MR. NEGRON:
Oh, for years I've been in this business. I started in this business with nearly nothing at $12 an hour. I was given an opportunity at that time, back in 2000, to work and prove myself. I took $12 an hour and raised it to an extremely, extremely successful business through hard work, determination, nonstop, a hundred hours a week for the better of my family and my community. I've been involved with wrestling, kid wrestling, high school wrestling, involved with college wrestling for over 20 years. This bill would tremendously affect how I live and how I could help the community, and been helping the community for 20 years. I've given monies, continue to give monies, moral support, ethical support to children throughout Long Island. Thank God for the blessing because of the success of my business. This bill would really impact my business immensely.

There's a deception article about when people go to fires, deceiving insured, so on and so forth. The last thing a board-up company can ever do is deceive a homeowner as far as monetary contracting. There is no contract between a homeowner and the board-up company. When an insured has a claim, a fire claim, my bill is a direct bill to the insurance company. At no time is there a contract between me and the insured. I bill State Farm, I bill Nationwide. If I send them a bill that's exaggerated, the company adjuster assesses my bill and he adjusts it. At no time can I ever deceive an insured at all. Contrary, people with homeowners -- home improvement license are in a real great position to hurt and harm homeowners by misleading them about the quality of work they're going to provide, the amount of work they're going to provide for the monies, and there's contracting with that.
If there's an issue at fire scenes because of behavior or certain tactics that the Marshals or Suffolk County don't agree with, that's why Fire Marshals are there, Suffolk County Police Department are there, so they could handle those matters on scene. Again, this bill would do nothing but take a guy like me, that works so hard, effectively pushing day and night and going to these scenes, because it's not glamorous, but providing an emergency service when necessary. Again, I say this bill would do nothing but affect and devastate my family and the families that work for me.

I take a lot of pride in what I do, and I'm a proud Long Island, Brentwood resident. And I just hope that if I could have the opportunity to speak to you guys in longer term, that I would have the opportunity, so I could be more, you know, explaining to you guys. Okay? Thank you again.

P.O. GREGORY:

DR. GRELLA:
Good morning, Legislators. It's a pleasure to be here today in support of I.R. 1268. After meeting with you last week, I compiled a list of documents that I forwarded to Legislator Martinez. Specifically, I'd like to comment on the fact that our cost share for the grant is well over $250,000 for the $125,000 that we are requesting for the Connetquot River State Park project titled Scientists and Stewards: Assessing Potential Nitrogen Loading and Mitigation in Freshwater and Salt Water Communities.

The cost share initiative is compiled in a budget that I will prepare for all. I can hand out to all of you if you need that. Additionally, within the lab, my Co-PI, Dr. Diana Padilla, we compiled a list of scholarships that were received in the time that we've been collaborating. Since 2010, we received over 1.8 million in college scholarships. That's free tuition to the students that participated in the programs that we are suggesting to you in I.R. 1268.

I.R. 1268 specifically focuses on students and scientists, getting out into the Connetquot River to collect data. So it's a hands-on program in which students are collecting data that will be used by you in passing laws, and providing the State with information on water quality. So this information will be available to you. We have already started to discuss setting up databases for the data with the Environmental Planning Committee. Camilo and Frank have been very helpful with that. So please know that any and all data will be available to you.

But more importantly, I think what's really here to -- and important is that students from both Central Islip and Brentwood will be your scientists, with myself and Dr. Diana Padilla. We will be out in the field collecting this data and preparing you and providing you with the information that you will need on what's going on on the Connetquot River. There's a paucity of studies, and I personally believe that this money is well spent, and will be beneficial to the students of both Central Islip and Brentwood, and it will give them a cutting edge in terms of providing them with an experience that not many students in Brentwood and Central Islip have.

So I am here again in support of 1268. I appreciate all of your help last week in helping me look at what resources we were bringing to the table. But, more importantly, I thank you for all of your support. So thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Doctor. Okay. Rebecca Carr, and then on deck, Thomas Cramer.
MS. CARR:
Hello. I want to take a second to say thank you for letting us speak. We're here in honor of supporting the acquisition of the land on Landing Road in Miller Place. It's about a little over five acres. I've heard a couple of other people speak about it. I grew up in Miller Place right around the area. I'm currently a business owner and real estate agent in Miller Place. It is one of the very, very few natural land that is left in our area. I spent a lot of time there as a kid watching wildlife in those woods and in the Girl Scout Camp, which is now Cordwood Landing, and it's very important to a lot of people that live in the area.

We don't want that developed and that taken away, and more houses added to our area, more land taken away from the wildlife. It's something that we really feel very strongly that it should be left as it is, and preserve something that we have very little left of in the area. Miller Place is a very -- has been a very rural town, and now it's growing exponentially, and we would really, really love to curb that. So thank you very much for your time.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Mr. Cramer, and then on deck, Vince Taldone.

MR. CRAMER:
Good morning, Legislators. It's been years since I spoke before you. For those that don't know me, my name is Thomas Cramer. I'm a resident of Miller Place, 12 Landing Road. I'm also Principal of Cramer Consulting Group, an environmental and planning firm also in Miller Place. I'm a registered Landscape Architect for 35 years. I was a member of Suffolk County CEQ. I was past Director of Environmental Protection for the Town of Brookhaven, as well as the past Commissioner of Planning, Environment and Development for Brookhaven.

I am here also to speak on the proposed acquisition for the five-plus acres adjacent to Cordwood Landing Park Nature Preserve in Miller Place. This is a unique parcel. It is the last remaining undeveloped track adjacent to the nature preserve. The -- Ann Carter spoke extensively about it before. She -- and I won't repeat what she had to say, just the fact that it is a unique parcel. It is extremely significant for the community, for the wildlife in the area. And, in general, the residents of the area strongly support this.

I'm also one of the editors and founders of Friends of Cordwood Landing. We operate a website. It's an informal group website, Facebook page. We have some 600 followers on it that are extremely concerned with the -- with this acquisition.

The parcel, there's some things that you probably don't know, the -- Miller Place itself is a -- is an Historic District. It was the first community on the Natural Historic List. This fits in well with the -- that character. It is as -- it's part of the nature preserve, which was the Girl Scout camp, Camp Barstow, and this fits in with it. It is a unique parcel. I grew up there. My grandfather built the house immediately adjacent to the property. It is a piece of property that should be preserved in its integrity.

There is a subdivision pending with the Town of Brookhaven right now and this parcel will be lost forever. It's an as-of-right subdivision. As I understand it, the developer is willing to sell the parcel, and we ask that the County move ahead. The Town of Brookhaven has pledged 30% of the acquisition cost to help in the aid of this acquisition. And I thank the Board -- the Legislature for the opportunity to speak.
P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Thank you, sir.

(*Applause*)

Vince Taldone, and then on deck, George Bartunek.

MR. TALDONE:
Good morning, Presiding Officer, Members of the Legislature. My name is Vince Taldone. I'm the President of the Flanders-Riverside-Northampton Community Association, as well as an 11-year board member of Five Town Rural Transit, and ad -- excuse me, advocacy organization that focuses on transit services to the East End. I'm also a member of the Riverside Economic Development Committee of the Town of Southampton. As you can tell from those organizations' description, I'm involved in a lot of projects that come before you for funding, and I thank you for that funding, particularly for the traffic circle in Southampton, and the Sunday and holiday bus service, which, while we're on bragging rights for the East End, the S92 being the number one bus by ridership in Suffolk County. So we're in an area where transit does work, and if you improve the service, we use it.

So I want to mention that only because getting to Hauppauge to attend committee meetings for someone like me, with a vision impairment, means take public transit, which takes me an hour and 45 minutes each way, not to include waiting time, walking time to the bus stop. So, to speak for three minutes, I'll spend six hours getting to Hauppauge, or just to listen to what's going on in the committees that are relevant to the work we're doing.

So, if you can provide additional or actually any committee meetings here in the County Seat, that would be greatly appreciated by people like me, and also others who are not so mobile, particularly older people who aren't going to travel all the way to Hauppauge.

So what you do really matters to us. We really want to support you, and it would be a lot easier if we could come here to this building, which is walking distance from my house. Thank you very much.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. George Bartunek, and then on deck, Roberta Chase Wilding.

MR. BARTUNEK:
Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. The reason why I'm here is I'm asking you to give very serious consideration to supporting Mr. Krupski's motion for adopting a Procedural Motion Number 4-2015, where you would have approximately one-third of your committee meetings here in Riverhead.

I am a former -- I should have introduced myself as a former Riverhead Town Board member. As you're well aware, there are so many issues relevant to the East End that should be discussed probably here in Riverhead, and you would be able to have more people representing the East End who could attend the council meetings if you did have the meetings here in Riverhead, such things as water quality, open space, farmland preservation, sewering, not to mention, of course -- not to forget the possibility of a passive recreation path at EPCAL. Thank you very much for your time.

(*Applause*)
P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Roberta Chase Wilding, and then on deck, Paul Arfin.

MS. WILDING:
Good morning. Thanks for the opportunity to speak. I just -- I know that the Toxin-Free Toys Act is not on the agenda for today, but I wanted to, you know, state Clean and Healthy New York's ongoing support for the legislation and the revisions that were made to clarify how it would be implemented. And, you know, you've heard from a couple of moms. There are certainly many more in the community that support this legislation. Is my mic not working very well? There we go. So I just briefly wanted to say that encourage you to keep the process moving forward. This is an important issue and continues to be a problem that parents are facing throughout the County and throughout the state. So thank you very much.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Paul Arfin, and then on deck, Sid Bail.

MR. ARFIN:
Good morning, everybody. My name is Paul Arfin. I've been a resident of Suffolk County since 1967, when I began a career developing nonprofit organizations.

I appreciate the opportunity to tell you about the book I just published, Unfinished Business: Social Action in Suburbia: Long Island New York 1945 to 2014. In the book, I describe Suffolk's illustrious history of social reform, a history that I believe you may want to know more about. The book contains an account of the early development of the Suffolk County Legislature by H. Lee Dennison, our first County Executive. It describes the development of our community health center network, its youth service and aging programs, and its services for people with disabilities. The book chronicles the substantial initiatives of this Legislature to protect our environment and protect its citizens, as well as the period when decisions were made to close our State mental hospitals, discharging patients into our communities, unprepared to care for them.

Also described are the turbulent Civil Rights struggles of the 1960s and the maltreatment to migrant farm laborers on the East End.

During my research of the 1970s and '80s, I interviewed several former County Legislators, Jane Devine, Steve Englebright, Jim Morgo, Rich Schaffer, Jim Gaughran, as well as Jim Kirby and Ruth Brandwein, former Commissioners of Social Services. I also interviewed Greg Blass, who not only served as a Presiding Officer of this Legislature, but also as a Family Court Judge and DSS Commissioner. In addition, I interviewed three former Deputy County Executives, John Gallagher and Larry Kennedy.

The book includes the important contributions of Presiding Officers John V.N. Klein and Lou Howard, and Legislators John J. Foley and Nora Bredes. I also interviewed dozens of nonprofit executives and dedicated volunteers who launched the policies and programs to address the needs of Suffolk’s growing and changing population. My research revealed 25 examples of policies and programs launched by the County Legislature, its Department of Social Services, and nonprofit organizations that were replicated in other parts of New York State, as well as nationally. Most of these policies and programs continue today. The research also suggests a number of lessons to be learned by leaders today.
I thank you for the opportunity to share this information with you. I hope you may find the book informative and inspiring as you make decisions regarding the unfinished business that faces us today in an ever more diverse and dynamic Suffolk County. You, indeed, stand on the shoulders of giants.

And I also want to thank Presiding Officer Gregory for placing the book in the -- in his conference room for Legislators, you know, to review as they -- as they see fit. I’d be happy to answer any further questions. And I handed out the brochure about access to the book. Thank you very much.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Mr. Arfin. Okay. Sid Bail, and then on deck, Herb Strobel.

MR. BAIL:
Good morning, Mr. Presiding Officer, Members of the Legislature. I'm Sid Bail. I'm President of the Wading River Civic Association, and the Wading River Civic Association urges you to support Legislator Al Krupski’s Procedural Motion Number 4, to amend the rules of the Suffolk County Legislature to authorize Riverhead committee meetings. This change will give residents of the eastern -- Eastern Suffolk the same opportunity as other residents of Suffolk County to attend Legislative committee meetings and interact on a face-to-face basis with elected officials. This change will also help to mitigate the great distances that residents of Suffolk County's East End currently have to travel to fully participate in the Legislative process. This change should also help facilitate the participation of Suffolk County's East End senior citizens, such as myself, in the Legislative process. It should also be noted that the cost associated with holding the five committee meetings in Riverhead will be minimal.

The 80-year-old Wading River Civic Association respectfully urges you to adopt Procedural Motion Number 4. It's the right thing to do. Thank you very much.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Mr. Bail. Herb Strobel, and then on deck, Casey Kirk.

MR. STROBEL:
Good morning. My name is Herb Strobel. I'm a farmer in Center Moriches, as well as working at Hallockville Museum Farm in Riverhead. And I am also here to speak in support of Procedural Motion Number 4, which would authorize a portion of the Legislative meetings to occur here in Riverhead, and not all of them in Hauppauge. And I certainly applaud Legislator Krupski for bringing this important issue to the forefront.

An awful lot of Legislative work, as you folks well know, occurs in committee, and these meetings are, in fact, very important opportunities for the public to provide very valuable input. Issues ranging from infrastructure projects, to bus service, to Veterans affairs, to open space and farmland preservation are discussed at these committee meetings, and all County residents deserve a reasonable opportunity to provide input. Unfortunately, as has already been pointed out by a number of other speakers, it is a hardship for many, if not most, residents in the eastern portion of the County to attend Legislative meetings in Hauppauge.

Nearly 300,000 residents on the East End, as well as the eastern portion of Brookhaven Town, live closer to Riverhead than they do to Hauppauge. And so at least a portion of the Legislative meetings deserve to be held in Riverhead so that these residents have a reasonable opportunity to provide input on these important discussions that you folks have. And so I certainly urge you to approve the procedural motion that's been proposed by Legislator Krupski. Thank you for your
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attention.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:

MS. EISENSTEIN:
Good morning. Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Mary Eisenstein, and I am here to support Mr. Krupski's motion to have more committee meetings here in Riverhead.

I live in Mattituck, which is on the North Fork, 9.38 miles from this lovely Body, and it takes 15 minutes. I live over 40 miles from Hauppauge, which takes an hour.

It was reported in Channel 12 and Newsday that some of you have come out against having the meetings here in -- the committee meetings here in Riverhead. I, with all due respect, wonder if you're not being a little bit Hauppauge-centric in your thinking. May I remind you that as recently as 1792, when Riverhead decided to break away from the Town of Southold, because its inhabitants complained that the length of the Town made it inconvenient for residents to attend meetings and conduct necessary Town business. Now, I'm not suggesting that we should break away and form Peconic County. I am simply requesting that you give us access to that most important process that our country is based on, and that is access and voice to our government. And I thank Mr. Krupski so very, very much for wanting to do this for our community so that we can be fully participatory. So thank you again.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Andrea Spilka, and then on deck, Tom Edmonds.

MS. SPIILKA:
Good morning. I'm Andrea Spilka. I'm President of the Southampton Town Civic Coalition. I'm here echoing many of the sentiments, but I'm also representing not only my civics in Southampton, but those east of the canal in Southampton, as well as the East Moriches Property Owners and the Moriches Bay Civic Association; they couldn't be here today. And thank you, Legislator Krupski, for initiating Procedural Motion 4. Frankly, approval couldn't happen soon enough.

I live in Eastport. I'm at the very western end of the East End, but it still takes me almost an hour, depending on traffic, to attend a meeting if it's held in Hauppauge. What about those traveling from Bridgehampton, or Montauk, or Jamesport, or Orient? For that reason, although I've spoken before you many times, it's very rare that I ever have time to attend a committee meeting, and that's where really things start to shape up. So I think it's important for folks out here to have an input. So, certainly, setting up a portion of the meetings will make a difference.

I do hope that you'll approve this motion and give more residents of Eastern Brookhaven and the East End the access to you and your work that we both want and deserve.

In addition, I'm also -- just found out that 1158, on proposing groundwater testing at the Sandland mine is on today. I implore you, please, to pass that authorization. I know how busy the Suffolk County Health Department is, but they're protecting us. They're making our lives different and keeping us safe for the future. Nothing is more important to the folks on the East End, frankly, than water. Thank you very much.
(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Andrea. Tom Edmonds, and then on deck, Michael Cox.

MR. EDMONDS:
Good morning. I'm here to also advocate for Legislator Krupski's Parliamentary Motion 04. My name is Tom Edmonds. I'm the Director of the Southampton Historical Museum on the South Fork, but I'm also a resident of Mattituck. It's very important, I think, that all of you give this motion, this Parliamentary Motion 4 your most serious attention.

There's a lot of us working people, like myself, who find Hauppauge very inconvenient to go to committee meetings. But, as you've heard from the many speakers before me, senior citizens, the physically challenged, homemakers who have a hard time getting to Hauppauge, it takes a whole day. I've been up there, but it really is a day-killer for anybody that wants to participate in local government. So, please, give this your fullest attention. Thank you very much.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Michael Cox, and then on deck, Angela DeVito.

MR. COX:
Good morning, Mr. Gregory, and Members of the Legislature. My name is Michael Cox. I'm a lifelong resident of Deer Park. I'm an attorney, I have an office in Lindenhurst, and, regrettably, this is my first appearance before the Legislature and my first participation in this -- with this body.

I'm here in opposition to I.R. 2160. And while we acknowledge the need for local government to protect the citizenry and the consumers, I think there needs to -- this resolution did not do the proper balancing of need and protection.

We have a situation where the board-up industry is a very small industry. I looked at the Legislative intent and I see that it references numerous -- numerous companies working in the board-up industry. It's my understanding that there are only a half a dozen board-up companies in Suffolk County. The rest, I believe, are home improvement companies which have dabbled in the board-up in an attempt to get bigger jobs for reconstruction.

I'm here at the request of Mr. Negron, who spoke eloquently before. He's been in the industry for, as he indicated, 10 -- since 15 years. Early in February, I think the Chief Fire Marshal had laid out a directive to request licenses for all board-up companies, that they be inspected. I sent the Fire Marshal a letter, which I have a copy for the Board, which indicated that in 2010, Mr. Negron went to the Consumer Affairs Department to get a home improvement license and was advised that his industry does not require the license.

In looking at the financial impact of this proposed legislation, I see that Consumer Affairs has indicated that they do not have the funding to perform the additional responsibilities required under this proposed law in 2015. So I would ask that this Board and the committee that's assigned to this take this -- table this resolution, get together with the board-up industry, the six or so members who actively participate, and try to tailor this registration law to better promote not only their business, but protection for the community.
I think it looks -- it looks, based on the report, that this is going to be unfunded mandate. While it's indicated in 2016, 2017 that the cost of implementing this law will be offset by application fees and by registration -- by fines, I think the resolution overstates the amount of entities that will be required to register under this law and the amount of fines that will be generated during the implementation of this law.

This is an industry where the contractors show up, the board-up companies show up on the scene, as are members of FRES. They are very familiar with the process. I, unfortunately, had the opportunity to witness this when my sister’s building went on fire in Hauppauge. I found that, like Mr. Negron indicated, the Fire Marshals take control of the scene.

(*Timer Sounded*)

They are respectful. There are -- is that my time?

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Yes, sir.

**MR. COX:**
All right. I just ask that the committee take this -- table the resolution until they can have better public input.

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

**MR. COX:**
And where would I hand in these letters?

**P.O. GREGORY:**
To the gentleman right there. Okay. Angela DeVito, and then on deck is Adrienne Esposito.

**MS. DEVITO:**
Good morning, Presiding Officer Gregory, Members of the Legislature. My name is Angela DeVito, and I am President of the Jamesport-South Jamesport Civic Association, and I've come here this morning to encourage you to support P.M. 4, the motion that has been introduced by Legislator Krupski to bring more of the committee meetings here to the East End.

Speakers before me have laid out the reasons for having such a change in your procedures, and I can only say that I support those wholeheartedly. Our civic association, which is not quite as old as that of Wading River, is 66 years old, and our members have been engaged civically for all of that time. We were able to bring to the Town of Riverhead, the East End, a fire department when one was needed. We are engaged right now with trying to save Main Road with -- through historic preservation.

I believe that if you bring these committee meetings here, our members will be here to work and learn from you, the actions that you plan to take. They will understand more of what your intention is with regard to legislation and be far more supportive of your efforts in the future.

So I would encourage you, please, to vote positively on this procedural motion. And I'll also remind you that this still is the County Seat. Hauppauge has not been declared the County Seat. Thank you very much and have a great day.

(*Applause*)
P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Okay. Adrienne Esposito, and then on deck, Bob Kern.

MS. ESPOSITO:
Good morning, Members of the Legislature, and a special good morning to our new Legislator -- new Legislator Kennedy. Welcome aboard.

My name is Adrienne Esposito. I'm the Executive Director of Citizens Campaign for the Environment. I'm here to support 1158, which is Suffolk Legislator Jay Schneiderman's bill on testing groundwater in a facility called Sandland, which is located in Wainscott. The reason that we're asking you to do this is that this facility is a 50-acre sand mine, also doubling as a solid waste facility. It is about 50 acres. It goes 80 feet down into the depth, and it's also looking to expand another 40 feet down and five acres wide.

Why is this a problem? Why do we need to find out? Well, number two -- number one is that it's in a Special Groundwater Protection Area. It is one of only seven Special Groundwater Protection Areas in Suffolk, and it's the only one on the South Fork. This is critically important to protect groundwater for all of the South Fork. Unfortunately, that's exactly where it's located. But why would a sand mine cause pollution, you may ask. That's a good question; we have a good answer. Because it's not only a sand mine, it's a solid waste management facility. It's been taking in and burying large quantities of mulch, construction and demolition debris, composting material, and other materials.

Your own report from the Suffolk County Department of Health tells us that storing and burying mulch causes groundwater, high levels of heavy metals, manganese, thorium, and also radioactivity in alpha particles in many areas throughout Suffolk. All we're saying is let's take a look, let's see if the facility is causing groundwater. This is exactly what the Health Department should be doing, and we need your support. Please vote "yes" on 1158. Thank you very much.

(*Applause*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Adrienne. Okay. Mr. Kern.

MR. KERN:
Good morning, everyone. Thank you for being here. I'm here to support Legislator Krupski’s P.M. 04 on behalf of the 300 businesses -- I'm the Vice President of the Riverhead Chamber -- who want to participate more, and, you know, due to all the reasons everybody else is talking about, cannot.

Also, on behalf of the $2 billion that are generated in tourism to Suffolk County, I think we deserve a portion of these meetings to be out in Riverhead. Thank you very much.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, sir. Okay. Again, Raymond Fuoto? And Casey Kirk? Okay. That's all the cards I have. Is there anyone else that would like to speak that has not spoken? Please, come forward.

Okay. I will take a motion to close the Public Portion by Legislator Anker.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
MR. RICHBERG:  
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Calarco, Martinez and Stern)

P.O. GREGORY:  
Can I have all Legislators to the horseshoe? Okay. Can I have all Legislators to the horseshoe? We're going to begin the agenda.

Okay. I'm going to make a motion to accept the -- to approve the Consent Calendar, second by Legislator Martinez. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:  
Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Stern)

**TABLED RESOLUTIONS**

P.O. GREGORY:  

LEG. LINDSAY:  
Motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Motion to table for public hearing by Legislator Lindsay, second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:  
Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Stern)

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

P.O. GREGORY:  
Okay. *I.R. 1262, in Economic Development, approving and adopting a Citizen Participation Plan in connection with the receipt of Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery funds (Sponsor: County Executive).*

LEG. CALARCO:  
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Motion by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. HAHN:  
(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:  
Second by -- Legislator Hahn has her hand up. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:  
Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Stern)
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.  **I.R. 1192 - Amending Resolution No. 1081-2014, providing notice of wireless technology on County property (Sponsor: William Spencer).**  Legislator Spencer?

LEG. SPENCER:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Spencer.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Second.

LEG. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Calarco.  Any questions?  All in favor?

LEG. TROTTA:
On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
On the motion, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
Moving the sign, is that what this is?

MR. NOLAN:
Right.  Right now, you're required to put a sign by each router.  This changes that to make it less onerous where the sign has to be put by the entrance to the County facility where there's wireless being used.

LEG. TROTTA:
Didn't we use -- didn't we use the reason -- hello.  Didn't we use the reason that we're putting it near the wireless routers because we have to protect possibly pregnant people, or something like that?

LEG. SPENCER:
Can I respond to that, please, through the Chair?  No.  There was some concern that was brought initially with regards to wireless technology.  My personal position was that it was more of a right-to-know issue, and that people -- I didn't feel it was appropriate to, when -- you know there's information out there, but I tend to feel that you need concrete scientific data.  But from the standpoint that you can't see it, I felt that if someone wanted to have the right to know that, and even though it's widespread in use, but in a public facility, that if someone had that concern, that we would just notify them.  So we didn't put "warning" in the bill, and we debated it, and we said, you know, wireless technology is in use, right to know.

So the fact that they would be displayed on every router, well, if you come into the main entrance and you see a sign there, then you know.  It cuts down on identifying every single router in the building and putting a sign that's there, and it seems to be more of a reasonable -- so this is not saying to the public that our position is that we think that there's an issue of wireless technology, but it is saying that it is something that's invisible.  It is in widespread use.  People more and more
want to know about smart meters, and so that they can make their own personal choice.

So this bill simple just takes -- it makes it less onerous, one sign. It's at the front entrance, you know that it's there, and that's it. So it seemed to be a very simple way to pass it.

**LEG. TROTTA:**
I was under the impression that we wanted it as close to the router as we could, because that's where the -- I mean, we had discussion in this room about how the signal's stronger and it's -- so now, all of a sudden, that's not important?

**LEG. SPENCER:**
No. Well, I'm sorry you had that impression. That was never the intent of the original bill. The original intent was to let people know that it was being utilized in the building, and that we did talk about it from the standpoint that there could be varying strengths. But I've always had the position -- there are some studies that people allude to, but these people make a personal choice whether or not they want to be a -- if you go into a restaurant and you want to know if this item is cooked with peanut products, or however you want to do it, I just think it's giving the public more information. If it's at the front door, you know there's routers in the place, and if you have a particular opinion, then you can act accordingly.

**LEG. TROTTA:**
There's wireless everywhere. In our County parks there's wireless. I mean, do we put it on a tree when you come in? Do we put it on the door? You know, they check in, they're not going to see it. You go to Starbucks, it's just --

**LEG. SPENCER:**
There's an --

**LEG. TROTTA:**
Is this more signs or less signs?

**LEG. SPENCER:**
There's less signs. It's less signs. So it will actually -- going more to your point of view, if you vote for this, then we're really addressing your concerns.

**LEG. TROTTA:**
So you want them on the outside of the doors?

**LEG. SPENCER:**
Just at the front entrance, one sign, "Wireless Technology in Use" and that's it.

**LEG. TROTTA:**
All right. Whatever.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Thanks, Mr. Chair. Just a question to the sponsor. Why don't we just -- I have to imagine that the percentage of County facilities that have wireless technology in use is pretty high. So why don't we just make a blanket statement on our website that says "Wireless Technology in Use in Every County Building"?
LEG. SPENCER:
Because our website does not reach to all the socioeconomic classes of people that may not have access so that. This notifies anyone that’s doing business, whether or not they’re a senior, whether or not they’re someone that can’t afford to have that access, it’s something -- we’re making the assumption that anyone that's transacting business with the County is going to our website. So that would be my response to that.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Right now, my warning sign is in the back of my office against a closet, which it doesn't scare anybody right now, except for those who walk by there and see that sign on the way to the bathroom. But, you know, my concern, though, is if we put it out front, I think it's just going to open up so many questions about the safety of wireless technology and things like that. That's my concern, Doc.

LEG. SPENCER:
You only have one router, so I think that we're -- you have the notification up. George, I mean, if he -- you know, what we're trying to do is really -- the legislative intent here is if you have a situation where you've got 20 routers and all of a sudden you're putting these signs. If someone has one sign at their Legislative office and they leave that -- leave that in the same position, they would be -- they would be fine, I mean, under this. What's your --

MR. NOLAN:
Well, the resolution says it's supposed to be at the entrance to the building. So, if Legislator McCaffrey has a sign now by the router, he should also put a sign by the entrance to the building, according to the terms of the resolution.

I think -- I would just note that I think the reason this bill was put in by Doc Spencer was the fact that I think people out in the County government were asking for this, or something like this, and I think that's what Legislator Spencer was responding to. They thought this would be better and easier for them to comply with.

LEG. SPENCER:
And there's nothing on the sign right now. It does not say "warning", it does not have a signal with radiating signs going through a pregnant -- this is "Wireless Technology in Use". There's nothing -- people know, most people will disregard it, if someone's looking for it. But I don't think there's anyone that would look and see, because it's not -- it's not an alarmist sign.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Yeah. But, Doc, let me just ask you. Is this -- so is this -- was this borne out of a concern from our employees or visitors coming to us and saying --

LEG. SPENCER:
The Administration, when they tried to effect the law that we were able to pass here, they came and said, you know, "Can we do this? This will make it a lot less onerous, a lot less expensive, and it will allow us to comply. Could we make this minor adjustment?" You know, so I felt it was a reasonable thing to do.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Yeah. You know, at first, I kind of thought it was a harmless bill, you know, until I saw the sign. And then I said -- I kind of said, "Why did I do this?" You know, it does look alarming. I mean, it's
right by my Chief of Staff's office, and he's alarmed every time, he tells me, he walks by there now. He was never concerned about it before, but now he is.

LEG. SPENCER:  
But I can say, since we passed it, and I have a massive Facebook and Twitter presence and, you know, a couple of remarks, but as far as just really since this law has been into effect, there's been no public outcry of alarm. So I think, in reality, it just hasn't borne itself out.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:  
Would you consider -- I know there probably isn't a rush to do this right now. I don't know if there is or not from the Administration, but could we make some sort of provisions for those of us who acquiesce to the wireless technology sign, but leave it where it is, as opposed to putting one out front, which may be more alarming to people who were never alarmed before?

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

LEG. SPENCER:  
I'm amenable to that, if the Administration -- I'm not sure in terms of -- as far as if it's something that would allow people, if they have one router, to leave it, if we made that revision, I'm amenable to that if that's the position of this body. If it's something that the majority feels comfortable with as is, I'm flexible. I'm very appreciative that my colleagues heard my concern the first time around, passed it unanimously, and we've gotten a lot of good feedback from it. So if that's something that would make some members more comfortable to have the option and it's okay with the Administration, I'm fine with that.

Is there -- sure, we could always do that later on, but I'm just -- there's someone here as far as with -- Lisa, could you -- do you have any particular feedback as far as this particular from the County departments; has there been an issue?

MS. SANTERAMO:  
So we are unaware of the conversations that you have had; I'm assuming it's with IT. We will have someone from IT come later. I'm going to assume it was for an instance like Dennison where we have over 20 -- you know, we have multiple routers there and they probably -- because I know our sign has been at the front door since the beginning, I'm assuming, based on conversations with you.

LEG. SPENCER:  
Sure.

MS. SANTERAMO:  
But I'm not privy to those conversations, so we'll have someone from IT come up. But honestly, whatever this body wants to do we will comply with.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Okay. Legislator Muratore?

LEG. MURATORE:  
Just a question to the Doc. How are we enforcing this? Who's going to be enforcing this, and how is it going to be enforced?

LEG. SPENCER:  
Well, there's been compliance already. It's our bill, so as far as -- you know, we're kind of -- the Administration has signed on and put it into place. I think if you were to walk into a County building
and not see it, as Legislator Trotta when he came to my office, he missed it the first time he came in, but if you -- I'm sure that if someone said that it wasn't there, they would put it up.

The intent of this is not to be punitive or an enforcement issue or an alarming issue, the intent of this is empowering the public. There are varying opinions. There are things out there that we don't know and I've had some very reliable constituents that have come up and asked for this and we did it and they're very happy that we did it. There are some that would like us to go farther; anytime I hear that, I feel that we've kind of struck a nice balance. So as far as enforcement, Tom, I don't think that's -- you know, we're complying for ourselves and people have -- you know, a lot of departments have called and asked about it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay. Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Doc, as the physician among us, just a couple of quick questions, because in terms of policy, I often rely on you, and if it's a health care policy, as being the most experienced, I felt uncomfortable, really, from the start on this WiFi thing, because I -- you know, if they're dangerous, I'm not really clear. I have one in my house, a WiFi router, you know, my kids are there, I don't want to hurt my kids in any way. You know, I read that, well, it's no different than radio waves and, you know, radio signals everywhere. Can you just -- in your professional judgment, is this a real issue? And on kind of the B part of that question, if that's the A part; if it is, are there things that we can do to lessen the health impacts of WiFi in the work spaces?

**LEG. SPENCER:**
Sure. That's -- I researched this extensively, especially looking into this process and, you know, the FCC licenses a bunch of different frequencies that we use to communicate, and we have everything from microwave technology to, I think, infrared has some of the longest wave lengths, and even looking at utility companies where there are massive amounts of power with an electromagnetic field.

Now, there's always been stuff in the medical literature that talks about clusters and areas where you have high electromagnetic fields of breast cancer and different things. But as far as -- and the same thing with cell phones, that, you know, with cell phones, best practices, not to necessarily sleep with your cell phone charging beside your head. But like most things with medicine, you know, for years we told people that it was the cholesterol in your diet and then we do a complete 180 and say it's the sugar.

I am of the professional belief that we don't know. I think that for the most part, I do believe that these things are safe. I think that to -- but I do think there are segments of the population that would like to take more extensive steps for their personal preference. And so when I see that there's a potential situation where there's something that they can't see, even though it's everywhere and we can do -- you know, we have enough of an outcry where we can take a simple responsible step to let them know that we're using it, that's kind of where I'm going. So my professional opinion is that I believe wireless technology and a lot of other technologies to be safe for the most part, but if -- as it changes, as the signal strengths increase, as the frequencies change, since there's not enough controlled studies out there to be a hundred percent for sure, if people want to make a personal choice, then I think they should have the right to do that.

I continue to use a cell phone, have a router, but there are differences in a home router or even a field that you could set up. Your phone can become a router, versus something that is designed for commercial use to provide a signal for an entire commercial building. And so I think that it's those differences there that make it reasonable for us to have something like this.
LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Just one thing I'll point out. Most people do have, you know, cell phones, and the cell phones will tell you when there's a WiFi and the signal strength of that WiFi, whether there's a notice or not. That's not to say that a little public notice wouldn't hurt if those people are so concerned. You know, we may be putting a little bit of an unnecessary fear in some people by the signage, but it does accommodate those people who are worried about it.

So basically your professional opinion is that the science is still inconclusive on this? You're not willing to say that they are harmful, but this is really just to provide public notice to those people who may fear that they could have a negative health impact.

LEG. SPENCER:
Exactly.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:
I want to applaud Legislator Spencer's efforts in putting this forward, and I will be cosponsoring this resolution. You know, we've been looking into this for decades, for at least 30, 40, 50 decades. We actually had wireless technology in 1902 when Nikola Tesla invented it. Actually, it was in Shoreham, you know, right down the road from where we are today we had the scientists that invented wireless technology.

Now, what I think I'd like to stress the importance is that this affects our children. You know, we have EMF frequencies and it's vital that we protect our kids. You know, lead was years ago, decades ago, no problem, lead was a great paint to use, now it's deadly. Asbestos, now it's deadly. This is something we're not a hundred percent sure, we're leaning towards this might not be so good for us. So let's use a precautionary principle and protect our kids and especially residents, you know, of Suffolk County. So I appreciate your efforts.

LEG. TROTTA:
DuWayne?

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
I'm confused. This bill actually makes the other one less effective. So if you're concerned, you shouldn't be supporting this bill.

LEG. ANKER:
I'll reply to that. No, this one actually, it creates more of an awareness. Because with wireless technology -- the resolution, what you have going there right now, shows where that router is located. So the router in my office is located in the office behind the front door, so as you walk into my office, you have no idea what you're being exposed to, because this is wireless technology, we don't see it. When the -- you know, if we pass this resolution, you'll be aware that it is -- you're in the vicinity of a router. And again, I think it adds to the awareness of the technology.
LEG. TROTTA:
The whole premise, I thought, was that the close -- I mean, am I hallucinating? I thought we had a whole conversation about how you have to be closer and it's bad if it's close, then it gets far away and it's not dangerous, and now we're saying that's not important.

LEG. SPENCER:
That was the -- not the sign, we did have that as far as the debate. But the Legislative Intent for this was a right to know. We did, we had a lot of debates. We went to -- we debated the issue of safety, we debated the issue of signal strength, but at the end of the day we said that the Legislative Intent and my intent was it's a right to know.

LEG. TROTTA:
I think we're underestimating the public's --

LEG. SPENCER:
Curiosity.

LEG. TROTTA:
-- intelligence. I think they know there's wireless in Starbucks and McDonald's and everywhere. You know, whatever.

LEG. ANKER:
Can I reply to that?

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, let's -- are we ready? We're ready to move on. All right, so that's --

LEG. D'AMARO:
DuWayne?

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:
I am going to support this bill. And I just want to put on the record that from my point of view, I'm not -- I'm just trying to give the public the right information at the right point. And I am certainly not, and I want all my constituents to know that I am not underestimating their intelligence.

LEG. SPENCER:
And there is a sign at Starbucks and McDonald's, letting you know, by the way.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Anker, the last word.

LEG. ANKER:
I just wanted to mention, too, though, Legislator Trotta, if you're a pregnant women, which, you know -- or if you understand with pregnant women, anything in their environment is susceptible to their baby, especially to children. And just knowing that there's something that's there that could possibly harm their child is vital. And again, I think this is what Legislator Spencer is putting forth, just information so people are aware.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right, no more comment. We have a motion to approve; right, Mr. Clerk?
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**MR. NOLAN:**
That's correct.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Yes, you do.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. CILMI:**
Opposed.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
Opposed.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
All opposed, raise your hands.

(*Legislators Cilmi, Barraga, Trotta, McCaffrey & Kennedy raised their hands)

**LEG. SPENCER:**
Well, I had you guys the first time around, you can’t win them all. I can’t win them all *(laughter)*. I love to see my Republican Caucus in agreement *(laughter)*.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Twelve *(Opposed: Legislators Cilmi, Barraga, Trotta, McCaffrey & Kennedy).*

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Legislator Hahn?

**LEG. HAHN:**
I'd like to make a motion to take out of order Procedural Motion 4?

**P.O. GREGORY:**
I have had a request to -- we're waiting for Legislator Stern who had a doctor's appointment who would like to vote on the bill. So I for one will not support a motion to take it out of order.

**LEG. ANKER:**
Cosponsor on Spencer's bill.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay, let’s move on.

**Environment, Planning & Agriculture:**

**IR 1158-15 - Directing the Department of Health Services to conduct groundwater tests for toxic chemicals at a composting facility in Noyack, Town of Southampton (Schneiderman).**

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Motion.
P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. Do I have --

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Oh, I'm sorry. On the motion?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Oh, I'm sorry. Al?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Could we get an indication from the Health Department what we're going to be testing for?

P.O. GREGORY:
I think the radioactivity of routers in the ground.

(*Laughter*)

MR. DAWYDIAK:
Good morning. Walter Dawydiak here, Director of Environmental Quality. Mr. Presiding Officer, Members of the Legislature, the Health Department does have this on our radar screen for testing. We'd be doing the standard suite of groundwater parameters. It's approximately 300, it does include radionuclides, inorganics, organics, semi-volatoric -- semi-volatile organics, metals, pharmaceuticals, personal care products, we've recently added Dioxane; and that's the nutshell of what we're testing, about 300 parameters in about a half-dozen wells.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Do you have a schedule for testing? I mean, you're going to put the wells in, you're going to test them on -- you know, a schedule going forward. And are you coordinating with the DEC?

MR. DAWYDIAK:
Yes, we are coordinating with the DEC. Our first step in this was to ask DEC whether the facility owner could be compelled to do this under their permit. DEC did inquire, the answer was no, so we were left without anybody to do this work, so the Health Department can step up and do this. We do expect to be able to do the wells and get the results and report on them in the timeframe contemplated by the resolution. What we find depends on what we do next. If there's any indication that resampling should occur, we'll set some periodic schedule for resampling; if not, we'll assess and take it from there.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
Through the Chair, if I could also ask. Walter, the -- this is to supplement Town of Southampton activities, or the Town of Southampton has nothing to do with this?

MR. DAWYDIAK:
I'm sure the Town of Southampton has some degree of site plan approval at this site. Really, though, we're acting as an agent for the State Department of Environmental Conservation, as well as the State Department of Health.

What we've already done at the site is a private well survey downgrading it to make sure that there are not any affected private wells. The wells that we've tested have all come up clean to date with one small exception of iron which is an aid of contaminant. It is not in the public drinking water supply well area, which is good news, but essentially we're looking at the groundwater, drinking water for State DEC and DOH. The site permitted by the State DEC.

LEG. CILMI:
And I recall a previous resolution had authorized the department to explore potential contamination in a number of different sites throughout Suffolk County. I know there is one in the Town of Babylon, certainly a couple of them in -- a couple in Islip, one in the Village of Islandia; where are we at with that whole process?

MR. DAWYDIAK:
We have finished the drilling and sampling at Roberto Clemente, the results should be forthcoming from our laboratory in the coming weeks and a report on those is going to come shortly thereafter. There are other dump sites in the area, we are working on the access agreements which are near complete and we hope to mobilize and begin drilling on those shortly. We actually had a head start on some of the off-site work in January. The February weather set it into March and held us back; there was deep snow and a freeze, but we're out there in full force with well drilling again.

LEG. CILMI:
So we don't even have access agreements yet for the other sites?

MR. DAWYDIAK:
They are under way. I will have to check with the County Attorney as per status of those, but I believe that if they are not complete, they are near complete. But the point is we've just finished Clemente which was our first priority, and we're marching on toward the next priorities.

LEG. CILMI:
And the department feels comfortable that in the myriad of things that you're working on and responsible for and given your current staffing situation and resources, that you'll be able to take this on as well?

MR. DAWYDIAK:
Yeah. We're actually really fortunate in the State DEC increased their pesticide grant to us which allowed us to increase our well drilling crew by one well driller; we've gone up from five to six. We've also added another sanitarian. So that well drilling program has never been this fully staffed in recent decades, which is good news. With that addition, we were able to mobilize an additional crew and deal with this work as well as other priority projects.
LEG. CILMI:
And the reports that you issue on this investigation as well as the others, they will somehow distinguish between contaminants that may be present in the ground as a result of, you know, past situations or nature, as opposed to specific contaminants related to whatever the activity is in this case?

MR. DAWYDIAK:
That's always a goal. We always try to go upgradient of a facility to see water quality which is unaffected by this site, as well as multiple down gradient sites. It does get complicated with large sites and contamination that goes over time, but we do our best to go on-site and differentiate to the extent possible, that's always the goal.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay, thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Anyone else? Okay, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Stern).

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Excuse me. Mr. Presiding Officer?

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
As per the letter with you in your office as Presiding Officer, and with the letter I have on file with the Board of Ethics, I'm recusing myself on the next resolution, IR 1193.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right, IR 1193-15 - Reappointing member to the Suffolk County Water Authority (Errol D. Toulon, Jr.)(Presiding Officer Gregory).

LEG. CALARCO:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Calarco. Second by Legislator Muratore. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Sixteen (Recused: Legislator Krupski - Not Present: Legislator Stern).
P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1203-15 - Authorizing the acquisition of Farmland Development Rights under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (effective December 1, 2007) for the Vitti property – Vitti Farm – Town of Southold – (SCTM No. 1000-059.00-03.00-027.000 p/o) (County Executive).

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So moved.

LEG. HAHN:
(Raised Hand).

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Krupski, second by Legislator Hahn. Anyone on the motion? Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Stern).

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1230-15 - Approving list of environmentally sensitive lands to be acquired pursuant to Article XII, Section C12-5.D of the Suffolk County Code (County Executive). Do I have a motion?

LEG. ANKER:
Motion.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Anker. Second by Legislator Krupski. Anyone on the motion? Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion. I would just like to thank everyone who worked hard for like about a year on this. There was money left over in the old Drinking Water funds, the towns participated. I thank Lauretta Fisher for her work, because it's been money that's sitting there. Nine of the ten towns have money available and now it can be spent acquiring these lands that the towns have input on their locations. So, thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Browning?

LEG. BROWNING:
Maybe Lauretta, because I know in the past when there's any discussion about Old Drinking Water, I believe that was something that was never touched. Can you explain the Old Drinking Water and why now we're using it?

LEG. MURATORE:
The old what?
LEG. BROWNING:
The old money which we should be using the old money rather than new money.

MS. FISCHER:
Good morning. Thank you. The old money always was available through what they called Section 12-5-A was basically the Pine Barrens, specifically the Pine Barrens Core area. And 12-5-D and E were separate sections of the Old Drinking Water law that spelled out amounts of money for either what they call Pine Barren Towns, which was 12-5-D, and the non-Pine Barrens Towns which were 12-5-E. Those monies were always there being collected, from 1987 on to '95 where the New Drinking Water Protection Program went into effect. So that money was collected through tax revenues and then spent, but there were pots of money that were still remaining within 12-5-D and 12-5-E that we still -- and it was allocated by townships, by per capita allocations.

So the money was still there in certain towns, different amounts of money per town, and we still have remaining funds, as Legislator Krupski said, in nine out of the ten towns. So we would like to continue moving forward. We reached out to all the towns again, asked them for their input on a list to be considered and that is what's before you today.

LEG. BROWNING:
And is this -- we have to have a match for --

MS. FISCHER:
No.

LEG. BROWNING:
We don't.

MS. FISCHER:
No.

LEG. BROWNING:
Okay. Well, thank you. Because I do remember some resistance in the past from using that money. I'll talk to you later.

MS. FISCHER:
Sure.

LEG. BROWNING:
Thank you.

MS. FISCHER:
You're welcome.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Calarco.

LEG. CALARCO:
Ms. Fischer? Just one other quick question for you, because this came up -- some of my colleagues had asked this earlier from the western-end towns. This particular resolution, when you look at the list of parcels, they are from Brookhaven and east, that's because it's this category E.

MS. FISCHER:
12-5-D, yeah.
LEG. CALARCO:
Whereas there is going to be another resolution coming forward in the future, that's the E classification if I got it right?

MS. FISCHER:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
That handles the other towns on the western end?

MS. FISCHER:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
For those who have money left and have properties they've identified.

MS. FISCHER:
Yes, absolutely.

LEG. CALARCO:
Okay, very good. Thank you.

MS. FISCHER:
You're welcome.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right, thank you. Anyone else? Okay, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Stern).

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, IR 1256-15 - Reappointing member to the Council on Environmental Quality (Gloria G. Russo)(Presiding Officer Gregory).

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Motion.

LEG. HAHN:
(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Hahn, second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Stern).

P.O. GREGORY: IR 1257-15 - Reappointing member to the Council on Environmental Quality (Daniel Pichney)(Presiding Officer Gregory). Motion.
LEG. HAHN:
(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Hahn. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Stern).

LEG. D'AMARO:
IR 1258-15 - Reappointing member to the Council on Environmental Quality (Thomas Gulbransen)(Presiding Officer Gregory). Same motion -- I'm sorry. Motion by Legislator Hahn. Second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Stern).

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1267-15 - Amending the Adopted 2015 Operating Budget to transfer funds from Fund 477 Water Quality Protection, amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds in connection with a pilot program for the installation of alternative wastewater discharge systems (CP 8710.143 and 8710.326)(County Executive).

LEG. HAHN:
(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Hahn. Second by Legislator Krupski.

LEG. HAHN:
Tim, cosponsor.

P.O. GREGORY:
Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Stern).

P.O. GREGORY:

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Martinez. Second by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. TROTTA:
Quick, on the motion?
P.O. GREGORY:  
On the motion, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:  
Just what exactly -- I mean, who are we giving this money to?

DR. GRELLA:  
Hi. Can I get some WiFi first?

LEG. TROTTA:  
Only if you have a sign.

DR. GRELLA:  
I've got to take a selfie. The money, Sir, is going to Brentwood Union-Free School District. Brentwood Union-Free School District will be in receipt of the funds. The funds will go into a private account, the account will be only accessible by myself and Legislator Martinez will oversee some of the funding, actually all of the funding.

It is easier just to put the money into Brentwood as opposed to putting the money into Stony Brook University where we would have overhead costs. So what I'm trying to do is minimize overhead and maximize expenditures for use with the students. This money is for research and rather than putting it through where I would be capped a fee for having and housing that money, there is no fee associated with this.

LEG. TROTTA:  
What are you going to do with the money?

DR. GRELLA:  
Well, as outlined in the budget that you have before you, this would be a year-and-a-half project in which we will be -- as in we, my colleague Diana Padilla and I will be mentoring students, approximately 120, in the Connetquot River State Park collecting data that has not been collected before on nitrogen mitigation and nitrogen loading using both aquaculture, one of our big questions will surround looking at rib muscle populations, the health of rib muscle populations in both the salt marsh at that mouth of the river there, and then we will also be looking at mitigation of nitrogen along the river using high technology such as putting in sonds. You know, we are not relying on the USGS for their sond use now because they do not --

LEG. TROTTA:  
Putting in signs did you say?

DR. GRELLA:  
A sond. No, not a sign; a sond, an S-O-N-D which is used to collect water parameter data. So we'll be collecting data on nitrogen, oxygen. This will be real-time data that, as I mentioned previously, we will be setting up for you to observe what we're doing in the field. So you will have a bird's eye view as to what we're collecting by looking at our real-time data, as well as looking at our student project reports that we aim to -- we aim to publish. The data that will come out of this study will be publishable data, but it will also be data that can be used by each of you to assess water quality in that local ecosystem and then be compared to local ecosystems that have already looked -- people that have already looked at nitrogen mitigation.

As mentioned by Legislator Krupski in the last meeting, Brookhaven National Lab does a small program called *A Day in the Life of the River* where they have students collecting data just on a daily basis. This program, Sir, collects data on, you know, a yearly -- a year-long basis.
LEG. TROTTA:
And you're a professor at Stony Brook, I'm assuming?

DR. GRELLA:
My PhD is from Stony Brook in the Department of Ecology and Evolution, I was a student there. I have been with the Brentwood Union-Free School District for 14 years.

LEG. TROTTA:
You work in the school district.

DR. GRELLA:
Yes. I run the research -- the High School Research Program. For those of you that are familiar, in 2012, Samantha Garvey was my student, she was also mentored by Diana Padilla, the woman that spoke with me last week. Samantha Garvey was our student when she was homeless when she was a recipient of the Intel Science Talent award. I have been in Brentwood for 12 years and for 12 years I've acted as both a teacher and a scientist.

LEG. TROTTA:
And this money is going to go specifically for what?

DR. GRELLA:
This money is specifically for work on the Connetquot River. This money is earmarked for only studies on the Connetquot River.

LEG. TROTTA:
Is it going to pay salaries? Is it going to buy equipment or what's --

DR. GRELLA:
The money will buy equipment, the money will pay for salaries, or stipends as we say, for university students to mentor our high school students. My salary is covered by Brentwood Union-Free School District; Diana Padilla's salary is covered by Brentwood Union-Free School District. The matched funds, as you see, total over $250,000, so we're coming to the table with more money than we're actually asking for.

The money that we're asking for will provide bussing for students to get to the site. We have students from both Brentwood and Central Islip that will be on-site at Connetquot River. The money will cover supplies for laboratory studies that we will conduct, any nitrate samples, nitrate analysis, we'll have processing -- we'll be processing in the lab.

LEG. TROTTA:
Is this new research or is this like a camp for kids?

DR. GRELLA:
No, it is not a camp. Sir, I am a scientist. My goal is to publish data that is of importance to not just the County, but also our nation in general. If it was a camp, we would just be meeting on a daily basis. The goal here of this review is to get out on the Connetquot River and obtain valuable information on both nitrogen mitigation, what's going on with the nitrogen that we're seeing in this river ecosystem; but more importantly, what's going on with our shellfish populations at the mouth of the river. What are we seeing in terms of measurable qualities of this ecosystem? How can we measure ecosystem health using previous research that both my team and I have conducted and my students have won various national competitions with.
LEG. TROTTA:
Do you have any plans to come up to like the Nissequoque River and look into that? Because they have ribbed muscles up there also that are depleting.

DR. GRELLA:
Surely. Right now the work that's being done on the Nissequoque, Dr. Mel Morris secured a grant for. So I am not actually going to touch the waters of the Nissequoque at this time. I would like to compare data that has been obtained from the Nissequoque River to this study, so as of this time, I do not plan to work in the Nissequoque. They're two different watersheds, so we have two watersheds on --

LEG. TROTTA:
Maybe next year?

DR. GRELLA:
I will request more funding next year.

LEG. TROTTA:
Okay, thanks.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
You know, I think this is important. And if you grew up out here and as a kid you're on the bay, right, you're on the creek and you see different things and you're familiar with the natural world. I don't know Brentwood, or I'm not familiar with Central Islip, but I know that when you expose students to the natural world, that they understand how important it is. And some of these students will have an interest in science and some will go on to make -- to become decision makers like we are. And if they have that background of how important our, really, ecology of Long Island is, they could get it here. You know, they might otherwise not have access to this sort of -- not only the natural world, but also the science that it relates to. So that's why I think this is an important program.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
Thank you. I agree completely with Legislator Krupski. But my questions are sort of different and I'd like you just to respond to them, and I'm trying to justify this in my head. You know, knowing the importance of the work that you're doing -- the work that you're going to do is largely in Connetquot State Park?

DR. GRELLA:
That is correct.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. So it seems to me that we're funding a public school district, or public school districts, for research on a State park or State facilities, and neither one of those things is congruous with our mission here in the County.
Now, I recognize that, you know, the health of the waterways in the County, regardless of where they are or who owns them or what have you, is important to all of us. And certainly the Connetquot River runs through my district. So the health of that river is important to me personally, as is the health of every other body of water in Suffolk County.

But my question is does it make sense for the Suffolk -- for Suffolk County taxpayers to fund public education to this extent? And does it make sense, given the fact that the purpose of the study is to study a body of water within a State park?

**DR. GRELLA:**
To address your question, I think the most important piece is to say if a student is -- has access to something that's right in their backyard, the more likelihood of them becoming involved in something is -- you're going to see an increased involvement if there's a direct proximity to a locale, to a body of water.

**LEG. CILMI:**
I don't disagree with that.

**DR. GRELLA:**
So we chose this facility because, one, it fit the -- you know, the agenda of Suffolk County Bellone -- Executive Bellone who specifically stated that he was looking for assessment on water. You know, what parameters would be responsible for nitrogen mitigation. Well, for one, when we looked at the studies in the surrounding area, there was nothing done on Connetquot River State Park. And yes, it is a State park, but it isn't within the proximity of the locales that we are addressing here. And as both a scientist and an educator, I feel that it is important to have something that's accessible to a student within proximity rather than having them go farther away to be interested. This is a locale where students can be dropped off, too, by their parents if we can't do busing. Perhaps they're going to meet me after work, you know, at three o'clock they'll meet me at the park. They could have a family member drop them off. If I had them at Stony Brook, and this is what I've had happen in the past; if students were at Stony Brook University and they were required to rely on public transportation and rely on getting on a bus every day, the students didn't show up at the university. However, being that, one, we're providing bussing through this grant to have students collect data with us. This isn't -- we're talking about substantial amounts of data. I could not collect this data on my own. We're looking at teams of individuals going out and doing -- catalogue census data on a piece of land, aside from being a State property, a piece of land that has so much for us to learn from. And, you know, we feel that being that this is such a close locale to these two school districts, it offers us an amazing opportunity to get these kids out in nature and to get them hooked on science, on policy making and on technology.

**LEG. CILMI:**
I'm just wondering if the State wouldn't be a better sponsor for this program. I mean, given the fact that the State is obviously a main contributor to public education in terms of oversight and in terms of funding, and given the fact that this is a State park that we're talking about working in, did you consider or did you go to your State officials and ask for help with this?

**DR. GRELLA:**
So in -- personally, I believe starting at a smaller level would be the right way to go with local legislation and then going to the State level. My experience with grants at the State level is that they want to see the local support prior to funding a long-term project. I have been working at Caleb Smith State Park, which is another State park, without a grant and not including -- and not including students. So to be honest with you, I think that starting at the local level and then moving up to the State level will then allow us to solicit more funding in the future. And that is just past experience with both EPA grants, SNF grants and grants within the County.
LEG. CILMI:
Thank you. I mean, if you have something to add, Sir, through the Chair, I'd be willing to listen.

MR. CASTELLI:
Hi. I'm Frank Castelli, Suffolk County Economic Development & Planning, their Water Quality Unit. The funding that's been proposed for this project is coming through the Quarter Percent Water Quality Protection and Restoration Program, and this project clearly met one of the requirements for funding under the program, and that's the reason why the Water Quality Committee recommended this project for funding. The projects that were recommended at our recent meeting really scanned many areas of the County; some of it's County property, some of it isn't. In this case, this project will be on State property. But the --

LEG. CILMI:
Frank, could you just speak up a little bit, please? Move the microphone closer to you?

MR. CASTELLI:
Okay.

LEG. CILMI:
Thank you.

MR. CASTELLI:
I just wanted to point out that this project clearly met the requirements that we put forward in the call for application.

LEG. CILMI:
Can you talk to us about some of the projects that were set aside, if you will, or not put forth by the committee?

MR. CASTELLI:
Sure. I just want to say one more thing about this and then I'll get to that in one second. The Lakeland County Park is at the headwaters of the Connetquot River, so some of what is going to be done by Dr. Grella here will have implications for what's going on in the County --

LEG. CILMI:
Why wouldn't we actually do the work in that County park, then, since it's a County facility?

DR. GRELLA:
Okay. So one of the things about collecting ecological data, Sir, is that you can't just collect it in one specific locale. With a question regarding the nitrogen mitigation that we're looking at, we need multiple areas along that watershed. We can't just collect in one locale, we need the whole body itself, which is why we're studying both the river and the salt marsh ecosystem. So if this was -- if you notice, we're focusing specifically on fresh water and the salt water community, not just the fresh water community as a whole. So for those of you that are familiar with some of the work on the Nissequoque, it would be like studying the Nissequoque River and then the salt marsh communities of the Nissequoque.

LEG. CILMI:
How many students from the high schools, from Brentwood and Central Islip High Schools, do you anticipate being engaged in this work? How many students from Stony Brook do you anticipate being engaged in this work, and how many hours would you expect the work to take?
DR. GRELLA:
So as outlined in our budget that was submitted, we're looking at approximately 120 students as a target audience, which will then be disseminated. We are planning on using social media -- Facebook, Instagram and Twitter -- to also reach a larger audience outside of the Brentwood and Central Islip community. We plan on using and utilizing TAs, teaching assistants from Stony Brook University to be in the field and be collecting data in both the fresh water communities and the salt water communities at the marsh and in the river, and I believe we have funding set aside for them for this year and for next year.

(*Legislator Stern entered the meeting at 11:40 A.M.*)

LEG. CILMI:
But you said -- I just want to clarify. You said the audience; what does that mean exactly? Do you mean 125 students --

DR. GRELLA:
So we'll have --

LEG. CILMI:
-- would be at the park collecting data with the Stony Brook students?

DR. GRELLA:
Not all at the same time, so don't see this as busloads of students coming in. We will have earmarked projects that will be -- that teams of students will be working on, and teams of students will be working on these projects from 10th, 11th and 12th grade. At the commencement of the project, we'll start and we'll designate teams of students to each topic or, you know, appropriately topic area, and then at the end of the three-year sequence, each student will have a project that they will either use for an individual Intel submission or they'll use as a team submission to the Seaman's Program.

LEG. CILMI:
The money that we're being asked to approve today, is that going to last you for three years; is that what you're suggesting?

DR. GRELLA:
So we see this money lasting a year-and-a-half and that's how we outlined our budget for --

LEG. CILMI:
But you see this as a three-year project.

DR. GRELLA:
I do.

LEG. CILMI:
So you're going to have to come back to us for additional money in a year-and-a-half?

DR. GRELLA:
I think you're going to want to see more funding towards this, yes. And I think that's what you brought up, and I really think this is a really valid and important point, is that once we have the data to support some of these really important questions at the local level, can we then go to the State for significantly more funding. We have to start small as a team and then we can apply for larger amounts of money. We cannot just go for large buckets of money without having the data to support the initiative.
LEG. CILMI:
Okay. I'll yield to my colleagues. Thanks.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, thank you. Legislator Spencer.

LEG. SPENCER:
I'm a -- I agree with everything that's been said with regards to the benefits of this project, and I think the educational values are important. I just want to make sure that we're taking those precious 477 funds and maximizing them. And, you know, I know that my colleague, her district, she's a champion there, I honor and respect her and this is something that's important to her district she represents. So I, you know, want to be careful with that limited funds that we have there, but I will -- I think there's a lot of noble cause that's in this resolution.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Martinez.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Thank you. And I do appreciate all the words and comments that have been made here today regarding this resolution. And just so you know, in terms of maximizing the funding for this, this is something that I don't take lightly. Most of you already know, have gotten to know me, and you know that I will fight hard for my district, just like Legislator Spencer just said. And unfortunately the students at Brentwood/Central Islip -- and Legislator Cilmi, as you know, you represent part of Central Islip -- you know that many of our children are not afforded similar opportunities that other children in other districts are.

So when this opportunity came forward and I saw the potential that can take place in this district, okay, which has already taken place in Brentwood through Dr. Grella's work with the stem project in our district and the outstanding work that she has done. And the papers that you received based on this resolution from her, you will see the amount of students that have gone through her program who have reached great potential, have gone to great schools, and that's through her efforts. And I think by doing this, not only will this put Brentwood and CI on the map as being competitive and giving them the opportunity to compete with other students across the County, but this is also the water quality initiative that we are working towards and making sure that our water quality improves. So why not start at a local level? And the reason why we picked Connetquot River is because it lines my district, okay, which is why I went with the Connetquot River.

Legislator Trotta mentioned another river, you know, which later on we can look into that river. And the reason why we're starting at the local level, because if we start here, we can then go to State and we can go to Federal to get more funding. So when Dr. Grella said yes, she'll be back for more money, she also knows that she needs to look for other grants as well, not just County funding, and those are discussions that we have had.

But I think this is such an opportunity for our students. I think it's such an opportunity for Suffolk County to make sure that we have scientists that are really out there doing this work day in/day out and really see what's going on with our waters and really see where this nitrogen loading is coming from and what's happening with our rib muscles and where are we going, you know, and just different questions that still need to be answered. And I have full faith that Dr. Grella and Dr. Padilla will do what is necessary, along with Frank and Camillo from the Economic Development here in the County.
So I’m asking, obviously, for all of your support. I think this is such an important cause, again, not only for the students that I represent and that you represent, Legislator Cilmi, but I think for the entire County of Suffolk.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:
I’m also in support of this resolution. And, you know, I was -- I had listened to your -- the information that you presented at the EPA hearing, or actually committee meeting, and I was very impressed at the potential of the investment of these County dollars, what they can do for Suffolk County and the residents. And I’d like you to briefly just mention about the scholarships available. Again, I’m thinking the investment into our future and the investment into the education, potential, I think outweighs any negative understanding of are we really spending County funds for the right reason, and I think absolutely yes. Could you talk a little bit more about that?

DR. GRELLA:
Surely. I would like just to state that you’ve been provided with a list of just a small number of students that worked with Diana Padilla and I. I have many students at Brentwood High School, this is just -- I provided you with a subset of scholarships that these students have received. Students in New York that participate in either the Intel Science Talent Search or the Seamans Competition; we’re talking about the top 1% of U.S. High School graduating senior; so we’re looking at less than 1400 individuals a year, nationwide. So when we have kids from either Brentwood or Central Islip who are going out and participating in these top national and international competitions, they are saying to a college, Look at me. I am capable of seeing a project from start to finish. I am capable of asking a real world question and answering that question and providing somebody with information that is valuable. And with that, in turn comes scholarships. With the scholarships that we are seeing at Brentwood, we are seeing full rides to top universities in the nation. We are seeing full rides like we have never seen before. When I first started at Brentwood, I did not see this pattern. The more students are participating in research and getting out and doing hands-on research and writing up these critically -- you know, reports, it is bringing them to a different level, it really is. It's bringing them to a different level and it's also giving them almost a foundation to build their educational career.

Samantha Garvey is an environmental science major, she is going to be majoring in -- she is majoring in environmental science and policy on a full ride at Boden; that's over $250,000, that's amazing.

LEG. ANKER:
Right. And again, I just want to commend you for what you've towards this. You know, the folks in Brentwood in the area, they don't have the resources that other residents have. But I think this is -- we're putting in the best bang for the buck that we're doing and, again, I commend you for all your efforts and helping the residents understand that our environment is vital, and what's even more vital is that our future generations will see that also. And we talk about stem and we talk about all these issues, kids are leaving Long Island; well, this is going to help prevent that. So again, thank you.

DR. GRELLA:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Hahn.
LEG. HAHN:
I agree. I agree with Legislator Anker and others who have spoke before about the stem importance of this. You know, we're raising the next generation of environmental stewards and the next generation of environmental scientists. I'm a little concerned with Legislator Cilmi's line of questioning because, you know, by saying, Oh, the river runs through the State park, so therefore we shouldn't be doing work there, in my mind is sort of short-sighted, you know, for many reasons. First of all, that river, I believe, empties into the Great South Bay, correct, and as you mentioned, begins in one of our County parks. And there's a major watershed in our County and of major importance, and I think you mentioned that hasn't really been studied to this -- at this kind of level and detail previously. And I believe that the Health Department, Division of Environmental Quality, would probably agree that the data you're going to provide to us will be valuable, will be a wonderful addition to all the work that, you know, that we're already doing.

I don't think we should be looking -- you know, far too often government puts things in silos and to put a river into a silo that it's in a State park and, therefore, we shouldn't touch it or study it, you know, is very short-sighted. And it's our water. If you understand our water system and our -- it's all interconnected; groundwater, bays and waterways, rivers, watersheds, all the water is interconnected and there's a cycle and it's one cycle and it's all critically important.

And so I think I covered everything. For all those reasons, I'm going to be supporting this and, you know, I'm very much looking forward to hearing the results of your students' studies.

DR. GRELLA:
I'm hoping to have a student here next year, you know, really giving the presentation to the County. And I think that that would really be a major milestone for all of us, that we have a student here, or two, providing us with the results that are going to be published. You know, our aim really is to make this data publishable and really ask these questions that are of importance for our County. But to have -- you know, to show you the importance, I think that that would be a true way, Legislator Cilmi, to show you how beneficial this is, and you're giving an opportunity to someone who would previously not have had that opportunity.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
Yeah. Could I just, if I may, just address Legislator Hahn's comments? I don't think it's short-sighted to ask questions, and I don't think it's short-sighted to be concerned that we're spending County dollars, when we have a $176,000,000 deficit over three years. I'm listening to the answers and I'm taking it all in and I'm trying to make an informed decision on whether or not to spend 477 money, which is a valuable resource. We certainly have lots of priorities when it comes to protecting our water quality here in Suffolk County, and I want to make sure that we're looking at every question and every avenue here to make sure that we're making the right decision.

So it's not short-sighted at all. I don't view Connetquot River or Connetquot State Park in a silo, I recognize that it's part of a larger ecosystem, and water obviously runs into other bodies of water and we spend lots of money studying water quality in the Great South Bay and in other places. I just want to make sure that we're -- that in the context of a $176 million budget deficit and in the context of all the different things that we have to do with 477 money, that we're making the right decision. And I understand that the committee that's responsible for recommending this has put this forward as a valid expense, an investment, if you will. I recognize that not only is it an investment in water quality, but it's an investment in education to some extent. And I understand, having had a brief conversation with Legislator Martinez, that in effect what we're really doing here is we're not really funding public education and that the Brentwood Schools is really acting in this case as a bank
account, if you will; is that correct?

**DR. GRELLA:**
That's absolutely correct.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Thank you.

**MR. CASTELLI:**
I just wanted to respond to --

**LEG. CILMI:**
Sure.

**MR. CASTELLI:**
-- two of the issues that Legislator Cilmi brought up. First of all, we're asking -- today we have four resolutions up for consideration from the Quarter Percent Water Quality funding, and the Budget Office has estimated that at the end of this year, 2015, the fund balance would be 2.5 -- approximately $2.5 million after all expenses and all projects previously recommended have been subtracted out. And during the committee meetings this past few months, we recommended a total of $1.3 million in new projects, so that we would clearly not threaten the solvency of the fund by being conservative. And also, we put a maximum -- we put a cap of $125,000 per project on these.

And also, regarding your other question that I never got to answer, there were several projects that were not funded; two of them came from the Town of Brookhaven. Brookhaven wanted funding to proceed with the -- additional funding for the dredging of the lower lake in Yaphank and, also funding for residual clean-up work after the dredging that was done in the Upper Lake, and we didn't think that either one of those was a worthwhile use of funding.

We also had a request from the Village of Babylon for funding a street sweeper, and the committee felt that it was a bit of a dangerous precedent to start funding equipment such as a street sweeper from local municipalities. There is another proposal for Cornell University that basically was duplicative of some of the educational outreach work that we've been doing on fertilizer reduction, so we didn't fund that also.

**LEG. CILMI:**
I appreciate that response. And not absent from my own personal deliberations here, you know, in recognition of the hundreds of thousands of dollars we have spent on researching nitrogen pollution in our waters, and we continue to spend on researching nitrogen pollution and the origins of that nitrogen pollution and the results of the nitrogen pollution and all of that. So that's a component in the debate and the discussion as well. But I appreciate your answers and I appreciate your testimony as well and we'll go from there.

**MR. CASTELLI:**
Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay, Legislator Barraga.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
Just one question. When you appeared before committee, I think yourself and I think the professor from Stony Brook, you indicated that after a year-and-a-half when the project is complete, I think the understanding was that you would submit a final report on suggestions, recommendations for
the future; does that hold true? Because I know you mentioned some interim reports as you go along.

**DR. GRELLA:**
Absolutely. Absolutely, without a doubt.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
All right. I'll be supporting the bill. I think Legislator Cilmi has made a valid point with reference to whether or not you want to mix County funds with a local school district and students from a given district benefitting from those dollars. But I think the circumstance surrounding Brentwood, and I'm more fully aware of it than most members, is that, you know, back in 1994, the State of New York made major changes with reference to the education formulas for school districts throughout the State; it was something like 46 major formulas for education as far as the distribution of the dollars go. But the changes were made in maybe three-quarters of them to drive more money to so-called high tax/low level school districts -- I'm sure you've all heard that term -- of which Brentwood and Central Islip and a lot of the districts on the western end certainly qualify, especially Brentwood because their combined wealth ratio is well below 1.00, they were basically a poor district and a big district with 13 to 15,000 students. So I was sitting there as the ranking Republican on the Education committee and endorsed the changes, but had a difficult time with it because we did not let the formulas run. If we let the formula run, Brentwood would have benefitted tremendously. But we put a cap on the poorest districts in terms of the amount of money that they could receive. I think the cap is no more than, no matter how poor you were, four or 5% a year.

As a result, over a 10-year period, from '94 to 2004, the Brentwood School District lost, because of that cap, between 300 and $400 million. Just think of that, one district, they deserved the money, they didn't get it. And yet the promise by Legislators at the time to me, and I was on board, that because we didn't have the money now in '94, because we were coming out of a recession in 91 and 92, that in a couple of years we'd let the formula run. So Brentwood and the other high tax school districts would get what they really deserved. We never let it run. Those districts took it in the neck, especially on Long Island, from Albany.

So when a bill like this comes along, for a measly 125,000 or 250,000 compared to the 400 million the district lost, I'll embrace the bill and I'll support it. Because just imagine what that district would have accomplished in that 10-year period between '94 and 2004 if they had gotten the money that they really deserved, but the Legislature put the cap on. And then when the money did come in and we were solid financially, we spent those monies someplace else.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay, Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
Thank you. You know, I do believe that anything we start we should always finish. And well over ten years ago -- and actually, Frank, I'm going to have to have Frank come up. Well over ten years ago there was an issue in Yaphank, and I know you brought up the issue about the Yaphank Lakes. The County helped to fund -- in fact, the County funded the entire study for the Yaphank Lakes, as long -- and with the Canaan Lakes. Now, there was a storm water remediation project in Yaphank, right off of the Yaphank Lake, which was declined because of the cost, and thanks to the Legislature we funded it, but we had to do it in the Capital Program. So I do have concerns about this cap and how much you can spend per project, because I think we have extremely important and valid projects that need to be funded that are our responsibility, not someone else's. And while I agree that this project for these students is definitely an excellent project, it is at a State park. And when you -- let's talk about Brookhaven and their application. Fourteen percent of the Yaphank Lake is owned by Suffolk County, and we refuse to fund $125,000 and there's two pots of money that they
were requesting, 125 and 55. And the County chose, the Water Quality Review Board decided not to fund the projects that the Town of Brookhaven requested the money for; and again, this is 14% of the lake belongs to Suffolk County, we are responsible. We did the study, we paid for that, we did everything, and now we're refusing them the necessary funds to finish the project. They're putting millions into it. And because of some holdups, if you go back to Yaphank and you take a look at the condition of the lakes, because of the holdups they're not getting it completed.

So while I think that this project is a very valid project, I see that you're taking a $125,000 away from the Yaphank Lakes. And again, like I said, if you start something you've got to finish it and that's what we should be doing, instead of starting off with something new.

**MR. CASTELLI:**
Well, to address that, first of all, there were three other Brookhaven Town projects that were funded. For the record, Brookhaven Town I think submitted five separate applications, which three of them were funded.

The reason that the committee felt that the upper Yaphank Lake project should not be recommended was in view of the problems that the town had with the dredging of our Upper Lake. As I think a lot of people are aware, there were a large amount of turbidity that was stirred up by the dredging and that was an issue, as the turbidity moved downstream. And the proposal from the town was to do additional, I think it was suction harvesting of the residual invasives that were left behind in the dredging. And the committee thought that in view of the problems that were experienced with the dredging, it wasn't a prudent use of fund for the Upper Lake.

Now, the Lower Lake was a different issue in that the town was asking for funding for Lower Lake to come up with -- to hire a contractor to come up with a better way to do the dredging of Lower Lake to avoid the mistakes that were made with Upper Lake. And we -- Legislator Calarco has retained capital -- not Water Quality funding, but Capital funding for Canaan Lake to do just that. We are going to -- in fact, the RFP just went out a couple of weeks ago. We're going to hire a contractor to come up with, for lack of a better term, a better way of draining -- not draining, of dredging Canaan Lake. And we could -- whatever is found out then would clearly be applicable to Lower Lake in Yaphank. So the committee didn't think it was necessary to provide additional funding to Brookhaven town for Lower Lake in view of the fact that we are spending County money on Canaan Lake and whatever is learned from that will clearly be applicable to Lower Lake in Yaphank.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
And I think the Yaphank Lake project even predates Canaan Lake. And again, Lower Lake, 14% of the Lower Lake is what belongs to the County.

**MR. CASTELLI:**
Yes, yes, you are correct.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
So I have to say that I was very disappointed and shocked to hear that the County would not continue with their responsibility to help the Town of Brookhaven finish up what we started.

**MR. CASTELLI:**
Canaan Lake was part of the original study that was funded, the Nelson and Pope Study on the invasives. That study was done for both Yaphank Lakes and Canaan Lake.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
I thought Yaphank was before Canaan, but that's neither here nor there.
MR. CASTELLI:
Yeah.

LEG. BROWNING:
The fact of the matter is, is that we're not completing what we started.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
I would like to see them doing something to stop the -- you know, someone else pointed out, we're
doing studies, studies, studies.

DR. GRELLA:
If we took the invasives from Legislator Browning's Lilly Lake and perhaps put them in the lake of --
we'd solve some nitrogen mitigation problems. That's why the watermilfoil populations in Lilly Lake
are thriving, and invasives are terribly difficult to remove. You know, as an invasive species
biologist, I will tell you Lilly Lake is -- I have assessed some of the watermilfoil at Lilly Lake and it's
horrific in terms of its removal; you cut it down it grows back, hence the name a cancer of the
environment. It's very, very, very difficult.

But going back to you, I absolutely agree with you. And any type of question that you feel is
necessary that you would like perhaps to see my team address, I am open to that.

LEG. TROTTA:
You would know better than me. I mean, I've seen they put these filters on the drainage systems;
I'd like to see them do that. You have 130 kids there who are, you know, in good shape, they
should be doing something physical rather than collecting a sample of water and having it tested. I
mean, all we do is do studies here. I'd rather see something get done.

DR. GRELLA:
I absolutely agree with you. And Legislator Browning, one of the things that I've been working on
just for you to bring to the table here is a benthic barrier for watermilfoil. My students came up with
a technique of devising a benthic mat that is placed down on top of the watermilfoil, so it's basically
a cage to keep down the milfoil. But the problem, again, leads to the detritus and the decaying of
the watermilfoil.

LEG. TROTTA:
You know what's causing the nitrogen.

DR. GRELLA:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
Okay. So here we are doing another study to find out what's doing the nitrogen.

DR. GRELLA:
Right, but the way we're addressing it is how can we mitigate it using what we have at hand. Can
we use -- can we look to nature for a question and a way to conquer this question. So can we turn
to nature using plants and/or animals that will allow the -- you know, the sucking in --

LEG. TROTTA:
High school students aren't going to be -- you know, that's something you and the scientists would
develop.
DR. GRELLA:
We have that going on in the lab now. So everything that we're bringing out into the field, these kids have already been exposed to in the sense that they have the concept at hand. So it's not as if we're going out and this is all new to them. They understand nitrogen mitigation because they have been working with us now on some of the questions.

LEG. TROTTA:
Is this only opened up to Central Islip and Brentwood students? You mentioned something if other students --

DR. GRELLA:
With our collaboration with Mel Morris from Brookhaven National Lab, we have a component that we're bringing in the Day in the Life of the river that will bring in Connetquot School District as well.

LEG. TROTTA:
Are the kids getting paid?

DR. GRELLA:
The kids are not getting paid. The kids will be paid in terms of a scholarship when they apply to college.

LEG. TROTTA:
That's where you lose me. I mean, I don't think it's the County's obligation to be doing this. You know, that's where -- you know, this money is to be used to keep our groundwater cleaner and to take care of it.

DR. GRELLA:
Sir --

LEG. TROTTA:
You know, while I'm concerned about their scholarships --

DR. GRELLA:
Right, but what about the data? The data is why I'm here. I'm here as a scientist, standing before you as a scientist to prepare you with --

LEG. TROTTA:
What kind of data are you going to get? You're going to get some samples, you're going to look -- you know, I'd rather see some work being done.

DR. GRELLA:
Explain in terms of work. You --

LEG. TROTTA:
I mean, when they go in -- I've seen kids, you know, around the Nissequoque, they go into the storm drains and they put mats or some kind of float system where the oil comes up or doesn't -- I don't know what they do. But, you know, where they put and they -- they spray paint, Don't dump anything down the spillways, or whatever they are.

DR. GRELLA:
I'll have them put up signs.
LEG. TROTTA:
Yeah, more signs. Okay.

(*Laughter*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Thank you. And my question is to the selection of the project, specifically the rejection of the Babylon project; if I could speak to you about that.

I guess -- I live on the South Shore, and all of our South Shore communities have -- our rain water goes right into the drain basins right into the Great South Bay. And I don't think there's any question, we don't need a study, we don't need anything to tell us that the salt and the sand, all the other debris, any oil that is on those streets are being washed directly into the bay is having a direct impact on our ecological balance there in those bays and estuaries; is that fair to say.

MR. CASTELLI:
Yeah, there's no question that the reduction of materials from the road surfaces by street sweepers does have a benefit and that it reduces non-point source pollution from entering the surface waterways. That wasn't really -- the issue was that the committee didn't think it was a good precedent to set to be funding capital equipment for other municipalities. There was no argument of the potential benefit of it.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Well, but here we are -- and don't get the wrong idea, I'm supportive of this. But here we are making the same argument that we are subsidizing basically a school district's project to be able to do in one specific school district, and maybe two, to do a study, and open up the opportunity for these students to get scholarships and learn more about the ecology.

If we don't have -- we're not concerned about a dangerous precedent for the South Shore communities, which we all agree could be benefitted by this type of money being put into it, how can we make the same argument that we're doing something specific and not starting a dangerous precedent where everybody -- in every other community? If Lindenhurst, Babylon, West Babylon, my district, their school districts come in and say, Hey, we want to study the Nissequoque River, or whatever river is in those districts, why wouldn't they be able to get $125,000 just to do a study? As opposed to where you have a municipality that wants to take a proactive approach and say, We want to clean up what we know is definitely -- we don't need a study to know this is bad and we need to fix it.

My concern, as you said, there was a dangerous precedent on one, but the other one, I guess it's just going to be an isolated incident and we're not going to expand that program no matter who asks for it.

MR. CASTELLI:
All I could say is that I really -- the Water Quality Committee makes decisions based on -- a case-by-case decision on every project. I can't speak exclusively for the committee, but I'm just summarizing what the sediment of the committee was.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Am I wrong in my assertions that this is -- you used the words a dangerous precedent, I wrote it down, with the equipment. And I see this as a dangerous precedent as well if we're saying, Well,
let's open it up to every single school district. We have $2.5 million in there, because we said we have it, if we accessed every school district to have the same type of program, it would all be gone.

DR. GRELLA:
You make a very important economic concern, but not every school district has a scientist running a full-time lab in it. I am a scientist as well as an educator, but what comes first is my science. I'm bringing to you my science. I brought to you my colleague, Diana Padilla, from the University. I am working with a team of scientists; not every school district has a scientist in it. I am the --

LEG. McCAFFREY:
I'm not arguing the science and I'm not arguing that you are. My concern is that we know that this --

DR. GRELLA:
Our school --

LEG. McCAFFREY:
This water going in the drain basins has gone into there and we're saying that we're not going to do anything about it, but we're going to fund studies in this specific area.

DR. GRELLA:
Well --

LEG. McCAFFREY:
And that's my -- my concern is what I'm being raised is raised about what -- we had a project that came by and said, No, we're not going to do it because it's a dangerous precedent. I don't think it is. You know, I'm supportive of the work that you're doing and what's going on in Brentwood and the need to do something there, and I don't disagree. I disagree with the fact that, your project aside, I am clearly taking a colloquial interest in the fact that the application is good for one, but the municipality in my district was turned down and it has a direct impact on the ecology of the south shore. And they told them it's not as important as high school students and scientists collaboratively doing a program to tell us what we already know, there's too many nitrates in there. So, that's all. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. We have an Executive Session that we have to get to in a few minutes, so we have two more speakers and we'll call the vote. Legislator Martinez, then Legislator Calarco.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Thank you. Legislator Browning, I completely agree with you in terms of completing our projects. And I do hope that this project is completely completed, and I have the full faith that it will be. In terms of what Legislator Cilmi said before in terms of school districts getting the monies, it's not the school district that's going to be funded, and nor are the kids being paid. The clarification is the school district is going to act as a depository for the monies, but it's not a school-funded project. The school is not involved. The only way the school is involved is because Dr. Grella works at the school, and she is there during the day which will facilitate her in obtaining these monies.

Also, it won't be subsidizing the schools, Legislator McCaffrey, as you just stated. And I do apologize that your application was rejected and I really hope that that does not have any impact on this, okay, because I understand your frustration. And in terms of setting precedent, you're absolutely right. But I -- you know, if I may suggest again, put it in again, you know, fight for those kids as well, and that's what I am doing. But I really hope that your frustration does not impede on what I would like to do in my district. And I give you -- you know, I know you're upset, but I just want
everyone to know that this has nothing to do with the school district itself. We're just using -- I don't want to say using.

**MR. NOLAN:**
It's a conduit.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**
Thank you, it's a conduit for students of Brentwood and Central Islip to participate in the project, but it has nothing to do with the school district itself.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**
And Legislator Martinez, I apologize if it was taken out of context, my remarks about the school district getting the money, because clearly it's not. I will be supporting this, okay. I just wanted to make my frustration known that when I heard there was a dangerous president; it's a dangerous precedent to have all these things that are in the streets going directly into our bay as well. So, I will be supporting it.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**
And I thank you. I would be frustrated, too, you know, but I do appreciate your support, and every single one of you who has said something here on this resolution. I hope it does go through and I guess now we will, I don't know, I guess call the vote?

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. MARTINEZ:**
Oh, sorry, Legislator.

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Call the vote.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. BROWNING:**
Abstain.

**MR. LAUBE:**
*Seventeen (Abstention: Legislator Browning).*

**LEG. SPENCER:**
Congratulations.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay, I'll make a motion to go into Executive Session. Second by Legislator Martinez. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**MR. LAUBE:**
*Eighteen.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Thank you. If we can have everyone clear the room. Thank you. The Executive Session is on the litigation with the Pine Barrens.
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(**Executive Session: 12:17 PM - 12:49 PM**)  

P.O. GREGORY:  
Okay. We are out of the Executive Session. We're going to break for lunch and be back at 2:30.

(*The meeting was recessed at 12:49 PM*).

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

P.O. GREGORY:  
Okay. Mr. Clerk, do a roll call.

MR. LAUBE:  
Yes, sir.

(Roll Called by Tim Laube - Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
(Not Present).

LEG. BROWNING:  
Here.

LEG. MURATORE:  
Here.

LEG. HAHN:  
Present.

LEG. ANKER:  
Here.

LEG. CALARCO:  
Here.

LEG. LINDSAY:  
(Not Present).

LEG. MARTINEZ:  
(Not Present).

LEG. CILMI:  
(Not Present).

LEG. BARRAGA:  
Here.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
Here.

LEG. TROTTA:  
Here.
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LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Here.

LEG. STERN:
(Not Present).

LEG. D'AMARO:
Here.

LEG. SPENCER:
Here.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Here.

P.O. GREGORY:
Here.

MR. LAUBE:
Twelve.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right. We are at the hour for public hearings. The first public hearing is on the 2016-2018 Capital Budget and Program. And I do not have any cards. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak on it? Please come forward. On the Capital Program. No? Okay. All right. So I'll make a motion to close. Second by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Twelve. (Not Present: Legislators Krupski, Lindsay, Martinez, Cilmi, Kennedy and Stern)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. IR 1151 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law to ban the sale of personal care products containing microbeads in Suffolk County (Hahn). I have one card and that is Jack Finkenberg. Jack?

MR. FINKENBERG:
Yes, that's me.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, sir.

MR. FINKENBERG:
Thank you. Jack Finkenberg. I'm with the Long Island Sierra Club. I'm here in support of bill 1151 to ban the use of microbeads in cosmetic products, personal care products. We're particularly concerned about the potential impact on our marine environment and that this would have a resulting impact on fish, shellfish. We anticipate that the microbeads will accumulate in the filters of fish and shellfish and have an impact on that substantial industry here in Suffolk County. So we recommend passage of this law. Thank you very much.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, sir. Okay. Adrienne Esposito.
MS. ESPOSITO:  
Don't get excited; it's only dish soap.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
It's the Avon lady.

MS. ESPOSITO:  
No, I'm anything but the Avon lady, I assure you.

(*Laughter*)

MS. ESPOSITO:  
Okay. Good afternoon, members of the Legislature. My name is Adrienne Esposito. I'm the Executive Director of Citizens Campaign for the Environment. I've come to talk to you today to support Introductory Resolution 1151, banning microbeads. Now, some of you might be thinking why am I going to ban plastic beads. I bet that's what you're thinking, Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:  
I was seeing what you had there, seeing if I use any of them.

MS. ESPOSITO:  
Well, unfortunately, many people do. Microbeads, for those of you who don't know, are very microscopic plastic beads that are being found in lots of products like facial scrubs, toothpaste, dishwashing soap and a number of other body care products, and we don't need them. They're little, tiny plastic beads that apparently are designed to go right through sewage treatment plants, which means they get discharged into the Great Lakes, the Finger Lakes, Long Island Sound, South Shore Estuary, Peconic Estuary. What could possibly be the problem you might say? I'm going to tell you.

Number one is that the microbeads are -- there are 360,000 of them in this one product. Three-hundred and sixty thousand of them in this one product. They do not break down. They're plastic that go into our waterways, and then they get into the food chain. So as these tiny, little plastic beads go into the waterway they then do what plastic does, which they become absorbant for toxics, PCBs and DTE and other toxic chemicals. Then the fish eat them and then you, Legislator Cilmi, eat the fish.

LEG. CILMI:  
No, I don't.

MS. ESPOSITO:  
Only you. Well, how does that impact Long Island? You might say -- but on Long Island one of the problems is one way that they get out of the water is shellfish. Now I have your attention, right?

LEG. CILMI:  
I don't eat shellfish either.

MS. ESPOSITO:  
Bay scallops, clams. As they are filter feeders, they suck in the water and they bring in the microbeads, but then they can't spit them out, so we end up eating them in the shellfish. I don't know if this ruckus that just occurred is about you're so upset about this or what's going on. But anyway, so here is the bottom line. Banning microbeads in Suffolk County will make our shellfish healthier, our finfish, our waterways. We don't need them.
I want you to know also that microbeads are also found in toothpaste. What happens now, and we’re actually getting letters from members of the public, and I know this is a little gross, but I’m going to have to walk you through this anyway. The tiny plastic beads in toothpaste get embedded in your gums and in your cavities. Look at the face on Legislator Lindsay when I said that. But this is a fact. Dentists are now finding them embedded in our gums, and what happens is that they attract bacteria. Okay, ask me a question. And then they’re actually recommending to their patients to switch toot

P.O. GREGORY: Okay.

LEG. HAHN: I have a question.

P.O. GREGORY: Legislator Hahn has a question.

LEG. HAHN: Are there alternatives?

MS. ESPOSITO: Yes, thank you for asking such an astute question, Legislator Hahn.

The reason that this is important for you guys to know, and the reason you can ban microbeads, is that there are alternatives already on the market. They’re only used sometimes just for color, which we don’t need. You know, we have a lot of color in our world; we don’t necessarily need it in our toothpaste. But they are also used as an abrasion, but we can use salt crystals, sugar crystals, ground up coffee grains, ground up apricot shells, and these are already used. So many products are already on the market making the transition from the old plastic to the new way. We didn’t know about this problem in the past. We now know some companies are phasing them out. In New York the companies aren’t phasing them out. They’re fighting in the New York State Senate right now, today, to keep microbeads in their products. The Assembly in the State has passed a bill banning them. The Senate is struggling with the words. Right? They want to keep biodegradable plastic alive, but unfortunately there is no such thing as biodegradable plastic as defined by law or as defined by science.

So there are already alternatives. Some companies are being responsible and some are being irresponsible. You banning microbeads will send a message to the State to get their act together and also will help us right here locally with our shellfish and our finfish populations.

P.O. GREGORY: Okay. Legislator Spencer.
LEG. SPENCER:
Adrienne, you always have a very practical way of putting things that --

MS. ESPOSITO:
I'm a very practical person.

LEG. SPENCER:
I appreciate that. And I see what you're talking about. I see the utility, but from a practical matter, do you really think if we pass -- we pass this legislation that we can ban Crest in Suffolk County?

MS. ESPOSITO:
No --

LEG. SPENCER:
When you look at all of our --

MS. ESPOSITO:
That's a great question.

LEG. SPENCER:
- stores, all of our retails, all of our contracts, can we really ban Crest in Suffolk County?

MS. ESPOSITO:
We're not asking the companies to ban a product and we're not asking any level of government to ban a product. We don't want you to ban a product. But what they would do is they would just not put in those little beads, so they find a substitute. In Crest, actually, they already have substitutes. They just don't have to use little plastic beads. The plastic beads are not there because they make your teeth healthier and, in fact, we're now finding they actually do the opposite.

LEG. SPENCER:
No, I get that and that makes a lot of sense, but if you look at Crest that is an international company, across the world how many places are microbeads banned. So they are going to make at some point a judgment call that we're not going do it, so then we have that law here. What happens to our retailers. And again, if it's something in the interest of safety I think my record would be that I would err on the side of safety, but I'm just looking from a practical matter. And give me a way that if you take Crest international, all over the world, that they're going to look at Suffolk County like, oh, we're not going to put microbeads, is it worth it for them to do that, and if we don't do that, what happens to all of our supermarket, all of the food chains that carry Crest?

MS. ESPOSITO:
Well, first off, not all Crest products have it. There's just one, it's called the Pro-Health product has it. So they already make products -- Crest already makes products without it, so they can make their number one product that has it without it. And number two is states are already -- in Illinois, for instance, they have banned it. So it sends a message to the industry that it's time for change.

My perspective is, and I know that you might not have this perspective, but I think the public does. When we have new science of new information, then we should make changes accordingly. If we just do things the same old way because that's easier, then we never progress as a society and we never make changes that benefit us. So, you know, we have to say okay, now we know about these things, now we know that damage is being done, so now we make the change.
Industry should be part of the solution. They should be with us on this, and some are in fairness, Estee Lauder and a number of -- Loreal. They already have publicly announced they’re going to phase it all out in their products. So the other ones, Crest and Aveeno, could follow suit if they choose to.

LEG. SPENCER:
Thanks, Adrienne. Appreciate it.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Schneiderman.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I think they'll follow suit faster if we prohibit them. They'll have to, you know.

MS. ESPOSITO:
Yes. There's a carrot and a stick approach.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Can I ask, Adrienne, I mean, I understand these products have the microbeads because they -- they're abrasive, so whether it's for brushing teeth or exfoliating or whatever it might be, they're putting them in these products. Is there -- you know, I looked at this one product that you gave me, and I look at the ingredients and nowhere does it say microbeads. Is there no labeling requirements that they have to put down that they have microbeads in them?

MS. ESPOSITO:
What I gave you, now hold onto your seats, was dish soap that doesn't have microbeads. So it still cleans your dishes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Oh, okay.

MS. ESPOSITO:
People in Illinois still have clean faces.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
So this doesn't have microbeads.

MS. ESPOSITO:
Correct.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
So do the ones that do have microbeads say that they have microbeads?

MS. ESPOSITO:
Yes. I handed you out a fact sheet and it lists the different terminology used that really should say microbeads, but it says poly this. So there are three different phrases that are used and it's on that fact sheet that we distributed.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. In the past, this County has prohibited all kinds of toxic substances from phosphates to BPA, a number of different things. Sometimes, though, we've sunset it and we haven't ban them, well, we've banned them but we've given a certain amount of time for the industry to phase them out, to get rid of their inventories, that kind of thing. I haven't looked at the language of the bill whether it
does that. I'm assuming it doesn't. Is that something -- how would you feel about a sunset provision that would allow a year or so to phase out these products in Suffolk County?

**MS. ESPOSITO:**
Well, being reasonable, as I was recently described, we would be -- definitely would look at that. And actually we're talking about that in the State version of the bill as well. We understand change takes time. But, you know, you said it best. This County Legislature, you guys banned MTBE as an additive from gasoline if you remember. And some of the same questions by Legislator Dr. Spencer asked was well how is the gasoline industry, the multi-national gasoline industry, how will they make special gasoline for Long Island? And you know what we said? Well, we don't want to drink their gasoline and so it was banned, then the State banned it. There was a three-year phase out program and in 2004 MTBE was banned. Best thing Suffolk County ever did. Got a whole ban for New York State. This is just like that. It is a burden on industry to make a change, but you know what? It is industry's requirement as being responsible to make changes. That's the way it goes.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Suffolk County is a big market. You have a million-and-a-half people here so if you --

**MS. ESPOSITO:**
Yes.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
-- send a message to the industry you just lost basically a huge sector of the market, they're going to have to modify, they'll have to put other products or come up with ways, products that do the same things using biodegradable ingredients or natural ingredients and I'm sure they will.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**
Right.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
I'm sure they will, but they may need some time to make that transition.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**
I agree, and we'd be perfectly amenable to that. And what also I believe is going to happen, as more dentists are uncovering more of the microbeads embedded in people's mouths, they're going to make the switch.

**MR. NOLAN:**
The law does build in that time. It doesn't go into effect until the end of 2016 and for products that are regulated by the FDA it doesn't go into effect until the end of 2017.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**
And particularly for toothpaste, just to go back to Dr. Spencer, it's purely, Doc Spencer, in there for aesthetic purposes. It's not in there -- it doesn't do anything for your teeth. Baking soda does a lot more.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay. Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Thank you. Adrienne, how are you?
MS. ESPOSITO:
I'm good, thank you.

LEG. CILMI:
So this is actually a question, please don't take it any other way. It's a real question.

MS. ESPOSITO:
No, go ahead. That's okay.

LEG. CILMI:
But I'm just trying to -- I'm trying to understand the science here. So if I'm -- if I'm correct you said that the microbeads absorb toxins.

MS. ESPOSITO:
Yes, they attract them.

LEG. CILMI:
And then they're eaten by fish and the like and whatever. So -- and they don't degrade. This is the silly part of the question, but I don't mean it to be.

MS. ESPOSITO:
No, no. Go ahead.

LEG. CILMI:
Contrast it with sand. I mean, wouldn't -- sand is there obviously. It's obviously absorbant. How do microbeads differ from sand?

MS. ESPOSITO:
That's a good question. Microbeads never break down, so -- but sand does. Sand is quartz and feldspar and sand is a natural product. It will fall to the bottom and that is also something where, for instance, clams can suck in sand and spit out sand because they are tiny quartz and feldspar crystals.

LEG. CILMI:
That doesn't happen with the microbeads? Do microbeads fall to the ground as well?

MS. ESPOSITO:
Yes -- well, sometimes they float in the water column and sometimes they sink to the bottom. It depends on the conditions, the water temperature, wind conditions, the depth of the water. What they do is as they accumulate these toxins, the clams -- and this is all brand new science -- the clams can spit some of them out, but a lot of them get stuck in there, you know, depending on the size of the clam and all these other things. So -- and also depending on the size of the microbead. They can be different sizes. When they're used for aesthetic purposes they actually want you to see them, so sometimes then those microbeads are bigger.

And the big debate, full disclosure, in the Senate is well, let's allow biodegradable plastics. They want to allow biodegradable plastic microbeads. And our argument is okay well, when they invent biodegradable plastics, we can look at doing a chapter amendment because the science is clear. Plastic only breaks down to smaller pieces of plastic, and it needs specific conditions to do that; heat, temperature and sunlight. In a marine environment or even in a freshwater environment, you don't have those three sets of conditions that are needed for the polymers to biodegrade. So we don't want to base a bill on futuristic technology. We need to base it on what we know and have today.
LEG. CILMI:
How close are we in the Senate do you think?

MS. ESPOSITO:
It's a raging battle right now. There's a good bill, which bans microbeads, that has about 40 -- how many cosigners? Twenty-four cosigners, it just came to me, and the bad bill, which allows for the biodegradables, has zero cosigners but one sponsor. So there is a big battle going on. We're hoping that the Long Island Senators will fight for us and ban microbeads.

LEG. CILMI:
Now, do the folks who are pushing this biodegradable bill, do they contend that biodegradable microbeads do exist?

MS. ESPOSITO:
No. It's being pushed by a company called Honeywell, which has a lot of political clout, but they are saying that they are -- they believe they will be able to invent these biodegradeable plastic beads soon.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. So there's no -- nobody thinks that they're already in existence. This is futuristic.

MS. ESPOSITO:
Correct.

LEG. CILMI:
So for all intents and purposes then, if the Senate were to pass -- if the State were to pass this legislation that allows for biodegradeable plastics in microbeads, then the immediate -- the immediate result of that would be effectively what you're asking for.

MS. ESPOSITO:
Well, except we're concerned that then there will be all sorts of claims by the industry that their plastics are biodegradeable and then who's going to prove they're not.

LEG. CILMI:
Right,

MS. ESPOSITO:
And we don't want to put the burden on the DEC or put the burden on who, the Attorney General's Office? So it should be that the beads are biodegradeable when proven biodegradeable, rather than they're put into the product and we have to prove it later. In other words, we don't want to put a band-aid on the problem and pretend we fixed it, we really want to fix it. You know, we're not into pretend legislation. If we got a problem, let's fix it and move on with our lives.

LEG. CILMI:
Thanks.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Anybody else? All right. Thank you, Adrienne.

MS. ESPOSITO:
Thank you very much for your attention to this matter.
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Next card is Michael Harris.

MR. HARRIS:
Hello, everyone. Michael Harris. I'm a resident in Suffolk County. I live in Centereach. I attend Farmingdale State College, so I've been on Long Island for quite a while. I'm concerned with an emerging issue regarding plastic microbeads. These beads are used in many facial scrubs, soaps, shampoos and toothpaste, and can range from one millimeter to a grain of sand in size. When visualizing their volume it doesn't seem like a problem until you begin to comprehend the vast amount of them being washed down our sinks and drains daily. Once in the water, plastic microbeads attract harmful chemicals such as PCBs, which are polychlorinated biphenyls, which are chemicals that are proven to cause damage to the human immune, reproductive, nervous and endocrine system.

The problem is when fish, clams, oysters and other marine life ingest the microbeads because they think they're food. Along with the microbeads are these harmful and hazardous chemicals. The toxins move up through the food chain and can accumulate in larger fish such as flounder and bass. Being on an island, we are lucky enough to get fresh fish and shellfish right off of our shores. I enjoy clams and shellfish as much as the next person here, and that's why I'm here.
I do not want toxins in my food.

I'm here to support this -- the bill 1151 to ban the sale of personal care products containing microbeads in Suffolk County. I want our County to be a leader in banning unnecessary and harmful plastic microbeads. Our fisheries and local fishing economy would only benefit from stopping this emerging threat. We are lucky enough to be surrounded by clean, healthy fish. Let's not let microbeads contaminate them. Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Thank you. That's all the cards I have. Is there anyone else that would like to speak? Please come forward. Okay. Seeing none, Legislator Hahn?

LEG. HAHN:
I have a question for Counsel. So the department has asked that I table this one cycle. When would I -- if I were to have an amendment, when -- what's the amended deadline in order to, you know, be able to continue to hold this hearing and it be properly advertised?

MR. NOLAN:
Well, you have the normal amending filing deadline would be the Monday before the General Meeting, okay? If you make any changes after that date, in order to close the public hearing, you can't make substantial -- substantial changes to the bill later than the Thursday before the General Meeting. So if there are substantial changes to the bill you want to make them Wednesday or before.

LEG. HAHN:
So if our General Meeting is the 12th, sorry I just want to make sure that -- I want to understand when I would have to -- so the sixth.

MR. NOLAN:
Is that the Wednesday?

LEG. HAHN:
Yeah.
MR. NOLAN:
Yeah, you want to make those changes by then, yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Okay. All right. So because it's a short cycle, it's just two weeks, I will, in order to take time to talk to the Health Department, I will make a motion to recess for the short cycle.

LEG. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Motion to recess by Legislator Hahn, second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1189 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law amending Article XXXV of the Suffolk County Administrative Code to establish a pool of qualified real estate brokers and consultants in the Division Of Real Property Acquisition and Management (Co. Exec.). I do not have any cards. Is there anyone that would like to speak on this matter please come forward? Not seeing any, I make a motion to close. Second by Legislator Martinez. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1248 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Charter Law to implement one-year rolling debt policy under 5-25-5 Law to mitigate budgetary shortfall (Co. Exec.). I don't have any cards on this matter. Is there anyone who would like to speak? Please come forward. Not seeing anyone, I make a motion to close. Second by Legislator Martinez. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Not Present: Legislator Spencer)

IR 1260 - Adopting Local Law No -2015, A Local Law to regulate "board up" businesses in Suffolk County (Browning). I have several cards, first being Mr. Raul Negron.

MR. NEGRON:
Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen, again. I had a brief conversation with Chief Springer trying to clear the air, trying to get to a meeting ground through a resolution on the matter that's above. It's hard for a lot of you guys to comprehend our industry because it's an industry that's really not known to the public. You really don't know the fire industry unless obviously you've been exposed to a fire, been at a fire or had a fire. You could hear all day about it, but until you actually experience and see it on scene, it's hard to comprehend it.

So getting back to my position, this is -- this is really threatening to my whole family financial -- everything. Support of my family, the whole nine yards. We have -- we have Fire Marshals, we do have people that are at these fires, like I said. We have Arson Squad Detectives. We have people -- police -- our fire police that are at these scenes that can easily, easily monitor and curtail any of the
so-called unnecessary behavior or tactics at a fire. They're there. They're there for that reason.

If they impose a bill where there's a list -- just to give you an example. They talk about a home improvement license and they talk about stress and the people being stressed out and what they're going through because they have the fire and what's going on at the time of a fire. A prime example of a board up guy with a home improvement license is real conflicting to restoration companies. When an insured has a fire, the night of a fire, and they put in a claim to State Farm at one in the morning, three in the morning, State Farm doesn't call board up companies. They don't contract home improvement guys. That's why if you see on TV SERVPRO, ServiceMaster. What they do is when you call and put in that claim, they hire and contract a restoration company.

So what happens is the restoration companies, in the middle of the night if you're on their list, they subcontract the board up guys to go and secure the houses. I built a very long list of customers that give me work for the simple fact that I don't do home improvement. They don't want to send a guy in the middle of the night and State Farm gave them a job and State Farm says I got a bad fire, you know, such and such the address, here's the homeowner's name, and they send a home improvement guy out there, SERVPRO. Now the guy's there to board up eight windows that might be a four, $500 job as a board up guy, but now the guy's got a home improvement license and he's looking at the house and he's like woo because he sees a four, $500,000 building job. And now you want to pressure people and put people in a tight spot, now the guy in the middle of the night, no matter who sent him, no matter what list is put out, now that same gentleman is imposing his will on insured, a homeowner who just had a fire. Well, you know, I could do the rebuild, I could build a house, I could do this, and before you know it, now you really -- it really starts stirring up a problem for the homeowner.

When the board up companies come in, other than the behavior that they're talking about that needs to be -- is that it?

P.O. GREGORY:
Sir, yes, your time is up. Please wrap up.

MR. NEGRON:
They said it was five minutes.

P.O. GREGORY:
No, three minutes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Can I ask him a question?

MR. NEGRON:
Sure.

P.O. GREGORY:
We do have a question. Well, I have Legislator Lindsay was the first one on the list.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Good afternoon. Thank you for coming in this afternoon. I'm in the insurance business in the private sector, so I'm very familiar with the process, very familiar with how these claims are adjudicated and who's contacted and when. Most restoration companies will subcontract work out that they bring in, so I don't -- I'm confused as to how this would make it more difficult for them to subcontract the work to you to do the board up just by the fact that you have a license.
MR. NEGRON:
Well, it's not so much because of subcontracting. The license part of it, I'm not doing home improvement. So if I don't do home improvement, I'm not there to change the condition of a house. I'm not there to do a bathroom. I'm not there to solicit any monetary contract with the person. Then that's exactly why having a license can be conflicting.

LEG. LINDSAY:
And I disagree with you there. I don't think the purpose of the license is to give you the ability to solicit. The purpose of the license is to make sure that you're a reputable firm. If there's complaints by whoever's homes that you're boarding up, they have some type of avenue that they can go to to file those complaints.

MR. NEGRON:
Okay, and I understand that and that's a good point that you're making. But the reason, like I said, I've acquired, which you're in the insurance business so I guess you would be an agent or work for an agency, then you would know that when these restoration companies are put on a job, whether it's Advanced Restoration, SERVEPRO, PCI, Joe Gentile's company, whoever it is, they'd rather not deal with somebody who's a home improvement guy. They don't want to take a chance. That's why I built such a great business.

LEG. LINDSAY:
You know, and I understand that and the fact that you have a license doesn't necessarily mean you are a home improvement guy. It just means that you're licensed.

MR. NEGRON:
Well, that's what the only license -- see, when I went and was -- and I confronted Consumer Affairs, and I was -- I've been in the business 15 years. Eight years ago I started my board up company from scratch, and I think it was about maybe my sixth or seventh month in business I was at a fire in Mastic/Shirley, and Mr. Henry Raterman at the time worked for Consumer Affairs, Henry's not with them no more, and I was cited with a ticket for not having a license. So I went to Consumer Affairs and I presented my case to Consumer Affairs, and when all was said and done, they had I think it was an eight or ten panel board meeting and they asked me exactly what I do and what I don't do. And I said why should I have a home improvement license when I'm just boarding up houses that have already been -- most of the time condemned where the people can't stay there that night. And Consumer Affairs looked at it and they said, Tony, do you do any kind of construction? I said, No. I don't do a kitchen, I don't put in a floor, I don't do anything. And Consumer Affairs came up and I have the letter. If you want me to read it I'll tell --

LEG. LINDSAY:
That's okay, because I think part of your confusion is that it's not a home improvement license that we're asking you to get --

MR. NEGRON:
I know, but --

LEG. LINDSAY:
We're just asking you to register.

MR. NEGRON:
Okay, yeah. That's fine.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Right now restoration companies will come in, they might subcontract out to carpenters or plumbers
or, you know, any artisans, that are licensed separately from the restoration company. So I'm still uncertain as to where your opposition --

**MR. NEGRON:**
What they're also introducing is trying to curtail us from going to fires and unfortunately, it's not glamorous, and in a respectful fashion a large part of how I get my work is dealing with the insured directly.

I'll give you a prime example. The other night I had a fire. I'm 52 years old. I work 100 hours a week easy. It's not easy for me but I have to push and do what I have to do to maintain my family's lifestyle and their educations and stuff. It's not easy for me at my age to get up in one in the morning, get home from a fire four in the morning, maybe hit the bed. Oh no, an hour later another fire. Sometimes I get 40 hours, 48 hours, I sleep an hour and three hours doing what I do. And a prime example is I had a fire in Dix Hills the other night. I got there, the fire started at two. Two-thirty I got there. I approached the insured. She was with -- it was Mary, her husband and her sister, Judy. I went, I gave her my card. I said, *Look, this is who I am. This is what I do.* I said, *Please, on the back of my brochure is a list of all the insurance companies,* or if not all, most of them. I said, *If your insurance company is on this list* I said, *Please call them, let them know USA Emergency board up is here.* You don't have to sign any paperwork with me, there's no penny out of pocket expense, *I bill the carrier direct.* The house got to get secured. She goes, *Okay, Tony,* not a problem. She goes along, she gets on her phone. Lo and behold she called Merchants, which is an out of state carrier. Well, nobody from Merchants picked up the phone, because a lot of these out of state carriers that don't pick up the phone, that they don't service the insured. So now there's nobody for them to talk to. So now she's stuck. So Fire Marshals or Fire Chiefs or arsonists saying, *Don't talk to them, don't do nothing with anybody, don't sign nothing with anybody.* The family is left there in dark, especially when it's ten degrees outside, stuck. So what did she do? She gathered herself, she got herself together. She came up to my van because I went in my van sat, you know, respectfully, and she said, *Tony, can I ask you something?* I said, *Sure, Mary. What's the matter?* She goes, *I can't reach my insurance company. Nobody picks up.* She goes, *How does this work?* I said, *Mary, it's very simple.* I said, *I will secure your property. You don't have to sign any paperwork with me, there's no contract. I will bill the carrier direct and they will pay me.* And one thing led to another, it just so happened, why I brought up the point is, my strength in the business is my people network. It just so happens she became even more comfortable when I asked her, when she saw I had a shirt, a wrestling t-shirt on --

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Sir, your time -- you have to wrap up. Actually, you do have one more person with a question.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**
I'll yield.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay. Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Thank you. I'm not really familiar with your business, so I did have a couple of questions.

**MR. NEGRON:**
Sure.
LEG. KRUPSKI:
How do you know where the fires are? Briefly.

MR. NEGRON:
Yeah, sure. Breaking News Network and First Responder is a company that we subscribe to, and they send us a text of any of the residential and commercial fires in Nassau and Suffolk County.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
You talked about tactics, people using different tactics when they come up to a fire scene. What are you referencing?

MR. NEGRON:
There's a lot of people, prime example, you get to a fire, if you look in my hands, you don't see too many with these, right? I have flip phones in my hands, okay, and the reason I use flip phones is because I depend on my hard work and the integrity of my business. The guys who have Galaxy phones, iPhones, there's so many ways to spoof and scam homeowners at night that if you are not honest about who you are, at least who you know and make a connection with people, it's very easy to mislead the people. They'll get on the phone, they'll get on an app right away, and before you know it they got the neighbor's numbers, they're calling out the Building Department. You know how many times I've been at a fire and the Fire Marshal's with the people and the neighbor comes out with the phone and goes, Oh my God, the Fire Marshal wants to speak to you. And I'm like, No, no, no. The Fire Marshal is right here or the Fire Marshal is in the yard. So the scams go on. They recommend themselves like there's no tomorrow.

I can have my competitor at the fire and they know that I'm strong in the industry, know I have a lot of accounts, and they know it. So what do they do? Oh, Tony is here. You know if it goes through the insurance company chances are he's going to get it. He's got a lot of contracts. He's got a lot of people. They call the neighbor. Oh, they call up the Building Department. Oh yeah, this is Bill Smith from the Building Department. I need the neighbor -- the homeowner's number.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, sir. You are technically filibustering.

(*Laughter*)

MR. NEGRON:
Well, it is what it is.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Krupski, are you done?

MR. NEGRON:
Not bad for 52 years old.

P.O. GREGORY:
No, you'd wake me up 2 o'clock in the morning after a fire, I'll tell you that. Legislator Barraga has a question for you.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Just one quick question --

MR. NEGRON:
Sure.
LEG. BARRAGA:
-- because I'm not too familiar with your industry.

MR. NEGRON:
Sure.

LEG. BARRAGA:
You keep on mentioning how you board up homes with fires.

MR. NEGRON:
Yes. Secure.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Are there enough fires in two counties to keep a company like yours and your competition in business?

MR. NEGRON:
Yeah.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Or are you boarding up foreclosures, abandoned homes. Is it strictly limited to homes that have had fires?

MR. NEGRON:
Well, since I don't do home improvement, I depend on every board up that I do because I don't do home improvement. I don't do kitchens. I don't do dormers.

LEG. BARRAGA:
I know that. But you just do fires?

MR. NEGRON:
I do. I have the contract with the Town of Islip and I just won the bid with the Town of Smithtown. So for the last year --

LEG. BARRAGA:
For home fires?

MR. NEGRON:
No, no, no.

LEG. BARRAGA:
For what?

MR. NEGRON:
Foreclosures, vacancies.

LEG. BARRAGA:
All right, because it's hard for me to believe that your business would survive just predicated on fires.

MR. NEGRON:
No, no, no, no. No.
LEG. BARRAGA:
How many people are in your industry?

MR. NEGRON:
That do exactly what I do?

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yeah.

MR. NEGRON:
We have four to the best of my knowledge in Suffolk County. I think six all together in Long Island.

LEG. BARRAGA:
How long does it take you to board up a house?

MR. NEGRON:
It depends. It depends on the size of the job. I mean, good as we are, I consider us the very best company out there, depends on the size.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Three bedroom ranch.

MR. NEGRON:
Three bedroom ranch? Every window, 12 windows, depending on the roof -- three hours, two hours.

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

MR. NEGRON:
You're welcome.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, sir.

MR. NEGRON:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Michael Cox.

MR. COX:
Hello again. I don't think I can follow Tony's act, but my concerns on this bill are its Constitutionality. When we have a bill that's --

P.O. GREGORY:
You have to speak into the mic.

MR. COX:
We have a bill that's specifically directed at one industry, and we're looking to protect the consumer. But reading the bill, I think the Legislative intent talks about numerous companies of this -- of this type. As Mr. Negron indicated, there's four in Suffolk County, there's six in Long Island all together. There's a Legislative intent regarding complaints of the behavior of these gentlemen at the fire scene.
I have been at a couple of fire scenes. I've seen it. They do compete, they do jockey, but we do have people on scene, Fire Marshal, police. We have people there who can protect the homeowner as opposed to taking these board up gentlemen away from the scene and leaving the homeowner subject to phone solicitations where nobody is watching what they're doing.

Secondly -- I lost my train of thought for a second, I apologize. On scene -- I'm sorry. I've lost my -- I was thinking about Legislator Lindsay's question to my client.

So the Legislative intent wants to protect from the scuffles, from the bad acts of these parties, but the legislation itself doesn't prohibit soliciting. All it does is ask for a registration. And my client went in 2010, the letter was provided earlier this morning. The department of -- the Department of Consumer Affairs considered this issue and considered that board up companies are not part of the home improvement industry to be licensed. It was already -- it was already done. So now we're going to go back to Consumer Affairs, tell them they were wrong, and require them in an unfunded mandate to have a technician put in place to control this law, to implement this law and implement this registration.

I think all -- when we review the intent and the requirements, the requirements are against unfair practices, unconscionable acts and those are all acts that are already criminal, that are already criminalized, a person can already be cited for. So this law doesn't necessarily balance the compelling State interest versus the restriction on free trade or the competition on free enterprise. I would ask this board, this committee, to table this -- a vote on this legislation until they can reach out and get true information from the industry and from the Fire Marshals. There's some anecdotal stuff here. And again, I also would urge that before we get into adding another cost to the Suffolk County taxpayer with an unfunded mandate that we check the financial -- the finances that are associated with this bill.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay. Mr. Cox, your time is up. But Legislator Cilmi has a question for you.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Thanks, Mr. Presiding Officer. Thanks for your testimony. So Legislator Lindsay asked the previous speaker how this would impact your business. The previous speaker was very concerned about the devastating impact that this might have on his business. I tend to be on the anti-regulatory, you know, side of the spectrum. But I still -- I haven't heard from either him or you as to why this or how this would impact your business negatively.

**MR. COX:**
The actual registration part won't. The actual licensing part won't. But this bill also looks for lists to be compiled by FRES, and the list, at least in the article that was published with regard to this legislation, would serve as a rotating list. Meaning that the members of FRES, the local fire department, somebody other than the contractor --

**LEG. CILMI:**
Okay. So it would eliminate the competitive nature of the process in your view.

**MR. COX:**
Absolutely. And a rotating list, we're going to have -- who's going to make the decision on who's on that list and how that list is presented to the homeowner?

**LEG. CILMI:**
Counsel, could you just clarify?
MR. NOLAN:
Yes. The latest version of the bill, there is going to be a list maintained that would be available to consumers, but nobody's going to be recommending anybody on a rotating basis or anything like that. It's just going to be a list of those who are registered. It may be made available to consumers. They make the call on who they want.

LEG. CILMI:
So with that understanding, do you still have an issue with this bill?

MR. COX:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. Why?

MR. COX:
With respect to the list, I have an issue with FRES putting their imprimir of good standing on any list, any company that's on their list that they hand to the homeowner.

LEG. CILMI:
Is it that you have a problem with the criteria that they may require in order to be added to that list?

MR. COX:
Well, I have a problem with the fact that at least Consumer Affairs in the financial report indicates they can't monitor it yet, and if this law goes into effect in 2015 when there's no technician to set up the licenses and do the monitoring, my client will be out of business for two or three months, until 2016 fiscal year when Consumer Affairs can set this up and get him a license. Again, he's not a home improvement person. He's a board up person.

LEG. CILMI:
I understand that.

MR. COX:
Are we going to limit the list to board up companies or are we going to allow every home improvement company to be on this list?

LEG. CILMI:
Well, can home improvement companies do board ups now?

MR. COX:
Yes, but they also don't do it because they're not willing to compete for the business. They're not getting up at 1:00 in the morning like Mr. Negron and going to a fire to compete for business.

LEG. CILMI:
So would this change that? Would this make them want to compete for that business?

MR. COX:
I don't know if it will make them want to compete or will they have to if the FRES representatives say's here's a list. I don't know how the list is numbered or who is ordered on the list, and they say call the top three people on the list. They're lying in bed and they come the next morning.
LEG. CILMI:
I mean, theoretically, and I don't know this for a fact, somebody can correct me if I'm wrong, but the way it sounds like this is going to happen is that we will advertise that there is now going to be a registration process for board up companies.

MR. COX:
Right.

LEG. CILMI:
Anybody who wishes to be added to the list of board up companies can apply to do so. There may be some sort of a fee or something associated with being on that list and, you know, that I might have a problem with, but that's a different story for the time being, and you might have a problem with that as well. I don't know what the fee is or is proposed here. And then theoretically, from what I'm hearing, that list will simply be available to consumers, and in order for you to do board up jobs in the County, you would have to be on that list. And theoretically, if you, you know, if there was a complaint, you know, at some point, once you are on the list if there was a complaint about your board up company by a consumer, that complaint could be made to Consumer Affairs and Consumer Affairs would investigate that complaint. And if there was a reason to justify that board up company's removal from the list, then that board up company would be removed from the list at that point in time. So assuming that that's the way the process will work, and I'm not seeing anybody, you know, disagree with that, then explain to me again what the issue is here.

MR. COX:
Well, I would ask what's the -- what's the necessity of having a list?

LEG. CILMI:
That's a good question.

MR. COX:
Have the companies register, have them be licensed by Consumer Affairs, let them pay their $200 annual fee, but why do we need a list? Like every other company, there's no other home improvement list, there's no other list for people that comes from the emergency service personnel and says these people are on our list of good high quality. If there's a complaint, and again, we're talking about --

LEG. CILMI:
Wouldn't you rather -- if you were, I'm sorry to interrupt. We probably have other questions and I just want to get to the heart of this. So you are fine with registering, even paying a fee if, you know, a reasonable fee, which again, I'm not sure that I'm fine with. But be that as it may, as long we don't provide a list? So wouldn't you -- if your company was registering and some other companies maybe chose not to register for some reason, wouldn't you want consumers to know that your company has registered and is an approved vendor in Suffolk County for this service?

MR. COX:
Doesn't the home -- well, the Consumer Affairs license number doesn't that do that? That's how we do it with regular home improvements.

LEG. CILMI:
Do you have a Consumer Affairs license?

MR. COX:
Do I personally?
LEG. CILMI:
No, no. In the industry is there a Consumer Affairs license that’s currently --

MR. COX:
I handed in the exhibit earlier this morning. My client applied for one in 2010 and Consumer Affairs said that industry is not a home improvement industry and they refunded his $200 application fee.

LEG. CILMI:
Right. So my point is, if it became a licensed industry of its own --

MR. COX:
Fine.

LEG. CILMI:
Wouldn't you want consumers to know that your company is duly licensed?

MR. COX:
Yes. If it became a licensed industry, but my license number would do that.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. All right. So --

MR. COX:
I would do that.

LEG. CILMI:
All right. So you would have a license number at that point.

MR. COX:
Sure.

LEG. CILMI:
And then you could provide that to the consumer and the consumer then would know that you’re licensed and they could check it out however they would check it out.

MR. COX:
And again, Legislator Cilmi, right now it looks like there’s about a half a dozen companies that do this on Long Island.

LEG. CILMI:
Right.

MR. COX:
Let’s say they all want to work in Suffolk County. The fee that's put in this bill is $200 biannual, so we have about $1,200 in income in revenue for the County.

LEG. CILMI:
It will probably cost us more to administer it.

MR. COX:
And the administration -- through 2019 is anticipated to be $290,000.
LEG. CILMI:
Right.

MR. COX:
So, now the other protection, as my client indicated, the other protection the homeowner's have is they don't get billed directly. They don't pay out of their pocket. They go through -- my client goes through the insurance company. The only document that I understand that a homeowner is required to do -- sign is an authorization that goes to the insurance company. So the insurance companies also will learn over time, as will FRES and the department, which companies are legitimate, which companies are in good standing, and they won't allow for the -- and they will also -- they can also decline the payment if the job is not done properly.

There is no immediate need to address the consumer protection avenue, and what this bill appears to intend to do is to stop the competition at the scene, but this bill doesn't address competition at the scene. It just requires that the competitors obey the rules of the Fire Marshall or the person in charge at the scene, which is already the law. All we're doing is taking my client, who probably gets, I believe there's somewhere around 400 residential fires a year in Suffolk County. He probably gets a third of those jobs because he's out hustling at 1:00 in the morning, he's up at 11:00 at night and he's going back at 4:00 a.m., and his reputation over his 15 years in the business has earned him this standing with, as he discussed with Legislator Lindsay, the insurance companies. Some -- when the homeowner calls the insurance company, the insurance companies in many cases contracts a restoration company. My client has a good relationship with many of these restoration companies and they subcontract the board up job to him. I think that was the point he was trying to make.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. So let me just say and I'll yield. I don't know that I disagree with you that there may not be a need for this. We'll debate that when we debate the bill itself. But from the perspective of the impact that it will have on board up businesses, I still don't quite get it, but I'm going to yield to my colleagues and maybe somebody else can get a better answer.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I have a question for you before we move to Legislator Trotta. So my parents had a fire at their home New Year's Eve two years ago. At six o'clock I'm getting these calls, you know, I'm watching TV, about to put the slippers on, and you know I get a call that your parents have a fire at their house. I run over there a half hour later, fire trucks, three or four trucks there, blah, blah, blah. We didn't see any of you guys. But my question is, and I was just talking to Legislator Lindsay about it. You're saying everything's fine as it is because you go there, you talk to the homeowner, you say we're not going to bill you, we're going to bill your carrier, but yet you're doing the work almost immediately, right? Or are you coming back the next morning or when is the work being done?

MR. NEGRON:
The night of.

MR. COX:
When the fire is put out and the fire department and the Fire Marshal tells my client the building is safe, please board it up, please secure the building, that's when the work gets done.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right. So when the homeowner's getting settled down, because it's a traumatic experience.
MR. COX:
Correct.

P.O. GREGORY:
You have someone tell them that we can board up your house, secure your house so that, you know, no one vandalizes your home or whatever, it's secure. You're saying we're going to bill your insurance carrier, but yet the work is done. The insurance carrier is going to verify that we're all registered and we're a reputable company, but yet the work is already done. So there's no, you know, there's no verification process. How is that handled?

MR. COX:
I think what -- my client cited the example of Merchants when there was no -- the insurance company didn't pick up at 1:00 in the morning. My sister had a fire and my client was there. Her office building burnt down two years ago. They called the insurance company. There is generally somebody there to answer, somebody there to get a claim number, somebody at the insurance to speak to to help guide the homeowner. And my client, what he does, he provides his card with a list on the back of the card is probably 30 insurance companies phone numbers and how to go make your claim. This happens either at the scene with the Fire Marshal present, with Arson Detectives present, with the police, the fire department present, or it's going to happen after everybody leaves and the homeowner starts getting besieged with phone calls from people who may already know the claim number, they already know the insurance company, who speak anonymously claiming that they're from the Building Department or they're from the Fire Marshal where there's nobody there to protect the homeowner. These people on the scene are the checks and balances to the anonymous solicitations. My client is on the scene there. He gets to speak to people, see them face to face. Some people may use high pressure tactics. Tony is very verbal. Tony also has a lot of connections. He always try to verify --

P.O. GREGORY:
But this bill, as I understand it, it's not eliminating anybody. It's saying that, you know, we're going to put your name along with a list of other reputable board up companies names on a list and provide it to the homeowner. It doesn't prevent you or anyone else from coming to the scene and soliciting the business. Is that correct?

MR. COX:
You know, again, I may have missed something in the amendment, but the original, what I saw in the article regarding this is that FRES was going to keep a list and it was going to rotate contractors on the list. I don't know if that's any longer in this bill, but that's the scary part of --

P.O. GREGORY:
That's not in the bill.

MR. COX:
Taking away the right to compete.

P.O. GREGORY:
And I agree with that.

MR. COX:
And putting in a list that is not going to stop what the complaint is about. If -- as you said, Presiding Officer, if the contractors or the board up guys can still go to the scene and compete, this bill serves no purpose. There's no reason to set up $290,000 in expenses over the next four or five years.
P.O. GREGORY:
But don't you agree that it could be helpful because you're obviously not going to make every fire. You didn't make my parents' fire, no one showed up. So it could be useful to that homeowner, here's a list, call someone, right? You're providing information.

MR. COX:
Well, the homeowner is going to call their insurance company and the insurance company is going to put them in -- going to hire -- could -- will refer them to somebody. I mean, I assume your parents' house got boarded up at some point?

P.O. GREGORY:
Yup.

MR. COX:
Through the insurance company. I don't know, maybe it was Mr. Negron's company that ended up doing it. I don't know how it happened. But there's somebody there to -- the insurance company is the check on the board up people, and the board up people who are on the scene are the check on the anonymous phone solicitors. And the FRES and the Fire Marshal's Office is there to protect the entire scene. So -- but this bill doesn't say the board up men, gentlemen, or companies cannot come to the scene. So I don't know what the purpose of this bill is. If you want to require registration and licensing? No problem. But my client's already tried to do that with Consumer Affairs and they said no.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.

MR. COX:
Unless this legislation is now directing Consumer Affairs to set up a new category of licenses, that's fine, we don't have a problem with that.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Legislator Trotta, you had a question?

LEG. TROTTA:
I just want to know how much it was, how much the permit was?

MR. COX:
The permit I believe was $200 biannually.

LEG. TROTTA:
One-hundred dollars a year.

MR. COX:
Well, I read the -- yes $100 a year.

LEG. TROTTA:
Is there any kind of insurance that you need?

MR. COX:
There's insurance, I guess it requires an insurance --

LEG. TROTTA:
A bond or something like that?
MR. COX:
It could require a bond if necessary. But I'm not here to oppose that part of it. All I'm saying is my client's already gone there for the licensing. He's insured, he's got his -- and Consumer Affairs has already said no.

LEG. TROTTA:
So you're just against the list.

MR. COX:
I'm against the list. I'm against anybody -- the restriction of competition. You know, without -- where's the -- where's the necessity for the -- for this body to control the competition in this industry.

LEG. TROTTA:
Okay. Thanks. I just wanted to know the price.

MR. COX:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Stern. Steve?

LEG. STERN:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for being here. So I was listening to the concern before, and before I could see all right, a situation where there's competition at the site. And the concern, which you had raised initially, appears not to be a concern in the legislation. You have a client, and I'm sure that there are others that do an outstanding job in providing the service and getting up in middle of the night several times and competing and winning the business, which is admirable.

So there's this list. Before I could see where if this was -- if it was onerous to be on the list, then perhaps that stifles competition. But them I'm thinking, is it -- is it the opposite. Is the concern here that if a list is distributed with "X" amount of vendors that aren't at the site, is the potential complaint there that you are then stifling competition because you have a -- you have someone who is there, but FRES or a representative is then giving a list of other vendors and someone might be free then to choose off of that list?

In other words, is there more information, is this one of the concerns, that there's more information being given out at the site than there are -- with information about potential vendors than there are potential vendors there at the scene?

MR. COX:
You know, I can see that -- I can see that part of it, but it's not about the information, because, you know, we all live in Long Island. We all know, everybody knows a contractor or has a friend or a cousin who's a contractor, so every home improvement guy can do this. Every home improvement company can do -- can board up a window. So where is my client's competitive advantage is that he's willing to get up in the morning and go to the scene and do it legitimately. And, you know, again, this isn't just my client going to an old lady and trying to sell her or tell her her chimney's going to explode and sells her chimney products or asphalt. You know, where the home improvement license came into effect in the first place. Theirs is an insurance that my client has to deal with. He calls -- he gets the homeowner to speak to their insurance company. He shows them where to go. He's there.
Now, you asked about this list. So FRES gives out a list and there are four companies that really do this in Suffolk, but let's say this list is 30 companies deep, because every home improvement guy wants to get on the list. Why are they giving the imprimir of, you know, standing in an industry they don't generally do. And they're really only on that list, as my client indicated, to sell the reconstruction job, not to do the board up. This is an emergency service that's done to protect the homeowner, to protect the community, from having a structure that's unsafe and unsound where people can walk into it and get hurt. That's what this is about.

**LEG. STERN:**
Not being familiar with how it works at the scene, help me here. If your client representing his business is there at the scene, but I'm given a list of 12 other vendors, this is the kind of thing, as you had said, it happens quickly.

**MR. COX:**
Right.

**LEG. STERN:**
So if I have a list with 12 vendors, with 25 vendors, but your client is the one at the scene, does that not in and of itself give him the competitive advantage regardless of how many names are on that list?

**MR. COX:**
I don't know. You know, there's volunteer firemen, there's friends, there's neighbors, there's people who come out of the woodwork who aren't necessarily going to be registered or on that list or subject to the complaints, who are all looking to get something out of this tragedy. So my client is there, he's open, he's seen, he's known by every one of the Fire Marshals, he is known by every one of the police chiefs -- fire department chiefs. But there are competing interests for this dollar that may not -- will not be covered under this bill. And the best way to do this is allow the people at the scene to come who are willing to get up and work and willing to say here I am, this is what I do.

I know this is -- and to -- from my client's perspective, he makes connections with people. He uses his background of 20 years of being in the high school wrestling community and there's always some connection that he makes where he can have the homeowner call a friend a cousin, a neighbor, who knows him very well because he's outspoken and everybody knows him. We all call him Uncle Tony in the wrestling world, and that's how I met Uncle Tony, through high school wrestling with my son. Everybody knows him and they all can vouch for him. Whereas you're given a name on a card by the fire chief. You're going to say oh, the fire chief -- you know, does Tony's name -- company go first because he's the number one provider of board ups in Suffolk County, or does he get stuck down at the bottom because his company name starts with the letter U? You know, who is going to direct how this list is done? Are we're going to have 50 companies on a list starting with A? People are going go to the first five. Or are they going to be rated somehow? There's problems with somebody else giving out a list when these people don't want to get out of bed and work, and their ulterior motive is to get the construction job.

**LEG. STERN:**
Does at least part of what you said go to Legislator Cilmi's point, though, if some of the angles of competition are those that might be the friend from down the street or someone who kind of dabbles, someone who's doing it as a hobby who, I would presume by definition, are not on that list because they haven't met certification standards, does not then Tony have the advantage because he is certified, he is on that list, he is licensed and that's something that can be presented at the scene.
MR. COX:
Thank you, no. The answer to your question is no because home improvement -- people with home improvement contracts licenses are exempt from registration under this list, are exempt from this registration requirement and they are automatically on the list. So anybody with a home improvement license, a plumber, an electrician, anybody who -- a roofer -- anybody who has a home -- a landscaper, you know, could be on that list. That doesn't mean they know what they're doing with the board ups, but they're there to get the reconstruction job.

LEG. STERN:
Thank you.

MR. COX:
Thank you.

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

LEG. CILMI:
One question. Just one more quick question and then just to reiterate. So you're okay with this except for the list. You're okay with the registration but you're not okay with the list. I just want to be clear.

MR. COX:
I am not okay with the list. I'm okay with the registration. There are other provisions of this bill that I'm not okay with, especially the cost associated with implementing the bill.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. Thank you.

MR. COX:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Jay Egan.

MR. EGAN:
Good afternoon. I'm here representing the Suffolk County Fire Districts, Suffolk County Chiefs and the Suffolk County FRES Commission, Fire Rescue and Emergency Service Commission, which is made up of all of the volunteer agencies and organizations within this County. I appreciate someone getting up at 52 at 1:00 in the morning and getting paid for it. I'm 62 and get up at 1:00 in the morning and fight fires for nothing, don't get paid for it.

This bill was brought up at the FRES Commission is where it first began. It began because of fighting on front lawns, harassing individuals who's houses were burning. Not blaming the individuals here, but we have multiple agencies that show up, dressed like they are emergency responders, and we spoke to Consumer Affairs, they said that they were calling themselves emergency response companies. When I don't see no one next to me on a fire line, they're not emergency response. That's my opinion.

The issue is that we would like to see that this bill goes into effect to just register. Fire Rescue and Emergency Services Fire Marshals do not come on the majority of fires within this County. The individual town Fire Marshals are, and the only time you're really going to see a County Fire Marshal or a representative of FRES, is if it's a County building. And if that's the case, I think that the
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County would like to know that the people boarding up their buildings are definitely registered and understand the policies and procedures.

We also look to see that there's going to be some level of professionalism such as meeting a HUD standard when you board up a building. Not just going up, screwing boards into the side of a house and hoping for the best.

We are concerned also about the safety of our members within the fire department, that those individuals, their reputation, stays at stake. That we can keep people behind a fire line. They can come, because they're coming no matter what. They come at that instance. Two months ago in a snowstorm I had a truck, and it happened to be the individual who is here today, whose truck blocked the road because it was narrowed down. I had a mutually aid company from a neighboring fire department could not get down the block. That's an issue to me.

If we can set up a fire line, establish the fire line, which we do, and keep all the individuals, I don't care if there's ten of them that come, after we get the scene secure and they are registered and can do the best for the taxpayers in my fire district, then the job is done and we can proceed forward. They can make money as they wish. Our taxpayers need to be safe and the reputation of all my fire service -- firemen can be upheld. We've had instances where individuals have come in after the fact and stuff was missing out of people's houses. Well, who's the first person they are going to blame? The people who were in the fire. Knowing some of the things that were taken, we found out later from P.D., had been pawned -- had been pawned at a neighboring shop. Wasn't by one of our firemen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Jay, your time's up, but I have a question for you.

MR. EGAN:
Sure.

P.O. GREGORY:
Wouldn't it be great if you hand out the list with sparklers? No, I'm only kidding.

(*Laughter*)

Legislator Browning has a question. You know I had to, Jay.

MR. EGAN:
Of course. But that's -- someone said it fizzled out, so we're good.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Browning has a question for you.

LEG. BROWNING:
Actually, I was just going to try and give him some more time, because I attend all the FRES meetings and this is an issue that came up with all of them. I think you -- there was the one gentleman from the ambulance company, if you could talk about his experience.

MR. EGAN:
This bill started out in the Town of Huntington, I mean this is where the issue came up. It came up from the Town of Huntington's Chief Council, then went to Babylon Town Chiefs Council, Brookhaven Town Chiefs Council, Southold has brought it up. Some of the issues we also find is that even though they're going to be licensed, once you get to the East End, that license doesn't mean
anything, because a lot of the East End towns do not abide by the licensing of the Consumer Affairs within the County. They go by strictly their township licenses. I can't speak for them completely, but they've also had the same issues out there where there has been fighting on front lawns. You know, I've had firemen I know that I've seen have broken fights up between two people as they're rolling on the front lawn, whether they are wrestling or swinging duke to duke. There's been issues on front lawns.

You know, it's unprofessional, and I think that there's -- the licensing or even the registering procedure put some sort of professional title to the individuals who are coming to the fire scenes. We as volunteers are unpaid professionals, but we are professional in what we do. I think those individuals, as good as their companies may be, need to keep that level of professionalism across the board, so that the person who has already lost their house, lost most of their belongings, can have the best possible outcome of an unfavorable situation that they were put in place.

LEG. BROWNING:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
So, Jay, I have a -- and to be honest, I haven't read the bill, but so you're not implying that FRES is going to apply any type of standard, are you, to who gets -- I mean, obviously someone can walk it, they get licensed by --

MR. EGAN:
We can probably extend the details of how deeply FRES can get with this bill. But from our understanding, we met with the Fire Marshals Association of Suffolk County, and they're supporting the bill. They had some changes and the changes were that the local townships should not and would not be able to nor would they like to see any type of rotating basis. They don't want to be the person saying hey, you should use XYZ Company. But they want to know that they can call somewhere and any of the chiefs or the Fire Marshals can call Fire Rescue and Emergency Services Dispatcher and say is XYZ Company on your list as being a registered company? Yes, they are, or no, they're not, and it's that simple. And that's all I believe, at least we know who they are and what they're doing.

P.O. GREGORY:
And as a first responder it would be helpful to you, right, or, you know, any of the first responders if you're there and an incident occurred as you mentioned that hey, look, this guy or this company is registered with you guys, he's interfering with our access to a scene. You make that complaint or whatever to the -- I guess Consumer Affairs.

MR. EGAN:
At least there's some follow-up, there's some continuity on what we expect from people. And there will also be some consequences should people or companies not do the right thing on somebody else's property.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right. Thank you. Anyone else? All right. Thank you, Jay. All right. Last card I have is Peter Cincotta.

MR. CINCOTTA:
Good afternoon, all. My name is Peter Cincotta. I am the President of the Suffolk County Volunteer Firemens Association, 33-year member of the five service. On a personal note, I've been dealing with this issue since I joined the fire service in 1982. I have answered the phone in people's homes while we have still had an active incident happening and people claiming they were the Fire Chief,
they were the insurance carrier, they were the Fire Marshal. And I remember telling a few of them that's interesting, because those three people happen to be standing right behind me. Would you like to speak to one of them? And they of course hang up. So this is not a new issue. And I'm glad that it's seen maybe the light of day and some legislation and some good discussion.

I have seen the arguments. I have seen the blocked roads. I have seen the in-cooperation of the companies that do come to our scenes however they find themselves there. I also get up at two a.m. and I've been doing it for 33 years and that's fine. I love what I do, and I love being a volunteer fireman. I don't like the reputation, though, when other people, necessary people, have a job to do and they come across our fire line, they trample with possible evidence, and they interfere with the good work that the Fire Marshal has to do, the Arson Investigator has to do, because if we're not walking on the scene at that point, they've asked us to back up and take a little different approach, well, so should all of these people have to respect what they have to do. And it is an active investigation and if the Arson Squad is called, it could very well be a criminal investigation that needs the full attention and what they do and how they accomplish what they do. That's the concern we have.

The list, I read the bill. I saw it as just what Jay said. If you're on the list and somebody comes to a scene, and we think they're forgazi, well, we can make a phone call and find out no, they're registered, they're okay. That's fine. If a homeowner is there and it's an hour-and-a-half later and they haven't had someone contact them legitimately, board up company or insurance company or otherwise, on the same token, we do have now at least somewhere to start where we're going to give them a legitimate name and a legitimate number. And if I was doing that business I would want to be that legitimate name, that legitimate number. I don't think anybody else is going to really get up and want to do what they do, and I've seen it firsthand, a couple of good friends of mine have lost their homes. I thank you for your time. I thank you for all you do. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Thank you. Anyone? Okay. That's all the cards I have. Anyone else like to speak? Please come forward. Okay. All right. No one's come forward. Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:
Okay. I make a motion to close.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Motion to close by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Amended to 18)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. IR 1273 - Requesting legislative approval of a contract with Hudson River Healthcare, Inc. (HRHCare) for the operation of the Brentwood Family Health Center (Co. Exec.). I don't have any cards on this matter. Is there anyone that would like to speak on it, please come forward. Okay. Seeing none, I make a motion to close by Legislator Martinez. I'll second. Legislator D'Amaro is going to recuse. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Recusal - Legislator D'Amaro)
General Meeting - April 28, 2015

P.O. GREGORY:  
Okay. Setting the date for the following Public Hearings, May 12th, 2015, 2:30 p.m., Rose Caracappa Auditorium, Hauppauge, New York. IR 1030 - A Charter Law to strengthen lobbyist registration and reporting requirement; IR 1118 - A Local Law amending Chapter 563 of the Suffolk County Code to modify the laws relating to home furnishings and dealers in secondhand articles; and the 2015-2016 Suffolk County Community College Budget. I make a motion.

LEG. CILMI:  
Second.

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

MR. LAUBE:  
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:  

LEG. HAHN:  
(Raised Hand.)

P.O. GREGORY:  
Motion by Legislator Hahn.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Second by Legislator Schneiderman. Anybody on the question?  All in favor?  Opposed?  Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:  
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Okay. IR 1270 - Amending the Adopted 2015 Operating Budget to transfer funds from Fund 477 Water Quality Protection, amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds in connection with the Quality Assurance Project Plan for Supplemental Data Collection necessary to re-open shellfish beds in the Peconic Estuary (8710.146)(Co. Exec.).

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Motion by Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
Second.
P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Krupski. Anyone on the question?

LEG. CILMI:
This is 2070 now?

P.O. GREGORY:
1270.

LEG. CILMI:
1270, rather. Yeah.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
So what's the -- could somebody differentiate between 1269 and 1270?

MR. CASTELLI:
Frank Castelli, Economic Development and Planning. 1269 is for funding for a study to determine the feasibility of initiating a kelp aquaculture industry in Suffolk County, and that's for a project that's going to be done in conjunction with Cornell Cooperative Extension. They're going to look into the feasibility of establishing a kelp industry, which would be -- it's kind of exciting. There would be a lot of benefits of -- potential benefits of kelp in terms of economic development and aquaculture, but also for environmental purposes due to the fact that kelp can reduce nitrogen and other nutrients.

LEG. CILMI:
So we're going to spend $75,000 of our 477 money to determine whether or not we can effectively develop a kelp aquaculture program?

MR. CASTELLI:
Yes, yes. That's the intention of the funding, to determine the --

LEG. CILMI:
That was 1269?

MR. CASTELLI:
That was 1269, yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. And then 1270?

MR. CASTELLI:
1270 is for -- this is a Health Services project in conjunction with the Peconic Estuary Protection Committee, which is an intermunicipal arrangement between the Peconic Estuary and several municipalities. It is for a -- to hire a contractor to develop a quality assurance -- a quality assurance plan, project plan, to come up with a way to determine what really -- they would be coming up with a plan on how to collect water quality data in the way that would be acceptable to the regulatory agencies, specifically DEC.
LEG. CILMI:
Okay. So they're going to plan or they're going to study how to develop a plan to study. So we're going to spend $75,000 to develop a plan to come to a conclusion as to how we can appropriately study water quality data.

MR. CASTELLI:
Yeah. Walter?

MS. LANSDALE:
Walt Dawydiak from the Health Department is here to answer additional information.

LEG. CILMI:
Thank you, Sarah. And thank you, Walter.

MR. Dawydiak:
Thank you, Legislator Cilmi. This project is a priority of the Peconic Estuary Program, as well as a newly formed Protection Committee, which was established by Intermunicipal Agreement. It involves the State, the County, all the towns and villages of the five East End towns. And this was their single top priority. It's addressed going into the -- coming out of the box. This is something that is really decades overdue.

LEG. CILMI:
Wait. What's the priority exactly?

MR. Dawydiak:
The priority is to be able to collect, use and leverage data among all different levels of government to a beneficial purpose.

LEG. CILMI:
Is the priority to be able to collect or is the -- and I'm sorry to nitpick here with you, but is the priority to be able to collect or is the priority to collect?

MR. Dawydiak:
It's actually both. What this particular project does is establish a protocol, and on every level of government, whether it's National Sanitation Foundation for DEC shellfishing or in the Health Department it's an EPA Quality Assurance Plan, everybody's got a written protocol for how they collect, analyze, report data. These things don't line up so the data is often not usable from one agency to another.

LEG. CILMI:
Can't we just get everybody together and say okay, what's the best way we can report this data?

MR. Dawydiak:
We have done that on an ad hoc basis, but to actually develop a protocol with all the different methods and approaches is a pretty formidable task, which is several weeks if not months of work, which is why this is a consultant budget.

LEG. CILMI:
It's absurd that we're going to spend $75,000 to do something that a few people around a table could do in probably 20 minutes. Seventy-five thousand dollars. Really?

MR. Dawydiak:
I respectfully disagree with the 20-minute characterization.
LEG. CILMI:
Sorry, I take the 20 minutes back. Maybe a few hours.

MR. DAWYDIAK:
Everything from materials to methods, hold time, preservation, sanitation, chain of custody, reviewing, reporting data management, these things are all different among all the different accredited methods, and not to say that one is right or wrong. But, for example, that school teacher that was here, the PhD from the Connetquot School District this morning, they're going to be using the same sums that we in the Health Department use and that data is going to be invaluable for us. We just want to make sure that it's written up, collected, supervised and overseen in an accredited way that we can pull into our databases and used for our purposes. That doesn't currently exist, and as a result, a lot of shellfish beds are closed and a lot of storm water and other projects are not done as well as they can and should be.

LEG. CILMI:
But, Walter, we form Task Forces in this Legislature to accomplish similar tasks all the time. Those Task Forces sometimes have maybe a couple of thousand dollar budget to take care of paperwork and stenographers, etcetera. They don't cost $75,000. If it's really that important to develop a uniform criteria for collection and presentation of data, and if you guys can't do it on your own, then we'll form a Task Force to do it and we'll ask people to do it for free. But to spend $75,000 of 477 money on that doesn't make any sense at all. I'm sorry. I know that's a statement not really a question. I'll yield, thanks.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you. So I understand the importance of the having a uniform protocol for water sampling. What's the role of the Peconic Estuary Program, IMA, will have in this, and how will it help them target -- also target which drainage to do and to get, you know, the best bang out of your money as far as spending money in the future to clean up, you know, improve water quality?

MR. DAWYDIAK:
Again, the Peconic IMA is a group of governments from village to town to County to State. They are formative in nature. They're just finalizing their bylaws. There have been some ad hoc meetings and discussions and again, this bubbled out as a top priority. This involves collection of information at the town, village, academic institution, school, volunteer mode. It can be used by the County and the State for helping to identify priority areas. A lot of storm water work has been done already that may warrant reopening shellfish beds and they're not reopened only because nobody's been looking, and that alone is a huge economic and social benefit that could immediately be realized, but it's a lot deeper than that. It's really a good government project and this is something I wish we had the resources in-house to be able to do. It's not a trivial undertaking. It is a formidable task that cuts across science, technology, management and data that we believe -- the Peconic Estuary Program believe they needed an independent third party consultant to help shepherd through.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you for explaining that.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Anyone else? Okay. That's it. All right. So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
MR. RICHBERG:
Fourteen. (Opposed: Legislators Trotta, Kennedy, Cilmi and McCaffrey)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. **IR 1274 - Appointing Robert Carpenter as a member of the Suffolk County Soil and Water Conservation District (Krupski).**

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So moved.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Krupski.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Second.

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

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. We have a request to take **Procedural Motion No. 8** out of order, **Setting land acquisition priorities in accordance with “AAA Program” requirements (2015 - PHASE I).** It's in the manila folder. Motion by Legislator Krupski, seconded by Legislator Schneiderman. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? To take out of order.

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. The resolution is before us. Same motion, same -- well, motion by Legislator Krupski. Second by Legislator Anker. Anybody on the question? Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
The request was to take it out of order just to recognize that there is County staff here that is waiting for this, instead of having them wait until the end of the meeting.

LEG. TROTTA:
What exactly is this?

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Anyone? Everyone know where we are? Procedural Motion No. 8, it's the acquisition.

LEG. TROTTA:
What is it?

P.O. GREGORY:
It's in the manila folder.

LEG. CILMI:
I think Legislator Trotta is looking for an explanation.
LEG. TROTTA:
Yeah.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.

MR. NOLAN:
This is the resolution that the EPA Committee puts before you. It's part of that new AAA acquisition process where they screen multiple properties, try to match it up with the appraisals and recommend to the full body properties that the County will make offers on. If we get the accepted offers then a resolution will come back for those individual acquisitions.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay? Any other questions? Okay. All right. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

LEG. ANKER,
Tim, co-sponsor.

P.O. GREGORY:

LEG. TROTTA:
Motion to approve.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Trotta.

LEG. CILMI:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Cilmi. Anybody on the question? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. ANKER:
Abstain.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Abstention: Legislator Anker)

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

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1106-15 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law to amend Chapter 563-49, Article V of the Suffolk County Code Commonly known as “Dealers in Secondhand Articles” (County Executive).
LEG. HAHN:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. CILMI:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Cilmi, was that?

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Anybody on the question, on the motion?

LEG. TROTTA:
Just --

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
No, I'm good.

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

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1107-15 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law to amend Chapter 563 Article IV of the Suffolk County Code Commonly known as “Precious Metal and Gem Exchanges” (County Executive). Do I have a motion?

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. I'll second. Anybody on the question? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1255-15 - Amending Resolution No. 955-2014, to expand the membership of the 401(A) Terminal Pay Plan Board (County Executive).

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. I’ll second. Anyone on the question? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

**Health**

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1206-15 - Accepting and appropriating 50% Federal grant funds from the United States Environmental Protection Agency to the Department of Health Services, Division of Environmental Quality for the Peconic Estuary Program (County Executive).

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. CILMI:
On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
I’ll second. On the motion, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
I’m sorry, if I could ask, through the Chair, for somebody to come up and just kind of talk to us about this resolution as well as, I believe -- no. Yeah, this resolution just, again, in the context of the other resolutions that we’ve now passed.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.

LEG. CILMI:
Whoever wants to. This is I think --

MS. LOLIS:
This is 1255?

MR. NOLAN:
No.
LEG. CILMI:
No, this is 1206.

MS. LOLIS:
That's what I thought. Wrong person.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Walter, I think.

LEG. CILMI:
It's accepting, I think, $353,000 or something like that, which is a 50%, which I guess means we have to spend another $350,000.

MR. DAWYDIAK:
Yes, Legislator Cilmi. Walter Dawydiak again. This is an annual grant. The total grant amount has been averaging $600,000 a year for the last several years, about 100-to-$150,000 of it goes directly to DEC and the rest, somewhere in the neighborhood of 400,000, comes to Suffolk County. This has been ongoing since 1993 and Suffolk County does provide a 50/50 match; so you're correct, the match for this would be put up by Suffolk County.

LEG. CILMI:
And this is our continuing study, I guess, of the Peconic Estuary; in what regard?

MR. DAWYDIAK:
Peconic Estuary --

LEG. CILMI:
In nitrogen and other types of --

MR. DAWYDIAK:
Peconic Estuary Program was set up with several different modules, brown tide is what actually started it. Brown tide is really a south shied side issue more so than a Peconic issue now, although the Peconic has other algal blooms like sea polly and other red tides.

LEG. CILMI:
Uh-huh.

MR. DAWYDIAK:
Also, pathogens, storm water, habitat living resource, toxics, education and outreach; it's a whole panoply of management issues that are addressed and that are continually being updated. Currently, the Peconic Estuary Program's top priority aligns with the Suffolk County Reclaim Our Waters Initiative, and the major focus right now is on nitrogen from septic tanks, fertilizers, other sources.

LEG. CILMI:
And so we've been studying this for some time, we've spent X amount of money doing so. Are we actually taking action based on our ongoing study?

MR. DAWYDIAK:
There's been a whole host of action, tens of millions of dollars of implementation action. The big push through the 80's and 90s was upgrading the point sources, the wastewater treatment plants.
MR. DAWYDIAK:
It really was by virtue of the work done in the Peconics that all the sewerage treatment plants were upgraded out to tertiary, in cooperation with the DEC, EPA and other stakeholders. Since then there's been a whole host of habitat restoration projects and storm water projects, those have been the two most common projects. The intermunicipal agreement is a recent way that we're going to leverage further the local support and buy into this and the ideas that everybody from the Feds, the State, the County, down to the Town and Village, does their share for the resource.

LEG. CILMI:
And is it your view that continuing study here is necessary because conditions always change and it allows us to react accordingly to those changes?

MR. DAWYDIAK:
I don't really consider this a study, this is actually a management plan.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay, so this is actual work.

MR. DAWYDIAK:
The comprehensive plan was last issued circa 2001 and there's an update process which is going on right now for pieces of it. The Harmful Algalbloom Action Plan is going to update the brown tide piece to make it more relevant. We're in the process of overhauling nitrogen. But it's a constant effort to leverage the planning with actual actions, absolutely.

LEG. CILMI:
And so you would expect this just to continue on for as long a period as we can, you know, afford. And I'm sure some would argue, and I might argue even, that we can't afford not to do it, but you would expect this to continue on for years to come.

MR. DAWYDIAK:
It's been part of the 28 National Estuary Program since 1993, but I believe the Federal expectation is that the partnership would continue indefinitely, so long as authorized by the Federal Government which right now is a definite.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. Thanks, Walt.

MR. DAWYDIAK:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right, thank you. Anyone else? Okay. All right, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eleven.
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, **IR 1216-15 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with renovations at County owned Health Centers (CP 4086)(County Executive).**

LEG. LINDSAY:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Lindsay. Second by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. D'AMARO:
On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
On the motion, Legislator --

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

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yes, I went -- I actually went back and I read this after the committee meeting. The contract says within 90-days of these contracts being signed, these renovations can be done, that we're responsible for paying. And these -- we've owned these places, one is a year and one is six months. So if someone from the County Executive's Office can explain why we're paying this, when I guess you sent me the contracts and in it, it said -- the first line says within the first 90-days we're responsible for this.

MS. CULP:
Hi. How are you? Jen Culp from the Health Department. I believe a contract states within 90-days we needed to have identification of proposed repairs for the health centers.

LEG. TROTTA:
Do you have that with you?

MS. CULP:
I have it for Tri-Community, I have not seen it for Shirley. I can't speak to how -- if that report came over. I did see it for Tri-Community and they've been speaking to DPW, working out permits for the work that has to be done.

LEG. TROTTA:
So is there someone here from the County Attorney's Office who has -- I mean, the contracts are here somewhere, hold on.
LEG. CILMI:
Gail's coming up, Legal.

MS. LOLIS:
I don't have the agreement.

LEG. TROTTA:
You know, we're supposed to be saving money and here we are paying, you know, for renovations on building where clearly I think, when we all discussed this, they were supposed to pay for the renovations.

MS. CULP:
Well, keep in mind, these renovations are specific only to changes that need to be made in order to have compliance with Article 28.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yeah, but --

MS. CULP:
Article 28 governs, you know, the health centers. So as a new operator, there are new regulations, new codes that have to be upheld. Some things we may have been grandfathered in, but as a new operator, there are things that have to come up.

LEG. TROTTA:
The contracts say within 90-days, they have to be identified or told about or completed or whatever that -- I forgot the verbiage. And, you know, when I read it, it was like, Well, what are we doing the see ya later for? It's past the 90-days.

MS. CULP:
We're just appropriating the funds now. So the reports came over within the 90-days and there have been discussions with our general operations, with our DPW about which changes we --

LEG. TROTTA:
Do we have any documentation of that?

MS. CULP:
Yeah. I mean, we have -- I don't have it with me. I have the -- there's an Engineer's Report, at least for Tri-Community.

MS. LOLIS:
If you want to pass over it, Gil Anderson is supposed to be here.

LEG. TROTTA:
Okay.

MS. LOLIS:
So he might be able to answer some of these questions.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. You want to pass over it? Okay. All right, we'll skip over it for now.

IR 1250-15 - To appoint member to the Food Policy Council of Suffolk County (Janet Sklar) (Hahn). Motion by Legislator Hahn.
General Meeting - April 28, 2015

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
(Raised hand).

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

MR. LAUBE:  
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Okay, Parks & Recreations:

IR 1125-15 - Establishing a Parks Passport Program for Children in Suffolk County (Hahn).

LEG. HAHN:  
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Motion by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:  

LEG. CILMI:  
Opposed.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
Opposed.

MR. LAUBE:  
Fifteen.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Okay. 1190-15 - Authorizing use of Smith Point County Park property by Mastic Beach Fire Department, Inc. For Public Safety Services fund drive (Browning).

LEG. BROWNING:  
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Motion by Legislator Browning.

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor?  Opposed?  Abstentions?
MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1191-15 - Authorizing use of Smith Point County Park property by Mastic Beach Ambulance Company for “Help Us Save You Program” (Browning). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
1199-15 - Appointing Carmella Masem as a member of the Suffolk County North Fork Preserve County Park Advisory Committee (Krupski).

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So moved.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Krupski. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1215-15 - Authorizing use of Blydenburgh County Park and showmobile by the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation for its Great Strides Walkathon (County Executive). Motion by Legislator Kennedy. Second? I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1264-15 - Authorizing use of Cupsogue Beach County Park by the Moriches Paquatuck Squaws, Inc. For its Inlet Ride fundraiser (County Executive). Motion by Legislator Browning. Second by Legislator Schneiderman. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

Public Safety

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1175-15 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law to protect privacy in Suffolk County (Muratore).

LEG. BROWNING:
Tim, cosponsor on 1264.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Muratore.
D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
On the motion?

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Muratore? I'm sorry, you said motion?

LEG. HAHN:
We were chatting, I was distracting him.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Motion by Legislator Muratore. Do we have a second?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
I'll second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Krupski.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion to table by Legislator Schneiderman. Do we have a second?

LEG. CALARCO:
Second.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Actually, I'm going to amend my motion to a motion to commit to Parks. This has not been through the Parks Committee, it's essentially Park policy, it hasn't been reviewed by the Commissioner nor the Park Trustees, nor the committee. If we're going to make a policy for the parks, I think at the least it should go through those bodies.

LEG. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Calarco. Okay, on the motion?

LEG. MURATORE:
What motion are we voting on?

LEG. SPENCER:
Your drone bill.

P.O. GREGORY:
It's your drone bill. The motion to commit goes first, right?

MR. NOLAN:
Yeah, but we're not voting. We're going to have some debate, right?

P.O. GREGORY:
Yeah. I said, On the motion, he said, Which motion are we voting on first?
MR. NOLAN:
Right. Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, anyone? Legislator Spencer.

LEG. SPENCER:
I'll let Tom go first.

LEG. MURATORE:
Why are we going to Parks with this; can you explain that to me?

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah, it's a sweeping policy. It's a straight prohibition that you're suggesting.

LEG. MURATORE:
There's no prohibition here.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
You're not allowed to use aerial drones in County Parks.

LEG. MURATORE:
No, it's not -- did you read the bill, Jay?

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah, you have to get a permit or permission.

LEG. MURATORE:
No. Did you read the bill?

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
It's with a camera.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
With a camera, yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
With the camera. Now, I guess you must be one of those, what do they call them; you're an enthusiast for flying cameras.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
They are often used for aerial photography and you don't want to be flying over people's houses. The places where people fly them are in the parklands because that's where you have your beautiful ponds and lakes and streams and things that you'd want to take aerial pictures of. Now, I could see a policy that prohibits them in beach areas, you know, crowded areas for public safety reasons, and that's what other areas are, you know, looking at in terms of policy. But this is a policy, essentially a Parks policy that hasn't been reviewed by the Park Trustees and they're there for this purpose. It hasn't been reviewed by the Parks Commission -- Commissioner, and it hasn't been reviewed by the Parks Committee. All I'm asking is for those bodies to weigh in and then we can have an informed
discussion about whether this policy, as you proposed it, is the best way to approach the issue.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Jay, this was --

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

The industry hasn't been heard on this at all.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

This was laid on the table in March.

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

Have you heard from any user groups who use these?

**LEG. MURATORE:**

I have. I met with one in the back here, he had no problem with it, so. I convinced him that it wasn't a bad bill.

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

Well, I don't think it's a good bill. I think at the very least --

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Okay. So you can vote no on it then.

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

At the very least, the Parks Committee should have a look at this, as well as the Parks Commissioner.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Well, what about other County facilities. It's not only Parks. Then we have to get DPW to look at it, we've got to get the Sheriff to look at it, the Police Department to look at it, the Health Department to look at it. It's a simple -- you know me, I don't put in exotic stuff. It's a simple little bill.

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

It's all County property, and --

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Yeah, so let's get all County departments in.

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

There's 50,000 acres of County-owned parkland; that's a lot of property.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Didn't we close the public hearings on it?

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

And how many people commented on it?

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Nobody.
D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Nobody. Okay, so maybe we didn't do a good enough job of reaching out to the public. I'm asking for one cycle so we can send this to Parks and get some information from the Parks Commissioner.

LEG. MURATORE:
You know, Jay, when you say we, you point a finger, three fingers point back. Maybe you didn't do a good job, but I thought I did a good job in getting the information out to people to come and say something.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I don't think most people know about this, and it's a straight prohibition. You can get a permit but --

LEG. MURATORE:
It's not a prohibition, Jay.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
You know, is there a process for getting a permit? You know, I'll just tell you a story, Tom.

LEG. MURATORE:
I'm not going to engage you.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Let me just --

LEG. MURATORE:
No, I don't need you to.

P.O. GREGORY:
One at a time, one at a time.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Let me tell you a story that just happened today, okay? I was with the Fire Chief in Flanders and, you know, it's an area where there's an awful lot of dead oaks in the County parklands and they're trying to identify places where trees have fallen in fire lands that are presenting access issues for fire trucks and emergency service vehicles. And the conversation came about using an aerial drone to photograph some of these areas so you can see from above where these obstructions are to help guide the fire department to better do their job. It happens to be County parkland. So we're creating a procedural step, and I know probably the Parks Commissioner would issue a permit for such a use. But still, I don't think that's necessary.

LEG. MURATORE:
It's not a permit, Jay. Where are you going with permit? It's permission. Call them up and say, Listen, I need a drone to photograph dead trees. Okay, yeah, you can do it.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
You think it's that simple?

LEG. BROWNING:
It's that simple.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Let's ask the Parks Commissioner if it's that simple. Is he here?
No, he's not here right now.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
You didn't reach out to him, huh?

**MS. HORST:**
No, Commissioner Dawson is not here today.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Does anybody --

**LEG. SPENCER:**
Do you have a position?

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Besides the Public Safety Committee, has anybody reviewed this; has DPW reviewed it, has Parks Department reviewed it?

**MS. HORST:**
I'm not aware if the Parks Department has reviewed this. But the County Executive's Office, we've reviewed it and we're okay with it.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.

**LEG. SPENCER:**
On the motion?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
What did the County Executive's Office say?

**MS. HORST:**
We're okay with this resolution.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
You're okay with it.

**MS. HORST:**
Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
That's it. Okay, thank you.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
I mean, no one's -- Mr. P.O, if I may be recognized?

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
No one's reached out to me. Jay didn't reach out to me. I mean, you know, the County Exec's Office didn't reach out to me. So apparently nobody had an issue with it and now you're here. They have no issue with it. The AMA -- not the American Medical Association, the other AMA -- have no
problem with it. So, I mean, I talked to a guy from Schenectady and I saved him a couple of hour trip to come down here and talk for three minutes, explained it to him. He read it over. A couple of my colleagues have spoken to me about it, some even joked with me about it.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Again. They're regulated by the FAA, we know that, there are numerous regulations. And I'm not opposed to a policy, but I think that policy should be developed with input from affected agencies. You want to just, you know, come up with a policy unilaterally and push it threw, I think it potentially effects a growing industry, a recreational industry, and economically --

LEG. MURATORE:
Do you have one?

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I do.

LEG. MURATORE:
You do, okay.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I do. And I've used it for aerial photography in County parkland.

LEG. MURATORE:
Now you'll have to get permission.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
In fact, it was used with the Parks Department to determine that the width was adequate for campsites, for trailing camping at Shinnecock East parking field, because they had prohibited campers from using the beach and they needed to show that there was adequate width there of beach and so the aerial drone was used to take photographs which were then used internally with the Parks Department to justify that they could reopen those areas. And in fact, by Labor Day of last year, we're able to open those areas in the Parks Department. So they have some potentially good uses. And I just -- I'm not saying we shouldn't have a policy; I think we should have a policy. And maybe there's areas that they should be prohibited or, you know, you need a permit to use them. Maybe some areas, like model aircraft, you don't need a permit, but I think we should at least get some input from some of those departments, particularly the Parks Department, before we craft and pass legislation like this.

LEG. MURATORE:
Well, if we pass it, doesn't the County Executive have to have his own public hearing on this?

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Again, Tom, I don't think it's unreasonable to ask the Parks Committee to weigh in here, I really don't. It's 50,000 acres.

LEG. MURATORE:
I'm not going to table this; either we move on it already --

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'm not asking you to table it. I've made a motion to commit it to Parks.
P.O. GREGORY:

LEG. SPENCER:
Well, I support this legislation, and I was looking into doing something. My concern with this is that as things stand right now -- and I went to the FAA. I'm a pilot, I've worked with some people in technology, old friends, and what's happening with these drones is that they're becoming more and more sophisticated. And as it stands right now is that someone could just pull right up to the Dennison Building, take out a drone, fly up with that drone, with an infrared camera, whatever, and be able to look in and see detailed documents, the Police could come up and they couldn't say a word to them. To me, it's a huge gap in public safety.

This is very specific. When we have open windows and higher floors and buildings, there's an expectation of privacy. And now the technology is there that there could be a situation where a drone could be at a significant distance or outside a window and someone could be working on sensitive information and that drone, with telescopic lenses and different technology, would be able to come in the stealth of night or any other -- and this is a start to say that it does leave a mechanism. I think that we have nothing in place. You know, the drones are able to carry objects, they're becoming more and more sophisticated. I think this is something that Legislator Muratore worked on for a while to strike that balance. The FAA is looking at this. But to me, it's a huge security risk, and we need to have the start of a policy in place that we can craft.

And he did go through the process. I don't know why it was flying or seemed to be under the radar, but to -- I think that if the Parks Commissioner wants to look -- the Parks Commissioner has not expressed any objections, too. And so if you had information of whether the parks Commissioner had a concern with this legislation and said, You know, I think there's a problem here, then I think that they would be here. I think that having the Administration weigh in on this and when I just see that one particular point, that as of now where someone could -- the Department of Health, they could get information in our clinics, they could get information off of computer screens, and to say that, you know, we're not County facilities, we're just closing that loophole with this to say you've got to ask for permission. That's all we're saying -- all he's saying in this.

I think delaying it is potentially a public safety risk. I think it's a good start and I'd be interested in modifying it. It does not stop you from using your recreational vehicle, it just specifically says camera. I don't know if your drone has a camera on it. But I think that -- I think the Parks Commissioner could easily give you consent and you could say, I have consent to do it, and if we want to formalize that we can, but I support Legislator Muratore on this.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right, I guess the Administration wants to chime in.

MS. SANTERAMO:
We just spoke to Commissioner Dawson and he said he is okay with this. He said this actually might help him in securing the parks in certain areas.

P.O. GREGORY:
Securing the parks how?

MS. HORST:
It would limit -- he would have the ability to limit, you know, people flying drones over Smith Point Beach in the middle of the summer.
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. So I have a question, then, and you probably won't have the answer. So I was reached out to by a gentleman who was here earlier, him and his club. They were flying -- there's like 20 of them on Long Island. So he said, We're flying, you know, Sunday, why don't you come out? You know, we'll have a bowl of chilli, some hot dogs, whatever. So I went out, you had people from age 12 to 70 flying model airplanes; they don't call them drones, quad-copters they call them. They were at the Town of Babylon Overlook Beach and the Town gives them a permit during the winter months because the summer crowds are not there so they are able to do that, and these guys are very structured. They have club rules, like you can't just come and fly, you have to pass a test, a safety test. There were some civilians that were walking in the area and they had a safety officer there they can usher them out. Because planes do fly -- drop if their battery or something like that were to die out of a charge. So they're very structured and they're very organized. And they don't like these quad-copters, for the most part, because they feel like the average person that goes into a hobby store and gets them, they fly them in their backyard. They're not flying with the same restrictions because they have to fly by restrictions, they have to notify -- if they're within five miles of an airport, they have to notify the airport that they're going to -- where they are, how long they're going to be there. They can't fly over 400 feet because they may interfere with the airplanes. So there is some regulation.

My question is does this bill -- stating that we get permission, does it necessarily give coverage if there's an incident? Permission doesn't say that, well, you have insurance in case a quad-copter falls out of the sky and hits a 12-year old in the head; you have insurance to cover that, right? Who's going formulate those types of -- that within the policy? Is that something that the Commissioner has given consideration to?

MS. HORST:
That I don't know. I'm not sure.

P.O. GREGORY:
Because to me permission -- and I guess I can ask Legislator Muratore, what is your, I guess, idea of permission? Because I agree with what you're trying to do, that there are certain places that they shouldn't be, but I think there are certain places that they should be, too. So delegating authority to the Parks Commission or the Board of Trustees to give permission to fly in the parks to me means more than just a phone call. Because there are safety issues, if someone gets hurt it's our park. If the person asking for the commission isn't providing insurance, that's going to fall on us because we're supposed to provide a place of safety, and if someone gets hurt they can't sue the person flying it, they're going to sue the County. So how do we rectify that?

LEG. MURATORE:
Well, I would think, first of all, like Mr. Green told me this morning, the vast majority of people that fly those things belong to the AMA.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right.

LEG. MURATORE:
So they have insurance. Do you belong to the AMA, Joe? Jay?

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
(Shook head no).
LEG. MURATORE:
No, you don't belong. Okay, so you don't know their rules and regulations. But apparently a whole -- like you said, a whole bunch of rules and regulations. They have insurance.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right.

LEG. MURATORE:
So maybe all the Commissioner has to say is, Do you belong to the AMA? If you belong to AMA, you can fly it; if you don't belong to the AMA, you can't fly it.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. So your intent would be that the Commissioner would ask to see if they're insured as part of their requirement to get permission.

LEG. MURATORE:
It's like anybody else, I mean, going to the park, doing something at the park. If they have their five-mile run or something at the park, right?

P.O. GREGORY:
Right.

LEG. MURATORE:
We give them permission and they have to come up with insurance, right?

P.O. GREGORY:
Right, right. Okay. All right.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
If I may. It sounds like you're saying there ought to be a policy where, again, the Parks Commissioner promulgates some rules.

We heard before that the Parks Commissioner was okay with it because he might, you know, be able to prevent them from flying at Smiths Point. And I wouldn't have a problem if they were a prohibition of, you know, these aerial copters with cameras at Smith Point, that makes sense. But there's vast, you know, unpopulated areas of parkland where it would also be, under your bill, you'd have to now get a permit, even though there's nobody in those parks whatsoever.

LEG. MURATORE:
No permit, permission. No permit, permission.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Permission, right. So rather than having the Parks Commissioner develop a policy for the parks, you're basically creating the policy and then he would then have to figure out how to exempt certain areas; that doesn't seem to make a lot of sense.

LEG. SPENCER:
But --

LEG. MURATORE:
Well, the -- what do I want to say here? The County Executive's supporting it, the Parks Commissioner is supporting it. If someone wants to fly it over the Dennison Building, that's not under the jurisdiction of Parks, right, that's DPW.
D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
So now if somebody wants to take aerial photography of County parkland, maybe on the East End, they would, what? What would they do to get permission?

LEG. MURATORE:
Is it a town park?

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Do you say how you get permission? Who issues it?

LEG. MURATORE:
You ask the Commissioner of that department for permission, it says it in the bill. That's why I asked if you read the bill.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I did read the bill, but is there a formal procedure by which the Commissioner would -- you know, you call -- try calling the Commissioner. If you're, you know, a regular citizen trying to get permission now to take aerial photography at Sears Bellow County Park.

LEG. MURATORE:
Well, I'm sure now that's going to happen. If you call the Commissioner, he's going to probably put somebody in charge of that and --

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
So he has to develop those, what, a piece of paper or a permit of some kind, right? Or just it's a verbal in your mind?

LEG. MURATORE:
Yeah, verbal's okay with me. It says ask.

LEG. SPENCER:
But Jay --

LEG. MURATORE:
Why do you want to make this bigger than it is?

LEG. SPENCER:
If I can respond also to that. The sense is is that the parks are not without issue with the photography, the beautiful landscapes. And the other concern here, I've got a 14-year old daughter that wears bathing suits that I don't like at times. And when she is at a --

(*Laughter*)

You know, you see the guys flew the drone following his kid to school or whatever. But on some of the beaches where you have minors or you have young people that don't exercise the best judgment, you're also in a position, too, in our parks where these devices can take -- and I know people have phones, they know that they can be video'd, but at least they can see, Oh, but this guy has a phone. But, you know, a lot of times, sometimes they're getting a tan, they might be -- the straps might be down, and you've got these devises where you could have someone that is on the park with minors, with families, that can just take unsolicited photographs, too, and utilize them. Now, is that right for them to do that? But we're just saying that we're establishing where -- there's no law against it, I agree. There's no law against it. No expectation of privacy, but I think that the fact that the drones have the capability of being in a position where if someone may not notice them
and may not know that they're being --

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMANN:**
But Doc, you know, prohibiting them at bathing beaches, that sounds like part of a policy. That's a stop-through policy, that makes sense, I could support that.

**LEG. SPENCER:**
And the Commissioner has indicated that he's comfortable being able to carry out the policy under this bill.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMANN:**
This prohibits --

**P.O. GREGORY:**
We have a list. We have a list.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMANN:**
This prohibits them everywhere, and then you'd have to get the permission; whereas specific locations would be part of a policy that could be developed.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
All right. Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**
Okay, I have a couple of questions. This legislation, how will it be enforced? It deals with the air space, so I know we had this issue a year or so ago with some individuals that had some issues with air space. How do you enforce this?

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Let me read it to you. Do you have the bill in front of you? "Any violation of this law shall be a criminal violation," so that means the PD is going to enforce it.

**LEG. ANKER:**
But how are they going to enforce it if it's in the air?

**LEG. MURATORE:**
You don't enforce it up in the air. The guy's on the ground controlling it.

**LEG. HAHN:**
How do you know where he is?

**LEG. ANKER:**
No. Well --

**LEG. HAHN:**
What if he's miles away?

**LEG. MURATORE:**
That's true with a camera.

**LEG. ANKER:**
We've got to get a big net and kind of catch them. How are they going to catch these -- you know, these machines up in the air? Again, it's just a question I have.
LEG. MURATORE:
It would probably come over as a complaint, and I'm sure they could -- you know, if they really want to get serious about it, they'll follow it. And when it comes down, they'll notice where it came down and they'll find the person with it and write them a violation.

LEG. ANKER:
But again, isn't that monitoring air space? In other words, what is the component of, what, the National Air Association? What is that, the FAA, is that what it's called? Are they part of this process of monitoring these types of flying machines?

LEG. MURATORE:
I don't know.

LEG. ANKER:
The other question is -- okay, so that's a question, that's a concern. Because again, if we're going to propose a law, we've got to make sure we can follow through with it.

The other question is that, you know, we're concerned about privacy on beaches or anywhere on a County property. But who's to say someone can take a picture with your cell phone anywhere, anytime, anyplace? You know, I just think this law, the way it is, needs to be tightened, and there needs to be participation with the, you know, Federal Air Administration.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, I thought you had a question. Legislator Hahn. Oh, no, Legislator Lindsay, I'm sorry.

LEG. LINDSAY:
My question was to the sponsor. Just, you know, I agree with the law in principle, I'm just trying to figure out the enforcement side of it. Some of these units have a range of miles, and we're starting to see more and more of them going into commercial use and I think that's going to be something that's going to be more prevalent in the market place. You know, even -- do we own, do we have a right to patrol the air rights over County-owned property, and is that enforceable

LEG. MURATORE:
I'd defer to Counsel on that one.

MR. NOLAN:
In terms of governing air space, this came up a few years ago when Supervisor Romaine was Legislator Romaine and he had proposed a bill, you know, I think it was helicopters. And at that time I stated that in terms of governing air space, that's generally the Federal government, the FAA. When Legislator Muratore came to me, you know, we brought that to his attention and we said you should draft this as narrowly as possible because of that concern, and that's why we limited it to County facilities.

I think there will be an issue in terms of the air space and our rights to govern that. Other municipalities are trying to do that now, arguing, you know, they're doing it under privacy as opposed to safety. But those laws have not been litigated yet, nobody's challenged them, so we don't know if that's going to be successful, that argument that we can regulate drones on the basis of invasion of privacy.

In terms -- the other thing I would say about this law is that we could definitely, if somebody came onto the park grounds or County property and they were trying to launch something on the ground on our facilities, we could definitely enforce it. I do think in terms of the air space issue, that is more problematic, that's why it's narrowly drafted. That's why we didn't ban drones everywhere in
Suffolk County, as some Legislators had wanted to do.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**
Okay. That was my only question.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay. I was just reading something. Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. HAHN:**
So I commend this sponsor for getting into this area, because I do believe, you know, this is a really growing industry, this is a growing problem. However, I do agree with Legislator Schneiderman in that, you know, we, as the policy making arm of this government, should be setting the policy on this, and I think that this is just a little too broad.

I agree on government buildings, whether it be the Dennison, whether it be this building, whether it be a jail or a police headquarters or any police precinct or any of our government buildings. I think that this is completely inappropriate that the drones would fly around, look in the windows, whatever we've all discussed here today, possibly even the prohibition on bathing beaches. I do think that there's, on public property, the expectation of privacy is not -- there is no expectation of privacy when you're in a public property space.

And so there's some complicated issues here that I do believe just require a little bit more thought. And I think that we could craft this policy and I think you're on the right track and I think we should be very focused in thinking through all the different avenues and where it's appropriate, where it's not, how it can be done properly, and I think you're on the right track. And I think if you allow us to all participate, you can really be on the cutting edge of this and craft a really long-lasting policy that will have meaning and will protect who we want it to protect and allow the use where we want to allow and actually encourage the use.

I saw a really cool video that was sent to us of a drone, you know, flying above the ice on the South Shore and showing the whole marina area and it just was a really unique and important perspective that you don't often get -- we don't often get to see; especially someone like me who doesn't like to fly, I really don't get to see it very often. So it just was an amazing video and there really is both an amateur photography angle to this as well as from a public policy perspective just seeing those angles, whether it's our shoreline, our beach line, following its changes overtime, whether environmental groups want to record that, etcetera.

So I think that there is a really important space here that you've taken the lead on and I think you can do some really good and important regulating and I think we just need -- I think it needs some tweaks, but I'm very supportive of helping you if it doesn't get done today.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay. Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Thank you. And I just want to explain my reason for seconding Jay's motion to send this to Parks. And it looks to me really like we're talking about having to have two separate types of policies here. I can understand the perspective of the sponsor and, you know, Legislator Spencer's perspective in terms of we don't want someone to be able to send up one of these quadrocopters or drones or model airplane, whatever you want to call it, and fly around the Dennison Building and be able to
take photos of what's going on inside the windows there, nor do we want them flying over, you know, Police Headquarters and taking pictures of what we have there. And perhaps what we need to do is have really two separate policies, one that says that we do not want this type of activity taking place over our general facilities, but we also need to have a separate one for the parks. Because clearly there are a lot of enthusiasts out there who do like to be able to do this. As new technologies emerge and become affordable to people, more people will take advantage of those kinds of things. So it's clearly there's a public demand that have space to do this.

Certainly someone's backyard is not going to be sufficient to do -- to send their drone up and take those aerial photographs, so we want to designate some park space that's appropriate for it and I think that's a separate policy that we have to put through the Park's Department and have some input from the Parks Department, input from the Parks Trustees about what areas are appropriate or not appropriate. And I'll give you another example of why I think we're going to need to use this type of technology and that's I got a call just yesterday about the Southern Pine Beetle and how it's infesting more and more of our woodland and the Pine Barrens, and that the way they actually -- the DEC has been trying to monitor the issue is during the wintertime they send a helicopter up to look for dead trees that look like they've got browning on the top. And that would be a perfect use of a drone, that would be a lot cheaper than a full-scale helicopter.

So it looks to me like there needs to be some tweaking and then one side for the Parks Department and another version that carries -- deals with other governmental facilities.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay, Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSNIK:**
Thank you. So, you know, it's hard to believe that we've spent so much time discussing something that a few years ago nobody ever thought we would be discussing. And to the point I think a lot of my colleagues are making, Ben Franklin said, *The law is like too much bread and not enough butter, and it just doesn't keep spreading, so you have to keep* -- that's why we sit here all the time, we keep making more laws because things keep coming up that we've never foreseen. And I'm going to support this legislation today because, you know -- I wasn't thinking about what Doc Spencer said about the security at different County facilities, and you're absolutely right. I was thinking more about the thousands of acres of Suffolk County parkland. You know, there's a lot of rules when you go to the parks. You know, there's rules about camp fires, there's rules about dogs, about horses, ATVs, hunting. So -- and when the County acquired the land, you know, the rules just kept accumulating as people came up with more and more different behavior, and there was a lot of rules. Because when you go to the park it's public land, and you have a certain expectation, when you go to public land, of your enjoyment. And I can see someone flying a drone with a camera on it really being -- it could really take away from your enjoyment because, after all, I don't think that's your expectation to go and be photographed in a park, on a beach, in the woods. So I would support this today because of that.

And then I would think, obviously, people are going to work on a protocol; yes, *you can use the drone, you're filming a documentary. Yes, of course, you're going to do a survey of the trees that were damaged by the southern Pine Beetle, you know, Yes, you want to take a look at the fire lanes that need to be cleared.* So there's obviously going to be a lot of uses for them that should be used, but I don't think -- I think the general public -- for right now, I think this is the right bill today and I think, you know, we'll work through those other details going forward.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
All right, Legislator Stern.
LEG. STERN:
This is certainly an effort to regulate. The legislation is regulating something, and if it's regulating something, I would think it would be very important that there be some type of set standard regulations that go along with it. I think that's my issue here, is that we can't have a policy, we cannot set a policy where you could just call up the Commissioner of Parks and Greg Dawson's going to say, Oh, yeah, okay, you can go fly your kite today. You can't have a situation where you get, you know, Gil Anderson on the phone and, you know, shoot it back and forth for a little while and then, Oh, by the way, Gil, is it okay if I fly my drone tomorrow? Sure, if the weather is nice, you can go ahead and do that. So I would have concerns that there would have to be written policy so that there is at least some minimum standard across the board that would be applicable to anyone that would be interested in utilizing, you know, this type of unit.

I agree with most of the fundamentals of the legislation. And I agree with the Presiding Officer, though I see this much more as a public safety issue than necessarily a privacy or security issue, but I can see that aspect of it as well. But regardless of whether you view this more as a privacy security issue or a public safety issue, clearly we can set the overall policy, but you're going to have to put some meat on the bones here. The question is when do you do that and who's responsible for doing that. I don't think that we necessarily have to have a full set of written regulations that this Legislature develops in order for us to be able to set the broad policy, we can certainly leave that to the Administration and the department heads, ultimately they are responsible for the implementation and the administration of the policy that we set.

And so I would just suggest to the sponsor that regardless of when that happens, it would be my hope that as the sponsor of the legislation, that you would play an active roll in ensuring that there be written policy in place and some type of a meaningful, justifiable standard that all of our residents and all of the members of the Administration of the various departments that are responsible for overseeing and implementing this policy can understand, know where to go so they can see it in black and white. Because there's going to come a time when someone is going to be denied this permission, verbally or otherwise, and there's not going to be a standard and that's going to be an issue later on, you can see that happening. And so it would be my hope, really, and expectation I think, that there would be a written policy in place going forward.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes I most definitely plan to do that. You know, I also think if I can just -- through the Chair. I would think if the Parks Commissioner just put it in the rules and regulations of using the park. I mean, if you want to have a fire, you can only have it a certain size, right? I'm not really familiar, I'm not a camping person, but if you use County parks, there's rules and regulations on using the park, correct? So when they do up the manual, just make a note in there that if you want to use a drone with a camera in a County park, you have to call 854, whatever, and try and get permission, or ask for permission.

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

LEG. D'AMARO:
Thank you. So Legislator Muratore, I think that you have the right intention here and I want to work with you on this, but I want to give you my thoughts also. And accept my apologies for not thinking this through a little more before today.

There are a lot of issues raised here making me think about what are you trying to do. So there's a criminal aspect to this -- for lack of a better word, spying, okay -- and there's a regulatory or safety aspect to this; what if one of these things fall out of the sky?
So let's look at the criminal side. The criminal side, I think everyone would agree that, yes, you don't want a drone, you know, coming into a fifth floor window and looking in the window, I guess there's the capacity and capability for them to do that. But if you're going to penalize that as a crime, which is what your law does, I think you need to be a little more specific and also think about the regulated air space that's above the County park; where does that begin and end and the FAA implications.

So for example, you could say on the criminal side, perhaps you need to regulate the drone flying within a certain perimeter of the building, below -- at or below the roof line. You know, when you talk about crime, you talk about intent; someone needs -- with the intent to eavesdrop or spy or whatever word we can come up with that encompasses all of that, so now you have a criminal offense. All right, so I own a drone, I have a camera on it, I purposely fly that into County -- at a County facility, it's below regulated air space by the FAA, it's opposite a window and my intention is to purposely be somewhere where I'm not supposed to be to spy on someone or to eavesdrop on someone; that should be a crime and it should be punishable, I agree. The problem with the law is that everyone else gets caught up in that, everyone else.

So you have the civil side of it, if you will. You have safety, it's a safety issue, and I think it is. I mean, people flying these things. You know, I don't know if they run on gas or electric, I don't know how -- you know, what if you have engine failure up there and it drops and maims four people? I mean, that's a possibility. I know when it comes to airplanes, because I'm also a pilot, there's vast regulations about how maintain an aircraft, where you can fly it, who you need to talk to, there's a lot of that, but apparently these drones don't have it. So on the civil side, you need to regulate specifically the time, place, manner, safety regulations, maybe licensing, written permission, what are the parameters of that permission. And I think the problem that I'm having with the bill, and maybe some of our colleagues, is that we just have, you know, the one sentence that just says the only criteria is if you have a camera, you can't fly it anywhere. And I think you have hit the right concept, but I think drafting the bill needs to consider a little bit more of the different scenarios, the different reasons, whether it's criminal or civil, safety as opposed to committing a crime, and then regulate time, place and manner and give people more notice of exactly what it is you're prohibiting and when. And then when you get someone who has a drone or is an enthusiast, they know the rules. They know, Well, I'm not flying my drone today over a County facility because I want to eavesdrop on the 7th floor of the Dennison Building, but I do want to fly over the County park today and, you know, the County does regulate the time, place and manner of when I can do that, so let me make that call and they'll say to me, Yeah, come down and fill out this form and we'll give you your permit and then if the Police show up you can show them the permit. So I think we just need that specificity built into this.

LEG. MURATORE:
If I may, Mr. Presiding Officer? Yes, Louis, I agree with that a hundred percent. And you know, if we look at the Academy of Model Aeronautical Safety, this group that was out here today, if a member -- if a person who's a member of that organization is flying a drone, he or she is not a near problem, they know exactly what to do. I don't know if there's any dues involved here, but I would suggest that maybe my colleague Jay Schneiderman join them, find out a lot more about them.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right. But if I could just -- that's not on the books, though, that's not enforceable.

LEG. MURATORE:
I was going to lead up to that.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay, good.
LEG. MURATORE:
What we can do is the bill goes forward, hopefully we can pass it, and then as time goes on, the more we learn about it, the more these become more popular, more sophisticated, the better we make the bill.

LEG. D’AMARO:
Well, so you're not disagreeing; you're saying that pass this now and then we'll come up with the specificity later?

LEG. MURATORE:
No, we'll make it stronger as time goes on or, you know, we craft it to what's going on. We have a resolution in place, we don't have to go through this arguing anymore, and as technology changes, we can come along and recraft the bill, and when that changes we can recraft the bill.

LEG. D’AMARO:
Yeah, I would prefer to give this a lot more thought and come up with a bill that addresses most, if not all of the concerns. Because for me to say it's a criminal act to fly a drone over County parkland on Sunday morning at six in the morning without any intent to harm -- there's no specificity in this law as to a criminal intent; you're a former Police Officer, you understand about intent and committing crime. This is almost criminalizing every single person that would fly a drone over any County property at any time for any reason, and I don't think that's appropriate to do.

LEG. MURATORE:
Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:
Are you done, Lou?

LEG. D’AMARO:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right, Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:
And again, just following through with the thought of trying to figure out, you know, how you're going to regulate this. Now, on February, 2015, the Department of Transportation and the FAA, they released proposed regulation. Now, what they're doing right now, they're taking comment, and this is criteria for Section 336, Public Law 112-95. So I would like to see this law you're proposing in coordination with what's being proposed on Federal level.

So again, I think there's a lot to work through in understanding how we can make a really good law that, as we discussed, would protect our privacy rights, but also would not complicate this issue, especially with County enforcement; and again, I'm having a hard time getting past that. But just a suggestion. Have you gotten in touch with the -- what is it, the Federal Aviation Administration, Legislator Muratore?

LEG. MURATORE:
What was that?

LEG. ANKER:
Have you spoken to the FAA, the Federal Aviation Administration?
LEG. MURATORE:
No, I relied on (inaudible)

LEG. ANKER:
Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Schneiderman.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Let me just say a couple of final things. First, I thought Kara, Legislator Hahn did a great job in terms of outlining what could be a policy. You know, I certainly would support any of the County buildings, that makes perfect sense. If you're shooting a film or something, you go and try to get your permission, etcetera; the bathing beaches is something I could certainly support.

You know, the East End where I am, you know, representative for the South Fork -- and the County's done a great job in preserving land. Thousands and thousands of acres of some of the most extraordinary landscapes you could ever see, and that bird's eye perspective only builds a deeper appreciation. I have an aerial drone, I use it strictly for aerial photography, I think I've gotten some extraordinary images captured from it. If your law is in place, I now have to go and ask first; maybe I will, maybe I won't get it. I don't see the necessity for it. I'd rather take a little bit of time and -- you know, I do think you're on the right track, but creating a good policy, if it takes another month to get a good policy, a stronger policy, a more logical policy that doesn't stop things that you're not trying to stop, Legislator Muratore, I think that's the right thing to do. You know, as a colleague, to me, that is better than rushing something through that is going to inadvertently hurt user groups that you had no intention of, you know, preventing.

So that's all. And I think Lou raised, I thought, some important issues as well. I think this begs for at least a little bit more input, and then coming forth with a policy that we can all get behind. Because I'd like to support a policy, but not one that is just a blanket prohibition, it doesn't make sense to me, and it hurts a fledgling industry in an economy that we're trying to help stimulate. Thank you.

LEG. MURATORE:
So do you think I'll get the support of my colleagues in crafting this bill in a better way?

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Absolutely. I'm not trying to just stop your bill, Tom. I'm trying to --

LEG. MURATORE:
I just want it on the record, that's all.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
-- stop a bill that will prevent something that you have no intention of preventing. Aerial photography is not something we should be stopping. People shouldn't be spying, I agree; people shouldn't be going and looking into the Dennison Building or whatever, I agree with that. But aerial photography, particularly in an area of extraordinary beauty, why should we stop that, or put up impediments to it? And I'd be happy to work with you in putting together that, even cosponsoring a policy with you.

LEG. MURATORE:
Well, I have Legislator D'Amaro and Stern and you and Kara, it's going to be a great bill. It's really going to be hopefully one of the best that comes out of here. Great, I appreciate it. So what I'd like
to do then is make a motion to table. Okay?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**
Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay. Motion to table by Tom, Legislator Muratore. Second by Legislator McCaffrey.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
And I think, Tom, you know, for me, Legislator D'Amaro brought up some -- he brought up some good points; I think everyone did, but he brought up some points that I didn't even think of. You know, when you come into -- it's not -- it says criminal, but it's really more of a violation.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
So I'm thinking like if you have -- you know, when I went out Sunday, I mean, they had 12-year-olds, 10-year-olds. So if you have a 10-year old that goes to a park and now they can technically be subject to a violation, I think they should be -- not that we would go out like, you know, the gestapo, but technically they would. So the thought process of, well, maybe we should have some strict policy as to if you're at a certain age you should be under adult supervision. I mean, it kind of leads to other questions that I think should be fleshed out a little bit more.

So I welcome your consideration to think this a little bit further and get some input from the Parks Department, because I think -- I certainly think you're in the right direction. I support it. I just think it needs to flesh out those -- for me, those questions. Okay? So we have a motion and a second to table. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
Against table.

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

**MR. LAUBE:**
Seventeen (Opposed: Legislator Barraga).

**P.O. GREGORY:**
*IR 1181-15 - Establishing a standing committee to ensure access to supportive services in the criminal justice system (Browning).* Motion by Legislator Browning?

**LEG. BROWNING:**
Motion.

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Second.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1112 -- excuse me, IR 1200-15 - To expedite training for experienced police officers (McCaffrey). Oh boy (laughter). We spent 45 minutes on drones, I can imagine how long we're going to spend on this.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion to approve by Legislator McCaffrey. Second by Legislator Trotta. On the motion?

LEG. McCAFFREY:
If I may, Mr. Presiding Officer. We spent $10.4 million above our $30.6 million for police overtime last year, which was 34% over budget. One of the biggest reasons for that is the fact that we do not have enough police officers. We're down several hundred sworn officers, we are anticipating many retirements coming up this year. For some reason or another, we have not hired as many police officers as we -- I'm sorry, as we've needed to, and I believe that we're starting to do that now. In that process of getting these police officers on the street, it would be advantageous for us to -- if they are qualified, to get onto the streets sooner. So the purpose of my bill is to say that we want to have the Police Department look at the feasibility. I'm not mandating anything, I am not saying that there should be a shorter academy, but I'm asking them to do a feasibility study to determine whether or not that if someone who has already passed through a State accredited police academy -- i.e., New York City or something like that -- that there may be some way that they could be going through a shorter, expedited academy.

From what I understand, is that quite a bit of the time that's taken up within the Police Academy is the study of the New York State Penal Code, firearms training, etcetera; many of the things that are already done, somebody has already completed. The New York State Penal Code within Suffolk County is the same as it is in New York City. I understand the patrol guide is different and also there may be different practices and policies, and I know there's EMT training, several different things.

I'm not asking that we short circuit the process, I am not asking that they go out with any training. But if they have shown some sort of ability to pass those -- they've already passed many of these things and they have to go through additional training, let's take a look at it. Let's see what's missing in their prior training, sure to make sure that they've got the proficiency in the areas that they said they already have and let's get them on the streets sooner.

One of the reasons for that, that I'm saying that is -- and just by way of example, this is just by way of example in terms of shortening the Police Academy. In the event that we're able to -- you look at Police Officer and the Police Department does a feasibility study, comes back with recommendations and said we put the two curriculums together and we determined that we could get them out on the street in half the time we normally could and we have an expedited training academy.

Generally, from what I understand, we have half the police officers that come into the academy have already gone through the New York City Police Academy and they're already experienced New York City Policemen. Using that kind of formula -- and it varies class-to-class, I understand -- if you're able to get -- if we went on kind of a hiring spree in here in the County and we were able to put in, say, 75 recruits per class, 150 annually, back-to-back classes. And if we went with 50% of them being eligible to be expedited and we could basically shorten their police academy time by -- in half,
they could be on the street in 13 weeks as opposed to 26-weeks, saving about 65 shifts.

Currently, an overtime shift for a full-grade police officer costs us $880, and 65 shifts at $880 is five thousand -- $57,200. Sixty-five shifts for a straight-time for a new hire is $214 times 65, it is $13,910, which would be a savings of $43,290 per recruit that we're able to expedite. If we were able to expedite 75 recruits a year, that would be a savings of $3.2 million; if there's only 50 recruits, it would be $2.1 million; and only 25 recruits would be $1 million. There's a potential for savings there. I am not asking that we mandate that this happen, I am simply asking that the Police Department look at the feasibility of seeing if we can do that.

Now, I know I've heard before that there's no way we can do it, all police officers have to go through this expedited training. I give the example of the Parks Department Police, when we expedited them, my understanding is there is actually even some Parks Department Police that had not gone through the academy and just got this expedited training and were put on the street. So it is something we have not done -- that we have done before, so I'm asking, simply asking the Police Department to look at. I think the savings speak for themselves. And once again, I'm not looking to short circuit training and put officers on the street without training that they have not already received from a State accredited agency.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Hahn then Krupski.

LEG. HAHN:
A quick question. Can you repeat one more time what your savings was based on; how many -- the officers would miss what?

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Say the current academy is approximately six months. If I said that half the training -- and I don't know, I'm just using by way of example -- they could --

LEG. HAHN:
Okay. So you're just picking out of a hat saying half the training would be saved.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Right. And then so if you -- and half the training of 75 recruits would be $3.2 million. If a quarter of the training were saved, it would still be close to $2 million.

LEG. HAHN:
But you don't have any -- I don't want to say scientific, but you don't have any reason to believe that someone who was trained in New York City would save three mouths out of our six-month training; you just picked like a hypothetical.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Yeah.

LEG. HAHN:
Okay.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
It's only because I'm asking the Police Department to look at it.

LEG. HAHN:
Sure.
LEG. McCAFFREY:
Not to mandate that it be a three-month academy.

LEG. HAHN:
Sure. I think that this is an extraordinarily complicated endeavor, as I've mentioned in committee, although I just feel like I want to repeat it here. I think it's worth looking at and that's why I supported it leaving the committee, but I think it's extraordinarily complicated. I think it would be incredibly difficult when we probably will have recruits coming from all sorts of different, you know, jobs ahead of time. And so, therefore -- and trainings taken at differing lengths, how long ago they took it and how -- et cetera. And so I'm not referring in any way to New York City trained officers, there could be. I think that each officer could be a unique case, could have experienced different from a brother or a sister sitting next to them. And I think that their -- you know, it could be incredibly complicated and we don't -- I think it will be less efficient to try to customize training schedules for each recruit.

I mentioned in committee that I thought it may be possible that the five-week EMT -- if we have an EMT, someone certified, current certification that they received that matches all the certifications of our EMT course, maybe they could save that five-week EMT if that was -- if we have a certain portion of the recruits, that their five-week EMT is the last five weeks of their academy, you know, maybe we have a way of saving those five weeks. I just think it would be hard to say, you know, you don't have to take this three-hour portion of the thing and you can miss those nine days and Joe can miss those five weeks and Sue can miss -- you know, I think it will just be really hard to customize an academy for each recruit.

There may be ways to find efficiencies, so that's the reason I'm supporting this, but I just think that our -- it's so important. We have, you know, an incredibly sophisticated training and we have -- we want it right, we want not only to them -- not only to have the recruits leave with the skills, the education, the knowledge base about the law, but there's also an emotional intelligence and a social piece to this that probably the recruit class staying together is also important. So we have to weigh different factors and figure out what they're worth. And certainly -- I would imagine there's some room for savings, but it's just so complicated that -- I guess I'll look forward to the report.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Yeah, I think that's all I'm asking for. And then, you know, not only have they gone through training, generally the police officers are experienced police officers, they've been on the street in probably some very difficult situations and they even bring that to bear, it could even help in their training, so.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So is this -- I've got a couple of questions, if I could, to the sponsor? Is this something the Police Department's ever looked at before?

LEG. McCAFFREY:
I'm not sure. I've told that they may have, but -- and I said if they have, if there's somebody from the Police Department that wants to speak about that. I haven't received it, no one's come to me and said, yeah, we've done it, here's the report, dust it off and we looked at it, it's not going to work.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
Good afternoon. I'm George Fasanelli, I'm Deputy Inspector currently assigned to the Office of the Chief of Support Services. Previously I spent a year as the Commanding Officer of the Police
We took a short look when we were looking at the Park Police, trying to expedite training there; apparently that only affected a small number of officers. I started with the department back in 1982, probably back then this type of transition for experienced officers would have been fairly simple. One of the things that impacts our ability to move people quickly through the academy is the introduction of so much technology. And again, the landscape for police services has changed tremendously over the course of those 33 years.

Would a study be of value? Perhaps. But I think the outcome would basically say there might be the ability to make small savings in terms of the time spent at the academy; however, we're kind of limited with the number of resources we have. And just for example, we'll talk briefly about the emergency medical training that we have. We have four classrooms available for that, we have five technicians. We're a very mobile Police Department. One of the pieces that we do is we have emergency vehicle operation courses; again, we're limited by the six vehicles that we have here. So again, trying to piece that puzzle together where, as Legislator Hahn had suggested where -- okay, this week you'll be here, this week you'll be here, this person will be over there -- might be significantly complicated in terms of completing the academy training that everybody will need.

There's another factor that I think should be weighed and assessed, just in terms of our general conversation here. There's a tremendous amount of role playing that goes on at the Police Academy. And part of the process of the role training is to assess how our officer candidates handle stressful situations. Role playing involves a lot of curve ball, a lot of knuckle balls coming your way. And really, there are some people who are great, they can handle the unusual that pops up out of nowhere in one of these scenarios. But there are other people who can't do that. Again, we use that in a big way to screen people's suitability, and sometimes it works for the individual themselves where he or she might realize this may not be the type of work that I'm looking for.

So again, just some of the things that we'll have to wrap our heads around, you know, if we're tasked with doing that study.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**
Deputy Inspector, you brought up a couple of points; Mr. Presiding Officer, if I may. You had mentioned about the emergency training, the EVAC training; I assume that these police officers have already had that part of it? Part of it is probably -- they haven't?

**DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:**
It really depends on the agency. One of the --

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**
Say New York City, which is probably what we're talking about, right?

**DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:**
New York City does do this, they do.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**
Does do it. Firearms training?

**DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:**
Again, depending on the --
LEG. McCAFFREY:
They have not had firearms training?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
Well, they've had firearms training, but we use a different weapon, we have different protocols that we use. And again --

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Right. You can do a proficiency to see if they're there.

EMT training; a lot of police officers now, do they have EMT --

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
Yes, Sir.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Every police officer out there today has EMT certification?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
Yes, Sir.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
They do.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
Except for old people like me who --

LEG. McCAFFREY:
I pointed out 1982, I would have been the class of 1982 if I was not color blind, by the way?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
Oh, really?

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Yeah, absolutely. They test for color blindness now, so. But going back to the training, the Penal Code; how much time is spent on the Penal Code?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
I would really have to look at the -- I would have to look at the class schedule to see how much time. What's happened over the course of the years, because we've been trying to keep the academy at about a six-month time, some of that work has been compressed so that we can do things such as computers in the car, that tracks, ticket system and the like, so the curriculum is constantly changing. We just had a meeting yesterday where we were talking about we're going to need to introduce more training on civil disturbances; because as I suggested before, the landscape changes frequently for law enforcement.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
And that's ongoing training, you would have a regular police officer who somewhere along the line had come in any way for that kind of refresher, right?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
Well, a lot of the stuff that we're bringing the more experienced officers in are included as part of the initial academy training.
So in all likelihood, recruits will be getting that as part of their academy training.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**
And they don't get that right now, right.

**DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:**
They get a piece of it, but it may --

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**
Okay.

**DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:**
-- grow to be more extensive.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**
Right. And then you mentioned role playing, those types of things. I mean, you know, like in the New York City Police Academy, which is also, I understand, a six-month academy, that they probably had some sort of role playing and that type of things.

**DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:**
Absolutely.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**
As we're talking, I think you said the point I'm getting at. I'm not saying this exactly, but I do believe, and I have to think deep down you believe that it's worth looking at, especially at a time when we're looking at a savings, possible savings of millions of dollars at a time when we're $10 million over our budget on the Police overtime and we also, you know, know all about our budgetary problems right now. So all I'm asking you to do is to look at the feasibility. And I think that you could agree that there may be some overlap that's at least worth looking at to determine whether or not we could look at it; is that fair to say?

**DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:**
That's fair to say, Sir.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**
Thank you.

**DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:**
You're welcome.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay, Legislator Krupski still has the floor.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Thank you. I do have a question for the Deputy Inspector. If you were tasked with this, who actually do this study and how would you -- it almost seems to me like it's an effort to recruit police officers from outside of the County, this would be some great advantage. Who would actually do this study and how would you know, like suppose you recruited someone from New York City, someone from Jersey, someone from Colorado. How would -- someone's got to reevaluate their training and try to make it mesh with Suffolk County protocol.
DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
In those instances, we would probably have to actually obtain training records from those departments. Fairly simple for the larger departments, whether it's Nassau County, New York City, perhaps the State Police. But if you go into a smaller agency that's Upstate, it may be problematic; those cases will probably present the most significant concern for us.

As to who would be involved in doing the study? That would be a decision made by, you know, the command level of the Police Department. And I would be concerned, if I could offer a personal opinion, that just to ensure that nobody can throw a rock at the department and say, Well, you came up with this answer because it serves your purposes.
My recommendation would be that it would involve more than just, you know, Police administration.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Would this -- how would this effect the officers that you train for the East End towns, or would they all be -- or would they all be trained the same way in the very end?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
Experienced officers from the East End? Many of them have gone through our academy, so in those instances we can do a very expedited training.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
I have a question for you, Deputy Inspector. So, you know, I'm a veteran, and I know that if you're -- you know, I'm in the Army and there were people that I knew that were in the Marines, they didn't have to go through basic training, they came through a separate branch of government, and you can have people from the Army go to the Navy or the Airforce or vice versa. So I can't see -- if it's good enough for our soldiers that are defending our country, why can't we go for forward and look at -- test studying the feasibility of looking at someone from a different Police Department and doing it? I mean, I think in my mind, right, if someone's in a police force in, you know, Biscayne, Florida, obviously their training and qualifications might be a little bit different than Suffolk County recruits. But I think maybe -- and Legal's not here at the moment, but even if we restricted it to say, Well, we will be willing to have some type of cooperative agreement with New York City Police Department, with Trenton, New Jersey or whoever because we know their standards, their standards meet our standards. And if there's anyone from those departments that would like to apply to the Suffolk County Police Department, we will admit them, we'll reduce training. I don't see how that that couldn't be done.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
The only problem I think we may run into is a staffing problem. Because effectively, in some instances you would be running parallel academies because of the way the training is broke out. It's not like a college where, you know, you finish up a month and then you move on to the next block. There's different classes, maybe in the morning you're doing the laws of arrest, maybe in the afternoon you're doing how to handle a domestic incident, for example, and then just piecing together that patchwork on an individual basis. Considering what types of training you may have, or what agency you may have come from; it's probably a little more involved than we may anticipate, you know, just through the course of discussion here.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yeah, but it should be -- if they're all -- if they're coming, say, from New York City --
DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
Right.

P.O. GREGORY:
-- and you say it shouldn't necessarily be, you know, at different levels, they all come at the same starting point, because you come from an accredited program that we recognize and you all, instead of going through the whole program, you go for six weeks and you're going to start with, I don't know, CPR or whatever, whatever you do and you go through that.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
Let me --

P.O. GREGORY:
You may have to hire a few more people because you don't have the people to cover it, right?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
I'll just offer up a couple of examples. We speak our own language as police officers because we use what's known as the 10-codes, okay. The 10-codes are different agency-to-agency, and it really becomes our language. And again, if you were to come sit in my car and listen to the radio, you'd probably be saying it's a lot of stuff going on that I don't know what they're --

P.O. GREGORY:
So like a 10-11 in Suffolk is different than a 10-11 in Nassau?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
Exactly. You know, the biggest one is the difference between the 10-13 in New York City and the 10-1 out here in Suffolk County.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
10-13 in New York City is I need assistance; out here, 10-13 is to call your command. So different things like that. Right now I think we have about 90 different codes; that's one example.

Computer systems, very unique to our Police Department. Some of the programs were developed internally, those types of training. So again, you're going to involve a block of time. And again, I'm not saying that it precludes a study or it may not be workable, but I'm just suggesting that it may be more involved and more complicated than it may seem on its face.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, fair enough. Legislator Browning, I had you next.

LEG. BROWNING:
Hi, George. Always good to see you.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
Same here, thank you.

LEG. BROWNING:
I have to say, one of the best guys I know. But I know we've had some disagreement on this issue, but I thought it would be important to make sure that everyone has numbers.
I did learn, we talked about the retirement seminar, it's every two years. The information I received, and I believe is correct, is that between Detectives in the SOA, I don't know if -- I think they just had a retirement seminar this past Sunday, there were a total -- between Detectives in the SOA, a total of 160 officers that signed up for the retirement seminar. The information that Budget Review has given me, with 284 sworn police personnel will have accrued 32 years of service at some point between now and 2018. And if anybody knows, 32 years is magic number with the Suffolk PD as far as retirement. Again, because of the overtime, as you know how the overtime works, is it the best three or the last three, however that works on your retirement?

**DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:**
It depends on what tier you're assigned.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
Right, right. So because of the overtime costs, the information I received was $39.9 million is what our overtime costs was, we budgeted for 30. Today we have 126 less police officers since three years ago. Retirement as of right now eligible to retire is 1124, which is 48% of our Police Department; in 2016, eligible to retire, 1296, which would be 55%; 2017, 1321 which is 56%; and in 2018, we have 1379, which is about 58, almost 59% of our sworn personnel who would be eligible to retire. So we -- seriously, I have said it time and time again, we have a serious problem.

We approved a contract and that contract was to save us money, and how we were going to save money is by hiring more new police officers at a lower pay scale. So I think this is just a study. We're not saying that we're asking you to do the study, get it done, so if we had a class this year, and I would hope that we would have quite a few officers this year. Maybe next year. Is there an opportunity to amend the curriculum in some way to fast track some people? And again, you know, we talked about the police officers, the Parks Police Officers; some of them didn't even go through the Suffolk County PD Academy training from day one, yet they did three weeks of training to become a Suffolk County cop this time. So if we can't do it with them -- you know, if we could do it with them, we could do it with somebody who comes from the city or somewhere else. I mean, I do think that we are going to see less guys coming from the city because of the payroll change.

And again, when you mentioned about the gun and firearms training, we use -- Suffolk County Police Officers use a Glock, right?

**DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:**
Yes, Ma'am.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
Okay, which NYPD uses a Glock also, so the firearms training is the same. So if we really look at these numbers and these retirement numbers, we really need to be concerned of what's going to happen over the next three years.

My biggest concern is having way too many rookie cops on the street losing -- we talk about brain drains; we're losing a brain drain in the Suffolk County Police Department and we are going to have too many new police officers on the street if we do a massive hiring over the next three years. We need to get them in now, we need to get them ready and we need to get them out on the street, because I do believe over the next three years we're going to see massive retirements. I guess, Jay, you're next (Laughter).

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Legislator Muratore?
LEG. MURATORE:
Thank you. I'm looking at your bill and I see the first RESOLVED, and maybe I'm wrong, but it says that we're asking the Police Department to study the feasibility. So it's just like my colleagues told me here before on my drone bill, go out and research it and study it, and that's what we're asking the Police Department to do. So this should be a ground ball. There shouldn't be any problem, we should just approve this and let them do their feasibility and get to us. Because I know in my hearts of hearts they'll give us the right information on it.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Good afternoon, Deputy Inspector. Thanks for coming today. Do you have an idea of how much time it would take to conduct the study?

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

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
That's a good question. I really haven't come with up with a -- you know, first thing would be we have to decide who would be involved in the study. I don't think it would take a great amount of time. We have people at the Academy that have been assigned there a long time, have great experience. Right now, we're in a critical period in terms of our Academy training, and that it's basically the last two months, there about, about six weeks left, so we're kind of busy. If we could defer it a little bit, that might be better, because then much of the Academy staff would be available to work with me or whoever's assigned to lead the study.

LEG. LINDSAY:
My other questions were for these other police jurisdictions, do we have published records of what their curriculum is, and does it specify it by each year? Because I would imagine the training changes from year to year, that what was on the Academy.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
So that's one of the issues I think that we'll face. So, again, if we have somebody from New York City who went through the Academy five years ago, his Academy training might be different than what New York City affords its recruits at this point. So, again, in all likelihood, there'll be a lot of dialogue between our staff and the training staff at these other agencies, just to determine -- just to determine what --

LEG. LINDSAY:
And are they readily cooperative to give up that information, knowing that you're going to utilize it to hire away their employees?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
That's a big -- that's a big question that I don't have an answer for.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Because there has been recent litigation by the New York City Police Department against some of these other jurisdictions that are hiring aware their recruits right after they come out of the academy, almost using the New York City Police Academy as their own, because it's free training for them, and the City has gone after some of these jurisdictions for reimbursement for the cost of their training. I don't know how this could affect that as well if we could end up getting caught up in that type of litigation.
DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
I wasn't aware of that. I wasn't aware there was litigation.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Legislator Lindsay, if I can speak to it. First, to the issue of the curriculum, that is available. In fact, a contact at the New York City Police Department gave me the person at the Police Academy who they can request as train their curriculum for -- and I'll be glad to pass that information on to you, Deputy Inspector.

And, also, to the issue of the lawsuits or what New York City is doing, some -- even Amityville, which uses our Suffolk County Police Department to be able to process for their recruits' training, they take anyone if they've had New York City police training. They do not send them through the Academy again. They accept it, because it's State accredited. With some training on the street, they'll do that. But if it's within a certain period of time, if it's within three years since they've graduated, they have to pay New York City back some sort of prorated cost of about $10,000 for the training, so -- and I think that's what New York City is doing to the other municipalities that are taking the New York City recruits within a certain time period.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Would we have to do the same?

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
I don't think so, because we're not telling them no training, we're just going to give them an expedited training, you know, so I don't think -- I guess we would cross that bridge when we get to it, but it's still -- when you look at these numbers, it's still cheaper than having to send them through the Academy, and there's a cost and while -- of training them in the Academy, and, also, the same as we get if they're on the streets.

LEG. LINDSAY:
I mean, I agree that the problem exists. I just don't know what the solution -- that this is the solution. To me, the solution is to hire more -- is to hire more recruits and get bigger classes going. I just think in this time of additional scrutiny placed upon Police Departments, I think they need more training, not less, and to have different sets of standards for recruits as they come in.

You know, my other question for the Deputy Inspector would be, from -- just from putting through the curriculum, how do you determine -- if you've got 80 new recruits in a class, but 20 of them come out of a different Police jurisdiction, how do you set up the curriculum where you've got 60 going through one set, 20 going through another, and maybe you have a mix in that 20 of different Police Academy -- you know, different police jurisdictions that they came out of? To me, it just sounds like an administrative nightmare to figure out how you're going to teach these -- you know, these recruits coming out with completely different backgrounds?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
It certainly could prove to be problematical for a number of reasons, you know, scheduling, scheduling being certainly one of them, staffing, and, again, as I suggested before, just equipment issues.

LEG. LINDSAY:
I would imagine there's a progression of the training as they go through it, that it's --

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
Yes, sir.
LEG. LINDSAY:
Okay. So you start at the basics, I would think, and then you progress to the more complicated aspects of the job?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
Absolutely.

LEG. LINDSAY:
So what would we do with these recruits that wouldn't need the basic training? What would they do in that interim time period?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
We would have to almost look to set policy, as was suggested before, almost on an individual basis. So here we have ten people, ten recruits, New York City trained, okay. This would be their course of instruction. Somebody from the Binghampton Police Department, this would be his or her course of instruction, after reviewing some of the -- you know, some of the training records that we would hopefully get our hands on.

LEG. LINDSAY:
And, you know, we here look at studies as being, oh, they don't cost anything, but there's a time element that's involved and there's a soft cost that's associated with the time that you and your staff would have to spend on putting together this information, where at the end, I think the result is going to be it's too difficult to implement. You know, again, I think the right solution is just to hire more recruits at this point and get the classes wrapped up, and get everybody on the same type of training. So that's all my questions. Thank you.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. Legislator Calarco?

LEG. CALARCO:
Asked and answered.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. Doc, you're next.

LEG. SPENCER:
Thanks. And I did have the chance to sit in at the committee. I have several thoughts with regards to this, and maybe the sponsor could also consider, is that it is difficult that you've got officers coming from different programs around the country, but also within the same program you have different levels of retention with regards to skills. And one of the ways that, you know, specialties do it, whether if you're an attorney and you move to California, you've got to sit for the Bar exam there. And if you are -- you know, the same thing, if you're a physician or a plumber, whatever you have to do.

So one of the things that we should do is, because there's no way that you could ever figure out a way to have an expedited program -- and to the sponsor, one of the considerations would be, especially in light of now what we saw in Baltimore yesterday and some of the incidents where you could have an officer that's on the street that discharges his gun and there's a question with regards to what his credentials were, is to establish proficiency standards. And so anyone that's coming in, they would be tested in all areas, and then based on -- they would have to achieve a certain level of proficiency and where they were deficient when then they could pick those areas in the curriculum, or they could start at that point in the Academy of where they achieve. That way you encompass everyone, you're playing by the same set of rules. And then, when they graduate from that
Academy, what you're looking for is not just the length of time in the Academy, but you're looking for a proficiency standard, so you know that you've got a certain caliber officer and everyone has those same skills. So that I don't know if that's something that could be incorporated. And that's something a lot more feasible, because there's just too many permutations to figure out an expedited training program, but there could be where this person could come in at the second semester of the Academy, or this person may need to take firearms, or Fire and Rescue, or whatever, you know, aspect. So I don't know. Is there some aspect in this bill, maybe to the sponsor, that could allow them to look at it from a standpoint of proficiency standards? Is that something that has any sort of interest that could maybe solve some of the concerns?

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Yeah, I agree 100%. In fact, in my opening remarks, that's what I said. I think that even though they've trained with guns, they have to show proficiency. I think that they should still have to pass some sort of proficiency test that. Yeah, they studied and learned about the New York State Penal Code, which is the same, but they need to pass a test that says they still remember that stuff. I agree with you. I'm not saying short-circuit anything. It's the same way any of these recruits, even though they go through now, they still have to pass proficiency tests at each one of these stages; is that correct, Deputy Inspector?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
Absolutely.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
So I'm not asking for a short circuit. If they've done, allow them to take a proficiency test and to show that they've retained it, and they're still at that same level of the same -- of the candidates that are coming out.

Understand that these are also experienced officers, so they come into the job with training plus, you know, in many instances. But also, to the way it can be done, you know this isn't just one Academy. Correct me if I'm wrong, Deputy Inspector, but each one of these, the Academy is broken into platoons, or squads, or somewhat, you know. So you could put that platoon in as the -- those one that are up for expediting, so they don't sit there idly because they've already learned it, or something like that. So there are ways that's already broken down within there now. But, Legislator Spencer, that's exactly what I was speaking about.

I'm not trying to tell the Police Department how to study it. As I said before, I had a conversation with the Commissioner about this and I said I come from a police family, my father, my brothers and my son are Police Officers, and I've never sat in a police car, front seat or back seat. But I just want to leave it to the --

LEG. TROTTA:
Not yet.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Not yet.

(*Laughter*)

But I will leave that to the professionals to look at this and come up with a determination as to how's the best way we can do that.
DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
Well, if I could just add one item. I’m sorry, I didn’t mean to interrupt you. Just one of the things that we might need to consider, the issues of liability. And I’ll use an example of driving, okay? I’m from a different agency, okay? I’ve had the emergency vehicle operations course, but I took it three -- I took it years ago. And if I’m involved in a fatal accident, do you open a window -- do you open a window for liability? Perhaps. Firearms training, the use of the taser, and the like. So those are, again, things that we probably will have to enter into discussion about.

LEG. SPENCER:
And I guess if you had a situation where you did that firearms training, and like I have to go and sit for my Boards again to show that I still maintain those standards. So that would address it if there was a proficiency standard, that the person, yeah, they did the training three years ago, but they took the proficiency test, they demonstrated that they still maintain competency, and that would address that they are under us and, you know, they’re valid, their training is valid, and we confirmed that. That might be a method. But I agree with you, it makes a lot of sense.

And I appreciate what you’re trying to do. I think it makes a lot of sense. I know that we need more officers, but nothing can replace experience, which Legislator Browning said. And so we could have a lot of cadets and replacing, but to be able to bring in from other agencies experienced officers and not have to have them sit into Police Officer 101, you know, “This is your gun,” you know, type of thing, then I think that there’s something of validity here and I’ll be supporting it.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Thank you. And if we have a run on the bank in terms of retirements here, we may be forced into a situation like this, where we may not be able to put enough Police Officers through our Academy, even if we wanted to, and to be able to staff safely our streets. So I think it’s something that we should look at. If not, just expedite, but have a backup plan in the event that we have this flurry of retirements and we need to get as many through as possible, doing it effectively and safely. So thank you.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:
Thank you. And thank you, Deputy Inspector, for being here today. My question, and I think you, for the most part, did answer it in your response regarding potential liability just now, but earlier, when you were talking about how the study was going to be conducted, it was going to be done in-house, it was going to be members of the department. It was going to be done relatively quickly, relatively inexpensively, and -- but then you had started to mention that above and beyond just members of the Suffolk County Police Department and law enforcement, that there would be other stakeholders that should be involved in that as well. So I presume, when it comes to questions about liability that we’re raising here today, County Attorney’s Office, our Legal Counsel, among other stakeholders that would have to be a part of that process. I was wondering if you can comment on above and beyond members of the Suffolk County Police Department who else you see having to play an important role as you go through this process.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
My concern would be, if we were to come back and say it would be almost impossible to pull this off. And, certainly, we might be open to criticism, whereas, if it were a multi-agency approach to this thing, then I think we could withstand that type of scrutiny, because we’d have people from other entities within County government say no. We looked at every aspect and this was the final product that we -- or the final recommendation that we came up with. That’s all I’m suggesting here.
LEG. STERN:
So then I would suggest this: Then, certainly, as you go through the process, if you do go through the process in working not just with our County Attorney’s Office, but if we’re talking about potential liability, and we can probably go on and on and on about circumstances and scenarios where you can see potential liability, that perhaps also our County Attorney’s Office can get some kind of outreach, some type of discussion going as you go through this process with representatives from the -- maybe the Federal Justice Department as well, because you can foresee, you know, three steps ahead, where if there are potential liability issues that potentially are not just limited to some of the local issues, not just some of the State issues, but some of the Federal civil rights issues as well. So I would hope that that would be part of your analysis as well.

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
Thank you.

LEG. STERN:
Thank you.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Anker, you're up.

LEG. ANKER:
So I have a question for Legislator McCaffrey. Is this the first time you've spoken with the Deputy Inspector about this, or what has been your line of communication with this resolution?

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
It's the first time I spoke with the Deputy Inspector, but I've spoken with other people in the Police Department on this.

LEG. ANKER:
So now the Deputy Inspector, do you run the training program?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
I was assigned as the Commanding Officer for the Police Academy there, I spent a year there. Currently, I'm assigned to the Office of the Chief of Support Services, so I'm no longer directly supervising the Academy training.

LEG. ANKER:
Okay. So, Legislator McCaffrey, the people that -- the people in charge that you spoke to, are they in support of this bill, the Police Department who's going to be working on this?

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
I'm not sure. You know, they have -- I'm just asking them to look at it. I don't know what the hesitation is. I mean, it's -- just look at it. I'm not saying do it, and I can't say that it's been embraced with open arms. And someone said, "You're not going to mandate that we do this," and I said, "No, I'm just simply asking you to look at it." And I don't think that that would be such a heavy lift with all these things in terms of the dollars and the savings, the potential for so many vacancies in our Police Department where we may have to do something like this to get enough people through the Police Department and staff the Department properly.

I'm just asking them to do it, so I'm not sure what -- there would be any reluctance, other than someone to come up here and say, "You know what, I think we should look at this." You make some valid points. There's got to be some overlap in the training. They're State accredited. Let's move forward with it and we'll you report in 90 days.
LEG. ANKER:
Deputy Inspector, is this a heavy lift? Isn't that what you're saying, that this could be a problem? You know, my concern would be the 90 days that they have to get this done with -- you know, it's a lot involved, so that that's what I'm thinking of first. But, Deputy Inspector, if this is a heavy lift -- let me ask you that question. Is this a heavy lift for you to do?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
It may be. Again, in some instances, and as several of the Legislators have suggested, many of our recruits do come from the New York City Police Department. So, in those terms, it would be pretty easy. It becomes more difficult when it's somebody from outside the normal transitional Police Departments that we see coming and enter into our Academy.

LEG. ANKER:
So do you feel that 90 days would be an issue to have a valid report?

DEPUTY INSPECTOR FASANELLI:
I can't answer at this point, but we're pretty resourceful. We could probably -- you know, we could probably accomplish it within 90 days.

LEG. ANKER:
Okay. Because, again, I think what's really important is that, you know, there's a line of communication. Before any Legislator proposes any resolution, you know, talk to your departments, talk to the people that you're going to be working with. And that's what -- that's my concern, Legislator McCaffrey, that, you know, who have you spoken to within the Police Department to move forward with this resolution?

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
The Commissioner. I mean, I can't go any higher than that.

LEG. ANKER:
And he feels comfortable that this resolution can be successful in the 90 days that you've requested?

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
We had more of a discussion about what I was looking for to do here, and, you know, he didn't say that they couldn't do it. And, you know, he's just noncommittal. I just wanted to make sure he understood what my proposal was. And, I mean, I've sat here through many legislations and many debates on legislation and I questioned whether anybody ever spoke to anybody about them. So, I mean, to say that this is -- this is something new, but I did speak to people, I spoke to them formally, informally, and all of them have suggested that it's something that they probably could do.

LEG. ANKER:
Right. The bottom line is we want this to be successful. You know, we're all in support of expediting, you know, whatever we can to save money. But, also, we want to make sure that our personnel, they're capable of doing this in an efficient and effective way. So, again, my concern is the timing. Ninety days to create a whole new program regarding our law enforcement, it's a little intimidating for me to, you know, accept.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
I did not ask for them to create a whole new program. I asked for them to do a feasibility study within 90 days to see if they could do that. And the timing of the 90 days is so that we may possibly be able, if we want to put a class in in January, or whenever the next class goes in, after maybe this next one that we're thinking about putting in, so that we could take effect for that, for that one. That was the timing of it. It's not to say here's the curriculum, here's what it's going to do. I want
them to be able to match up things, look at the -- get the New York City Police Department curriculum, and then look at our curriculum, see what the overlap is, and determine whether or not it is feasible or possible to do an expedited Academy. I wasn't asking for them to do the detailed analysis of it. I have all the confidence in the world in our Suffolk County Police Department, and we have very smart people there and I'm sure that they could do this.

**LEG. ANKER:**
Okay. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
All right. Legislator Calarco?

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Thank you. I know I had -- was on the list earlier and took myself off, but I'd like to get back on.

You know, sitting and listening to the last half hour of this testimony and debate and conversation, hearing from the Deputy Inspector, I almost feel like we already have a foregone conclusion here. Like, I mean, the Deputy Inspector is standing at the podium and he has probably given us a half a dozen reasons, if not more, why he does not feel that this is going to be a policy or a practice that we're going to be able to effectively institute, whether it's a fact that NYPD is in all likelihood not going to want to share much information with us, because they want us poaching their officers and using them at our Training Academy, or the logistics and the scheduling problems that you might confront, considering -- I guess when you said a day in the life of the Academy is a cadet doing P.D. a portion of the day, and probably some classroom time during the day, and then some other types of training during the day. So to fast-track somebody is not necessarily easily done, because you're going to have them going through differently programs. And so you may need the cadet at P.D. one time, but you may not need them for firearms training, but then you're going to need to put them into the class for some book training, because he's going to have to get brushed up on some of the Penal Codes that applies in Suffolk County, versus where they would come from.

So, I mean, I just feel like we've already gotten our answer. The Police Department is standing here telling us that, "No, we don't believe this is going to be a feasible thing for us to implement." And so whether we pass this resolution or not, I think we already know what's going to happen. They're going to come back to us and they're going to say, "Yeah, we took a look at it, no dice." So I don't know if there's a need to get a feasibility study to get information that we've pretty much already ferreted out sitting here today. So I'm just not sure this is even necessary anymore.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay. Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Listen, I agree that we should do this. To me, the stakes are high. And while we've talked about it for maybe a half an hour, there's a lot more to this analysis than what has met the eye in the last half of an hour. And, certainly, if you believe, Legislator Calarco, that they've pretty much come to a conclusion after a half an hour of discussion, then it seems to me that it's not going to take all that much longer to put there -- to put their, you know, thoughts --

**LEG. CALARCO:**
I don't think --

**LEG. CILMI:**
You know, to crystalize their thoughts in terms of a -- in a formal report or analysis.
LEG. CALARCO:
Right. I don't think it's a half hour of our discussion, but I think they've probably spent some time already preparing themselves to be here today and preparing themselves to be at committee last week to discuss the issue.

LEG. CILMI:
So that being said, then let them crystalize their opinion in the form of an analysis, two, three, four, whatever it takes. Let them speak with the other agencies that they think can collaborate, you know, in forming, you know, a well thought out opinion here, and present it to us and then let's have a discussion about it. But to just talk about it here at the Legislature for a half an hour and get, you know, one opinion, and come to a conclusion that, you know, eh, it's just not worth it, when we're talking about potentially, you know, millions of dollars of savings, we're talking about putting additional cops on the street potentially quicker, which is something that we all appreciate, it seems to me it's worth some time to make the effort to put some information on paper so that we could have a -- you know, a discussion that's filled with context and not just, you know, sort of off-the-cuff conversation. And a lot of the questions that have been presented to the Deputy Inspector here, and that have been asked of the sponsor of this bill, are questions that really should be answered in an analysis.

So I say let's pass this bill now. We are constantly being asked for ideas on how we can -- how we can, you know, save money and do things differently. And this is an idea that's worth looking at, and it's worth looking at it for, you know, formally, and it's worth looking at for a longer period of time than just what we've spent here at the Legislature this afternoon. So I'm in favor of it, and I hope the rest of us are in favor of it as well. Not to say that I'm necessarily in favor of the actual -- you know, of actually doing it, but I'm in favor of asking the experts on policing in Suffolk County to present to us in a formal way whether or not they think it makes sense.

P.O. GREGORY:
And then, if I may, I know we don't always agree, but I think I agree with you on this, Tom. I think, you know, it's a study. The study is supposed to answer questions and not study things that we already have a predetermined conclusion on. I think if you put a study forward that says this is feasible, we can do it, but this is the way we have to do it, and this is what it's going to cost us to do, we have to hire five more instructors, you know, whatever the case may be, I think the study should flesh all that out, as opposed to taking the position, well, we shouldn't even look at it, regardless of whatever requirements we have to put in place to make it work. All right? I think the study, as I said, should weigh all those options, and, you know, we make a conclusion in the end as to if it's feasible or not.

So we have a motion to approve. We have another motion? Motion to table? No? Okay.

LEG. ANKER:
Motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion to table by Legislator Anker.

LEG. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Calarco. Okay. Motion to table goes first. Roll call.
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(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
(Not Present)

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
No.

LEG. TROTTA:
No.

LEG. KENNEDY:
No.

LEG. BARRAGA:
No.

LEG. CILMI:
No.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
No.

LEG. LINDSAY:
No.

LEG. HAHN:
No.

LEG. MURATORE:
No.

LEG. BROWNING:
No.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
No.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
No.
P.O. GREGORY:
No.

LEG. SPENCER:
No.

MR. LAUBE:
Four.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay?

MR. LAUBE:
I'm waiting for you to call.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, I'm sorry. Motion to approve.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.
LEG. ANKER:
No.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I.R. 1200 passes. All right. Oh, I'm sorry. We have Gil Anderson here.

We had passed over, what was it, 1216 in Health? Yes. *I.R. 1216 (Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with renovations at County owned Health Centers (CP 4086) (Sponsor: County Executive)]. Okay. Commissioner, this is the 2015 Capital Budget and Program, appropriating funds in connection with the County-owned health centers. I believe Legislator Cilmi or Trotta had questions.

LEG. D'AMARO:
And, Mr. Presiding, please note my recusal once again on the record.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Thank you.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yeah. I pulled out the contract and it says, you know, and I probably know what you're going to tell me, but I'd like to see it, within 90 days you had to be made aware of these things, of any improvements.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

LEG. TROTTA:
And that was like a year later they're asking us for money?
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, the only involvement we've had is with -- when there are improvements that they wanted to make to some of the facilities, as the code officials, they make those submittals and requests, and we then review them and approve them, and adjust them as need be. At the Tri-County facility, they've done one request regarding a fiberoptic cable, and then recently, we've had discussions about the dental facility, and they're making all the repairs, they're doing all the work at their own cost.

LEG. TROTTA:
So why are we spending $150,000, or whatever this is?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I don't have an answer to that one. Just I know from the -- I'm not familiar with the bill, other than the fact that --

LEG. TROTTA:
But what is it again, DuWayne?

P.O. GREGORY:
I'm sorry.

LEG. TROTTA:
What's the bill number again?

P.O. GREGORY:
1216.

LEG. TROTTA:
It's basically for -- I think it was 115,000 -- $150,000. And I pulled the contract up and it says, you know, within 90 days after the effective date of this lease, we'll do the repairs, not to exceed $100,000. So, you know, here's a year later after we've done this.

MS. LOLIS:
I did make a phone call. From what I could -- from what I could ascertain, I don't have the actual reports that they gave, but they did give the -- they did give us the notice of the repairs within the 90 days, the one -- one of the -- it's just that the resolution wasn't laid on the table until March, but I believe one of the leases was back in July and we received it within 30 days, what repairs needed to be made. And then the other lease wasn't until November or December, and we did receive it within the 90 days.

LEG. TROTTA:
Well, this one is from June of 2014.

MS. LOLIS:
And we received it within -- I confirmed with my office, we received it within 30 days, that one from 2014.

LEG. TROTTA:
Thirty days?

MS. LOLIS:
Within 30 days. It was received in 2014.
LEG. TROTTA:
And it took a year to get here to pay for it?

MS. LOLIS:
I don't -- how it -- why it took so long to get here, I don't know. I know they made the request, they sent us the report. My understanding is that there are people in DPW that actually go through all of the requests that they make.

LEG. TROTTA:
Do you have those things and what was done? What are we paying for?

MS. CULP:
I know in terms of the -- again, it's only the Article 28 changes, so we're not paying for like any changes for the dental suites or anything, paint to beautify the area, it's just in regards to code compliance. So those things include utility, HVAC, ventilation, egress issues. Again, these are things that were either grandfathered in --

LEG. TROTTA:
So you don't know what we did.

MS. CULP:
We haven't done anything, because we've been going through the process.

LEG. TROTTA:
We haven't done anything?

MS. CULP:
No, because we're still going through the permitting process, and then we have to approve it. So, again, it's only 50% or up to 100,000 for Tri-Community.

LEG. TROTTA:
I'm just reading this again. So you've done no work there?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The County has not.

LEG. TROTTA:
Are we going to do it ourselves, or are we going to pay someone to do it?

MS. CULP:
My understanding is that we would -- they we will pay for it, and then we would reimburse, you know, the 50%, capped at 100,000 for Tri-Community.

LEG. TROTTA:
Do you have a list of what they're going to do?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The work that we've been in discussion so far is in our Buildings Department, and it's a work in progress, if you will. As I mentioned, the one issue -- two issues that I was made aware of was the fiberoptic cable that they're running through the building, as well as the dental facility.

LEG. TROTTA:
Why are we running the fiberoptic cable? According to this, it says --
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We're not, they are.

LEG. TROTTA:
So why are we paying for it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We're not. These two issues are outside of the scope. From what I see, it appears as though the standard, the normal day-to-day operation of a building, the HVAC system, the electrical, things like that, we would be responsible for 50% of the cost.

LEG. TROTTA:
But only if it's identified within the first 90 days.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct, and they've submitted their report and we're working on it. It's not -- even though it may be over 90 days, it's something that we have to get their report, we then have to review their report, come to some understanding between our agency and theirs, and, you know, work it out.

LEG. TROTTA:
A year later?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, yeah.

LEG. TROTTA:
Wow.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. That's all the questions we had. Mr. Clerk, do we have a motion and a second?

MR. LAUBE:
Yes, you do.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. And that's to approve?

MR. LAUBE:
Yes, to approve.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All in -- can I have all the Legislators to the horseshoe. Okay, I see you standing over there. Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. KENNEDY:
Opposed.

LEG. TROTTA:
Opposed.

MR. LAUBE:
Who's opposed? Just raise your hand. Fifteen (Recusal: Legislator D'Amaro)
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I'd like to recognize Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Mr. Presiding Officer, I'd like to make a motion to take --

P.O. GREGORY:
Oh, I'm sorry, I apologize. I drew my six-shooter too quickly. 1216A the bond resolution (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $150,000 in Bonds to finance renovations at County-owned health centers (CP 4086.310), same motion, same second. Roll call.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Legislator D’Amaro recuses.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
No.

LEG. TROTTA:
No.

LEG. KENNEDY:
No.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
No.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.
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LEG. MURATORE:
No.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Twelve.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Now I recognize legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Mr. Presiding Officer, I'd like to make a motion to take Resolutions 1111 and 1112 under Public Works out of order.

LEG. CILMI:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. We have a motion and a second to take 1111 -- we have to do one at a time, Counsel says, 1111 out of order. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. 1111 is before us. (1111 - Authorization of alteration of rates for Fire Island Ferries, Incorporated (Sponsor: Presiding Officer).

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Barraga?

LEG. BARRAGA:
I would like to make a motion.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by legislator Barraga, second by Legislator Lindsay. Anyone on the question?

LEG. LINDSAY:
On the motion.
LEG. LINDSAY:
Just on the motion, we -- both Legislator Barraga and myself have worked with the ferry operators, along with the community organizations, and we're able to work out an agreement with them, where everybody was sufficiently satisfied with the outcome of those meetings, and, at this point, we don't have any opposition that is known within the community. So, obviously, I will be voting in favor of this.

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

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

LEG. BARRAGA:
I would like to take a motion -- make a motion to take 1112 out of order.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Motion by Barraga, seconded by Lindsay to take 1112 out of order. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. 1112 is before us. (1112 - Authorization of alteration of rates for Fire Island Ferries, Incorporated (Sponsor: Presiding Officer Gregory)

LEG. BARRAGA:
Motion to approve.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion to approve by Barraga, second by Lindsay on I.R. 1112. Any questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Back to Page 10. I.R. 1202 (Appropriating funds in connection with improvements to various Sheriff's Office facilities (CP 3019) (Sponsor: County Executive).

LEG. BROWNING:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Browning, I'll second. Anyone on the question? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. **I.R. 1202A**, bond resolution (*Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $200,000 Bonds to finance the cost of improvements to Various Sheriff’s Office facilities (CP 3019.310)*), same motion, same second. Roll call.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. BROWNING:
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:
Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.
LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.  I.R. 1225 - Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of Heavy Duty Vehicles for the Police Department (CP 3135) (Sponsor: County Executive).

LEG. BROWNING:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by legislator Browning; second. On the motion, anyone?

LEG. CILMI:
To bond.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All in -- on the motion, legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
I'm sorry. I'm not in Public Safety. Just a quick explanation of exactly what this -- what these heavy-duty vehicles are and why they're necessary.

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Lieutenant Doherty. I'm with the Suffolk County Police Department.

I'm in receipt of a short explanation from Deputy Inspector Mike Shanahan, who is the CO of Special Patrol. We currently have six patrol trucks and a patrol van. Four of the trucks have over 200,000 miles on them; 267,000 miles, 283,000 miles, 246, and 233. It's not unusual for two or three of these vehicles to be out at any one time. So this purchase would go a long way in helping us help out our Emergency Service Unit.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. So those four vehicles, it sounds like, are well past the point at which we would expect them to at some point just kind of die on the road.

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
They are diesel vehicles, and diesel vehicles do last a little bit longer, but they do have very, very high mileage on them.
LEG. CILMI:
Right. Okay. So you would view this or the Department would view this as an absolute necessity for public safety purposes at this time?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Correct. Some of the equipment that the Emergency Service officers carry, in addition to the tactical weapons and vests, would be HAZMAT equipment, power tools, air bags which can lift vehicles, and trains even if we need to. So we have to have those vehicles out and about to ensure public safety.

LEG. CILMI:
Sure. Okay. Thanks very much.

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
You're welcome.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:
What's the age of those vehicles now?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
That information I don't have, I just have the mileage with me.

LEG. LINDSAY:
More than five years old, more than 10 years old?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Some of them look like they’re about 10 to 12 years old.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Okay. So --

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
That's just from my -- that's my guess.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Okay. The other question, I mean, it's obvious that if one of these vehicles will break down, it would probably happen during the most extreme emergency that we would have with HAZMAT, lifting vehicles and all the type of equipment that's housed on them.

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
And again, with that type of mileage, they do break down quite often, and they do have to go to DPW to be fixed. And while those trucks are down, you know, the equipment is there as well. We have to secure the equipment back at -- back at the ES base. So it makes doing the job of and ES Officer a lot more difficult.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Okay. Thank you.

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
You're welcome.
P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Schneiderman.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
This, obviously, is for the PD, it's not for FRES, but it's -- basically, it's an emergency service type of vehicle. I haven't seen the vehicles, I don't fully understand what they do. I just want to understand. In terms of who pays the debt service here, is this a Police function, is it a whole County function? Is this coming -- part of the Headquarters operation, or is this something that is a precinct operation; do you know?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
I don't know offhand. The appropriation resolution says it's 2015 Capital Budget.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Maybe Dr. Lipp knows who's paying the debt service on it. Is it whole County or just Police District?

MR. LIPP:
I'll get back to you on that one in a few minutes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:

LEG. D'AMARO:
Hi. What's your position in the Police Department?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
I'm a Lieutenant. I work for the Chief of Department's Office.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So do you work in the area of the -- are you responsible for these particular vehicles?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
No, I am not.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So have the vehicles that we're looking to replace -- you said four of them had over the 200,000. What did the other two have?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
That information I don't know.

LEG. D'AMARO:
You don't know. All right. And how many vehicles is the Department looking to purchase?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Right now, one.

LEG. D'AMARO:
One for the 175,000?
LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Uh-huh. And is there a specific incident that occurred where the mileage on the vehicle became a factor in responding or --

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Not to my knowledge. There was not one specific incident, but according to the notes I have from the CO of Special Patrol, it's not unusual for two or three of these trucks to be down at any one time.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right, but we have six of them now or seven?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Six patrol trucks and a patrol van.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Oh, one's a van.

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Yeah. I don't believe the vans are able to carry the same equipment.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. So when we purchase the one additional vehicle, or the one replacement -- is it an additional vehicle, or is it a replacement vehicle? Are we taking -- decommissioning one or -- do you know?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
That, I don't know. I would imagine, with the amount of mileage on some of them, that one or two of them are probably not far from being decommissioned.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right. So they become surplus, in effect?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah.

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Well, actually, once they're decommissioned, we cannot use them.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah, so they --

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
It will be sold.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Sold, or whatever we do --
LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
-- scrap. So you don't know if we're taking one out of service; we might wind up with seven
vehicles?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
It's possible.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah. The reason why I ask is because a vehicle could -- you know, as it gets older and the mileage
gets higher, of course, I guess it's more probable that it's going to be -- need more repair, but --

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
That's correct. I do have a note on here that the ideal plan would be to replace a truck about every
other -- every other year.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right. So you're starting a program of just trying not to get to the 280,000 miles?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Correct. I mean, once you're at that high a mileage, you're -- you know, you're playing against
time. It's only a matter of time until the truck is unusable.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So why wasn't the request made earlier, then?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
I don't know.

LEG. D'AMARO:
See, that's why I asked you about a specific incident. You know, did something happen where
someone said, you know, "We need to address this, these trucks are unreliable"? We're saying that
we need to replace one because they're high on mileage, but, yet, they've been relied on. They're
being relied on today as we talk about this.

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So I'm just trying --

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
I don't have any information on the timing of the request.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So who would make that decision?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
It would probably come from the Commanding Officer of the Special Patrol Bureau. He would
inventory his vehicles and basically study, see how much they're in service and how much they're
out of service.
LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Based upon that, request a new vehicle.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right. And in fairness to the Commanding Officer, this request might have been put in months ago, or even in the past.

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
That's possible.

LEG. D'AMARO:
And for budgetary reasons, it was not prioritized high enough to get the attention, so I really don't know the history.

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
That is certainly a possibility.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. Thank you, I appreciate it.

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
You're welcome.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
I can speak, they're junk, they're old, they're beat up. I was in one not that long before I retired.

My question is, 175 grand? It's basically just a box truck, you know, with things on the back?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Well, I know that they're able to winch, able to upright vehicles. The lockers on them are fairly expensive.

LEG. TROTTA:
It's not the equipment in it, it's just the truck.

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Just the truck. From my understanding, it's just the truck.

LEG. TROTTA:
Wow. Okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Who makes it?
LIEUTENANT DOHERTY: 
That, I don't know.

LEG. TROTTO: 
Ford.

P.O. GREGORY: 
Okay.

LEG. SPENCER: 
Is it an armored vehicle?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY: 
It's not armored.

LEG. D'AMARO: 
Wouldn't that have to go through a process for procurement anyway, I mean, you know, to make sure we're not getting ripped off?

P.O. GREGORY: 
Yeah, I would imagine.

LEG. D'AMARO: 
Is there a procurement process with safeguards to make sure that we're not overpaying for the vehicle?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY: 
I'm not privy to the procurement process.

LEG. D'AMARO: 
I don't know. Maybe Commissioner Anderson, I saw him earlier, Gil knows the answer to that question.

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY: 
I would imagine there are very few manufacturers of this type of vehicle.

LEG. D'AMARO: 
Yeah, I think you're right, you know. So I'm not saying that we are overpaying, but just what's the check and balance on that, that's all.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: 
Yeah. The equipment would be bid, it would be publicly bid.

LEG. D'AMARO: 
Oh, so it would be bid.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: 
And that's the way we'd procure that.

LEG. D'AMARO: 
Okay. All right. Thank you. Thank you.
P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Do we have a motion and a second?

MR. LIPP:
Case in point --

P.O. GREGORY:
Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. LIPP:
-- to finish off the question that was asked before, it's the Police District debt, not General Fund, Police District.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right? We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 1225A (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $175,000 Bonds to finance the acquisition of a heavy duty vehicle for the Police Department (CP 3135.528), bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

LEG. TROTTA:
On the motion. On the motion. I just want to know how long the bond is for.

MR. LIPP:
It remains to be seen. It could be a five-year bond. It could be worked in with all of the other projects and be a much larger number of years, perhaps 18 is the average, so it remains to be seen. But if I was a betting person, I would say probably five years, but we'll have to wait and see. It's up to the Treasurer how they -- how they structure it.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Is there -- if I may, was there an analysis of the debt service to the bond?

MR. LIPP:
For this particular one?

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah.

MR. LIPP:
So I just ran some quick numbers and it would average about 14,000 and change a year, if you did it over eight years.

LEG. TROTTA:
Eight years?

MR. LIPP:
Well, if you did -- I'm sorry, over 18 years. That would be the long one. I didn't have an opportunity of running a shorter program, that would take me a couple of minutes. But according to the Executive -- okay, I apologize. According to the Executive, it would be $272,000 over 10 years,
so that's 27,000 a year.

**LEG. TROTTA:**
Say that again?

**MR. LIPP:**
According to the County Executive's Fiscal Impact Statement, it would be 272,000 and change over ten years, so that would be 27,000 a year.

**LEG. TROTTA:**
So you're paying an extra $100,000 for bonding it for ten years?

**MR. LIPP:**
That's -- you get interest costs when you borrow.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay. Anyone else?

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Robert, were you able to answer the question I asked before?

**MR. LIPP:**
Yes. It's Police District monies.

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

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay. All right. We have a motion and a second. Roll call.

*(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)*

**LEG. BROWNING:**
Yes.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**
Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Pass.

**LEG. STERN:**
Yes.

**LEG. MC CAFFREY:**
Yes.

**LEG. TROTTA:**
Pass.
LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
No.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
No.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMANN:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
No.

MR. LAUBE:
Fifteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.  *I.R. 1226 - Appropriating funds in connection with the Communication System Microwave Spur Upgrade (CP 3243)(Sponsor: County Executive).*

LEG. BROWNING:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Browning.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMANN:
Second.
P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Schneiderman. Anyone on the question? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 1226A (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $225,000 Bonds to finance the cost of communication system microwave spur upgrade (CP 3243.510), bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes. I apologize, yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
No.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.
LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
No.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Sixteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I.R. 1227 (Appropriating funds in connection with Equipment for Police Investigations (CP 3516) (Sponsor: County Executive).

LEG. BROWNING:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Browning. I'll second. Anyone on the motion? Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
What is it?

P.O. GREGORY:
It's equipment for police investigations.

(*Laughter*)

I don't know.

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Mr. Trotta, it's to replace the Total Station equipment that the Crime Scene Officers use. The total station, I don't know if you've ever seen it on TV or in the newspaper; when there's a crime scene, especially a homicide or a fatal motor vehicle accident, it's that laser equipment that Crime Scene uses to accurately gauge distances with precision. And from what I understand, the equipment that they're currently using is about eight or nine years old, and, unfortunately, now, especially in extreme weather conditions, the equipment is not working as intended.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. We have a motion and a second. All in favor?

LEG. D'AMARO:
Wait, hold on. I'm sorry.
P.O. GREGORY:
Oh, I'm sorry.

LEG. D'AMARO:
I had a question.

P.O. GREGORY:
Oh, okay. I didn't know.

LEG. D'AMARO:
That's okay. So the equipment we're using right now is the same laser technology, or is it different?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
I believe it's similar, but I think it's an upgrade over what we had. Again, I'm not an expert, I was never worked in Crime Scene, but as was explained to me, that it will do the same job, basically.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right. The equipment that we're using now, whatever it is, is it failing?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
It is, yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
It is? In what respect?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
From time to time, especially in extreme weather conditions. This winter, apparently there was one particular crime scene where they actually had to mark it manually, leave the crime scene, hold it and then come back and redo it.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay.

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Until weather conditions improved. I think extreme heat and cold will expand and contract the actual housing, and after a while moisture can seep in and interfere with the laser.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right. But is it fair to say 98% of the time the equipment that we have now is functional and doing a sufficient job?

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
I wouldn't be able to put a percentage on it.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay.

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
It was explained to me that in the extreme weather conditions, most notably winter, that they were failing.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right. It's $132,000 for -- my notes here say four sets of laser measuring equipment. So --
LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Does that mean we're replacing all of our equipment or some of it? And, you know, I'm trying to justify the expense, if --

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
I think four sets would not be all of it, that's just my guess. I believe they have more than four sets, but this would begin to replace all the equipment. And again, that's an entire package. It comes with the Total Station and all the other tripods and charging equipment and poles and whatnot, all the accessory devices.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Uh-huh. Okay.

LIEUTENANT DOHERTY:
And again, speaking from an investigative standpoint, other than a camera, this is probably the most often used tool that the Crime Scene Officers use.

LEG. D'AMARO:
All right. And to the Budget Office, what's the cost over five years?

MR. LIPP:
One hundred and forty-five thousand.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Interest?

MR. LIPP:
So that the interest is only 13,000.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Thirteen a year?

MR. LIPP:
No, total.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Total.

MR. LIPP:
Right. I'm sorry. It's 29,000 total for the debt -- for the interest. Also, what should be stated also is that the current equipment, you really need two officers to work with this equipment, you should be able to do it with one officer.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. That answers my questions. Thank you, Officer, appreciate it. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen.  (Not Present: Legislator Martinez)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.  **I.R. 1227A, (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $132,000 Bonds to finance the purchase of equipment for police investigations (CP 3516.510), bond resolution.  Same motion, same second.  Roll call.**

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Pass.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
No.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
No.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.
LEG. HAHN:  
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:  
No.

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:  
Fifteen.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Okay.  *I.R. 1233 - Appropriating funds in connection with Fire Rescue C.A.D. System Upgrades (CP 3416)(Sponsor: County Executive).*

LEG. BROWNING:  
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Motion by Legislator Browning.

LEG. HAHN:  
(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:  
Second by Legislator Hahn. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:  
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:  
*I.R. 1233A (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $750,000 Bonds to finance the cost of Fire Rescue C.A.D. System upgrades (CP 3416.514).* Same motion, same second. Roll call.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. BROWNING:  
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:  
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:  
Yes.
LEG. D'AMARO:
I wish I had a chance to ask a question on this, but okay, yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
There's somebody here from FRES, if you need to ask.

LEG. SPENCER:
We're in the middle of a vote.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah, no, you can't.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
No.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.
MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen.

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 1234 - Appropriating funds in connection with improvements to the Suffolk County Fire Training Center (CP 3405) (Sponsor: County Executive).

LEG. HAHN:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. MURATORE:
(Raised hand).

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Muratore. Anyone on the motion? All in --

LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion?

P.O. GREGORY:
On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
I have a question about the -- is this in relation to the brush truck training course?

MR. VETTER:
Good afternoon. Joel Vetter, I'm the Chief of Support Services for Fire Rescue. No, it's not. It's replacing the inoperable, currently not in service, water-oil separator for the entire Fire Academy complex. So the brush truck course, though within the confines of the property, is outside the fence of our training area.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Anyone else? Okay. You got a question there?

LEG. TROTTA:
Yeah, what is it for?

MR. VETTER:
It's a water-oil separator. So it's the catchment basins for the water. The water that we use at the Fire Academy is recycled and separated from the hydrocarbons, so we're environmentally friendly and being green. Plus we recirculate the water and reuse the water; so, if we have fuel products in there and we're putting that on the fire, we're creating a hazardous and dangerous situation. It will also allow us to separate out any of the particles of the unburnt ordinary combustibles; hay, wood, things along that line.

LEG. TROTTA:
A hundred and fifty thousand dollars for a water separator?
MR. VETTER:
Water-oil separator. So the piping has to be dug up and changed. It literally connects to each catch basin and drain at the existing sites, and it also ties into the current sump pumps within the basements of the training buildings.

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

LEG. D'AMARO:
Thank you. Just to follow-up, the -- we're doing this separating currently, but the system we have in place failed?

MR. VETTER:
The system -- many years ago, the County went to a simulated propane gas fire, and then the water-oil separating system was not maintained as effectively, and the technology and requirements from the environmental or regulatory side has changed. So, to answer your question, it's still functioning, does not meet the standards, and does not allow us to separate --

LEG. D'AMARO:
But I don't understand. So the system was not being utilized.

MR. VETTER:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So we're changing the method of training so that now we need the system again?

MR. VETTER:
There are -- there is a liability and opportunity where hydrocarbons, fuel-based products --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

MR. VETTER:
-- are in the training system. Rather, it's gas and augmented, or even what's called smart technology, smart Class A technology. Imagine a crib with wood in it, the fire is started with the gas propane, and then it gives us the effects of the ordinary fire. So there are other capital projects that are coming within the larger scope of the projects that are changing the technology over. So the gas fire simulation is over 20 years old; that technology has got to be retrofitted and changed out, that's next year. We can't do that until we get the water-oil separator put in place.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So there's another project coming down the line that's in our Capital Budget --

MR. VETTER:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
-- to upgrade the fire system. And forgive me, I don't know the exact terms, but in order to do that upgrade, this system needs to go into place?

MR. VETTER:
That's correct.
LEG. D'AMARO:
So we're changing -- we're changing the system that we use, so, therefore, now we need the separator system again?

MR. VETTER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
And why wasn't this included as part of the capital project for the next year's project?

MR. VETTER:
Because it was segued out with the amount of budgetary money --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Uh-huh.

MR. VETTER:
-- as well as the ability for us to perform the projects in the time. So we want to avoid closing the Academy during operational season, which is now.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay.

MR. VETTER:
For us to appropriate the money within the regular confines of Capital Projects, now's the time to appropriate it so we could sell the bonds in August, and then do the project in the Fall when the Academy is closed. So every roadway will actually be gouged, pipe worked on. It's very extensive. So we've done some of the -- out of the current funding of 3405, that's the Capital Project.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

MR. VETTER:
We've already replaced the sump pump in one of the buildings. So at the next --

LEG. D'AMARO:
What's the total of that Capital Project, do you know off hand?

MR. VETTER:
Currently, we have about $71,000 that's being encumbered for various repairs and maintenance. So we've been going through metal fabrication work, restoration of the floors, and then we have the 150,000 this year, 50,000 in planning and design, which that RFP was already put out, and then 100,000 of construction. Next year, it's one million. So that's the replacement of proposed for the taxpayer, that's the commercial building and the tower. So the maintenance cost on that, so you're aware, is roughly $60,000 a year by us changing the system out. If we get the taxpayer off the building this year before June, it's a $28,000 savings.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. So this is part of a larger renovation and upgrade?

MR. VETTER:
Yes.
LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. Thank you. I appreciate it. Thank you.

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

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I.R. 1234A, bond resolution (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $150,000 in Bonds to finance the cost of improvements to the Suffolk County Fire Training Center (CP 3405.121 and .323). Same motion, same second. Roll call.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
No.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.
LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay

I.R. 1235 - Appropriating funds in connection with FRES Vehicle Replacement Program (CP 3515) (Sponsor: County Executive).

LEG. BROWNING:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Browning.

LEG. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:

LEG. KENNEDY:
Thank you, Chairman. I asked one of the questions at committee, and I thought I knew what I was talking about. And last night I ran into a DOT inspector and I ran it by him and he gave me a bunch more questions to ask. So, if I remember them correctly, what is the weight, the maximum weight load that the present vehicle that only has 18,000 and change miles on it can hold?

MR. VETTER:
It cannot exceed more than 28,000 pounds.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. What is the weight of the new equipment that you want to put in?

MR. VETTER:
The weight of the equipment requires a twin axle, which is proposed, which would hold up to 32,000 pounds. The other issue with adding the weight, which I couldn't tell you the specific number of the weight, I could tell you what's engineered and design in the spec, required us to go up to a twin
axle. If we were to take some of that weight and add it, so an additional pole off the rear of the current command post, no bump-outs, it's going to increase the wear and tear on the axle and reduce the actual stopping distance from the engineer brake system of 11 years ago.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Do you have -- I read in a repair statement about the generator use. The generator is used for?

**MR. VETTER:**
The generator? So the vehicle is not driven over large distances, but it's operated for prolonged periods of time. When the vehicle gets on site or on center, on station you could say, the vehicle motor is physically shut off and the two generators provide electrical power for the entire operation of the vehicle, as well as base camp, so capabilities of plugging into it and providing the electric to other aspects.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Other aspects of?

**MR. VETTER:**
Tents, shelters, structures, cellular cow towers, you know, if we're going to provide power into something in that way. So, for example, in Sandy, it was dragged down, physically dragged down to Fire Island and operated there as their infrastructure of Fire Island for a prolonged period of time.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Okay. This gentleman told me that you don't need a second axle. He said you can adjust the spring ratio. I don't know what that is, but I'm asking.

**MR. VETTER:**
So I could tell you, out of the 26 years of my experience in emergency service, and this is not the first multi-million dollar truck I've built, that is not a true statement. So, you know, from a vehicle aspect, if we're talking just a vehicle, absolutely. I did provide and I could give you some drawings of what's being proposed. The mass weight off the rear of it in itself creates a significant weight load. The vehicle is also going to be much more top heavier with the center of gravity because it's taller, as well as the bump-out reaches on the components. So it requires our ability to put jacks for stabilization when it shows up, four power jacks drop down and literally give it a stable base. So we cannot -- we did look at pricing. I could provide that offline, and we could provide to you some of the maintenance costs that we have and some of our concerns. It's not something that we publicly share, because we're looking to sell the vehicle and trade it in.

Some preliminary numbers that we're looking at there is about $120,000 that we're going to be able to recapture. That will be built into the bid of the vehicle. So it doesn't go out to salvage and wait to be surplussed, it has to be taken, privately sold, and/or a trade-in value applied.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Okay. So that's 120 off the 500?

**MR. VETTER:**
No, in addition.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
In addition to. And we were told at committee that you're getting a grant for some money; how much is the grant?
MR. VETTER:
So FRES traditionally manages the regional UASI grant, the Urban Area Safety Initiative grant, as well as SHSP, which is the Homeland Security Grant. We've already appropriated, out of a mixture of budget lines there in those grants, in the amount of around $235,000 for technology.

LEG. KENNEDY:
So that's in addition to the 500?

MR. VETTER:
Yes. The vehicle that's here that we could send around is estimated between 760 to 780, in that line. I don't have copies for everybody, but --

MR. LAUBE:
I could make them.

MR. VETTER:
Sure.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Are you finished now, Legislator Kennedy?

LEG. KENNEDY:
I just want to look at that, but thank you.

MR. VETTER:
Sure.

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

LEG. D'AMARO:
So we presently have a vehicle in use.

MR. VETTER:
We have two vehicles. We have a large mobile command post that this is replacing, which is called MCU1, and we have a small truck chassis, which is MCU2. Both vehicles are used not only by FRES, but shared as backups to the Police Department.

LEG. D'AMARO:
How often have they been used as backups to the Police Department?

MR. VETTER:
So Hostage Negotiation uses it.

LEG. D'AMARO:
No, but when; when's the last time it was used?

MR. VETTER:
They're used --

LEG. D'AMARO:
For hostage negotiation.
MR. VETTER:
So for law enforcement matters, I would have to give you an estimate of about 15 to 20 times per year in that matter. It's supporting an upcoming POD at the Police Department that the Health Department's running, the large mobile command post is going to provide incoming satellites.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. So it was used 15 or 20 times in the last year. Did it ever fail during that use?

MR. VETTER:
It has technology that we're not able to utilize.

LEG. D'AMARO:
The question was did it fail?

MR. VETTER:
It has failed and it has been out of service.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Tell me how it failed.

MR. VETTER:
We've lost the mast in the rear. So for the Montauk parade, where we support --

LEG. D'AMARO:
No, no, no. I'm talking about with the hostages 15 to 20 times a year, did the vehicle fail?

MR. VETTER:
No, it didn't physically fail there.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. How many miles are on this vehicle?

MR. VETTER:
There is roughly 18,000 miles on it.

LEG. D'AMARO:
But you're considering a trade-in for that, right?

MR. VETTER:
Absolutely. So there's a -- there's a formula for large vehicles for municipalities on capital projects that we utilized for the arc. So it's an arc of the placement value --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

MR. VETTER:
-- versus replacement value.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Was there -- so there's some new technology in the vehicle you want to purchase for $750,000?

MR. VETTER:
So the overall square footage space is a significant issue that's --
LEG. D'AMARO:
How would that have made a difference in those 20 responses where the vehicle was utilized to have extra square footage in the truck?

MR. VETTER:
Specifically, an example would be at the Cupsogue fire. We're limited with the amount people that were put in there. So there's expansions within the Incident Management Assistant Team, which is called an IMAT Team. That IMAT Team comes to a location and works within the command structure. So it's aiding the 109 fire departments and 27 EMS agencies.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So you were not effective in doing that with this vehicle?

MR. VETTER:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
You were not?

MR. VETTER:
Correct. Some of the technology that's being added to it is cellular --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Tell me how it wasn't effective.

MR. VETTER:
So planning of time. There's also the degree of connectivity. So currently in the system that's required, for example, would be a large scale brush fire. We have to call back to the radio room to actually activate other agencies. There's no connection to the central CAD System --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

MR. VETTER:
-- and/or toning capabilities of the radio. So the radios that are in the current system are mobile radios, just like in any sector car or a fire truck. So it requires multiple individual radio resources at each work position. The new system would allow us to centralize a network of a radio. So we're sharing a resource and sharing the antennas so it gives us reach.

The other aspect is the ultra-high frequency, the UHF stuff. So UHF is positioning when it comes to the antennas. Currently, the fire service is outgrowing and going away, as well as the companies, Motorola specifically is doing away with low ban technology. The majority of your fire districts are utilizing UHF frequencies. In some of those areas, mast height and position of the antenna means we're able to communicate and support them or we're not. So take the 800 system, similar to that, where we have issues of dead zones, per se, in Huntington, take the issues with the lack of antenna sites and microwave connectivity on the East End Forks, and it significantly limits our capabilities. So it's created an environment over the last several years where we have to find work-arounds. So we're calling back to a room. We're adding live-ware, human-ware components on that, and those are just unfortunate opportunities for things to fall through a crack.

LEG. D'AMARO:
I understand what you're saying, that the new truck with the newer equipment might facilitate being somewhat more efficient in a critical period of time; that's what you're saying?
MR. VETTER:
That's correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Uh-huh. But what I'm trying to understand is to what extent you've been impeded without having the new truck. I mean, I've never heard anyone really complain that the response -- the response of our first responders to that type of emergency has been nothing but stellar. So it seems to me just --

MR. VETTER:
Sure.

LEG. D'AMARO:
It seems to me that the departments that would utilize this vehicle have been able to utilize it successfully.

MR. VETTER:
So I think, speaking to the aspect of response, in comparison to what we're operating in is different to the effect of overall effectiveness and capabilities.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

MR. VETTER:
We're living in a culture that is drastically changing. I've sat here and I listened to the drone conversation.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah. What's drastically changing is people can't afford to live here and pay interest for $750,000 vehicles.

MR. VETTER:
I totally agree with that.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So that's -- you know, let's not -- let's just talk about the --

MR. VETTER:
No. I was trying to --

LEG. D'AMARO:
You have a truck now, you want a new truck. Tell me why we should spend $750,000 to replace a vehicle that has only 18,000 miles on it. You did explain some of that, the mast height, the technology. But my point is that I've never heard anyone say that this vehicle was insufficient, or that our response was not top-notch. I mean, are you telling me that we are not doing the best job that we can? I mean, I don't understand that.

MR. VETTER:
So my personal opinion? I think as an emergency responder, and as, you know, your Chief of Support Service for Fire Rescue, I believe we can do a better job. And I think we need to support initiatives that provide some cost savings.
LEG. D'AMARO:
Right. So this truck --

MR. VETTER:
So there is a cost savings on maintenance.

LEG. D'AMARO:
But this truck would also be used at fairs, funerals, the marathon, I mean --

MR. VETTER:
Correct. So there's a command structure in all of that.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Don't get me wrong, I admire the fact that you're here to advocate for this. But it seems to me that I'm not 100% convinced that we need to replace this vehicle at this time, given our budgetary constraints. You have a vehicle, it's functional, it works, you've been working with it. I've never heard anyone say that our response was not sufficient based on this vehicle. I'm not -- you know, it's just like kind of, you know --

MR. VETTER:
It's not like --

LEG. D'AMARO:
-- there's a new -- there's a new i-Phone out, I need to have it kind of thing.

MR. VETTER:
Not the case. This is not something that hasn't been planned for, and it actually was a discussion in the prior Capital Project submittals, but we just didn't have the means to live by that.

I don't take, you know, lightly, what money we're asking for you and the taxpayers to spend, I could assure you of that. And we've made modifications in our Capital Projects over the last two years. So a prime example would be on the Fire Academy side.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

MR. VETTER:
Last year, this governing body, or the governing body at that point, appropriated $5 million for the Fire Academy. During the planning phase that we did internally, we identified that we couldn't spend that in an appropriate time manner.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

MR. VETTER:
We proposed and we worked with Budget Review and the Executive body and we reduced that to a million dollars next year.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

MR. VETTER:
So, you know, I don't take it lightly, you know, the numbers we're throwing at it.
**LEG. D'AMARO:**
I'm not --

**MR. VETTER:**
I know you're not.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
I am not expressing an opinion as to what you're thinking, I'm expressing an opinion as to what I'm thinking.

**MR. VETTER:**
Okay.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
All right? And I appreciate the fact that you're in a position of having more specifics than I do. But it seems to me that you're not giving me an instance where this vehicle has not really performed. You're using it and it's being utilized, you know.

**MR. VETTER:**
So, again, in instances of use of the tower --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Uh-huh.

**MR. VETTER:**
I mean, if you want physical locations and calls, I could work on that with, you know, our Chief of Communications, Greg Miniutti, pull out those areas of some of the technology of where it's limited, and we could provide that for you in a detailed aspect.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Right. But if it's limited and there was an emergency response required, the Department has dealt with that somehow.

**MR. VETTER:**
Yes. But as we're building out the UHF and the VHF paging capabilities --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Right.

**MR. VETTER:**
-- we're literally aging this vehicle out of service. If we wait two or three years to try to do this --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Right.

**MR. VETTER:**
-- the vehicle is going to have no resale value.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
No resale value. Okay. Thank you. I appreciate it. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Legislator Trotta?
LEG. TROTTA:
What does this vehicle do?

MR. VETTER:
The vehicle is broken down, if you look at the three -- the drawings.

LEG. TROTTA:
No. What does the existing vehicle do?

MR. VETTER:
It's a mobile command post?

LEG. TROTTA:
And what do you do in it?

MR. VETTER:
What are we doing in it? So the three areas of operation is communications support, so that --

LEG. TROTTA:
You talk on the radio. Go ahead.

MR. VETTER:
We also issue cache radios out. So we --

LEG. TROTTA:
Radios, okay.

MR. VETTER:
We manage the County's assets for portable radios, which I know seems like it might not be nothing major, but the new portables that we're buying are $5,000 radios. So, if we don't have accountability to it, that's a significant loss of Federal-funded dollars. The central area is a lot of the plotters and printers that would be put in there, and the rack-mounted technology service. So it gives us the ability to grow with the vehicle over the life span of it in comparison to growing out of it. And the rear of the vehicle with the two bump-outs is the command and control area. So that's where we look to bring in a unified command within the standard, so that's the local Fire Chiefs, EMS providers, who's ever running those individual branches of that operation.

LEG. TROTTA:
So you talk on the radio, you hand out the radios, and you sit in it. That's what it does. I've been in it, I know what happens in there.

MR. VETTER:
I guess in a simple way, that could be phrased that way.

LEG. TROTTA:
Okay. To the budget guy. Have we paid for this one yet? Do you know that the bond is only ten years old?

MR. LIPP:
No. This -- all this does is it appropriates the funds. The bond won't be issued until the TAN --

LEG. TROTTA:
No, I'm talking about the old one.
MR. LIPP:
Oh, well --

LEG. TROTTA:
Have we paid for it yet? I mean, we spent a lot of money on it, we probably bonded it. I want to know if we paid for it yet.

MR. LIPP:
We probably didn't finish paying for it.

LEG. TROTTA:
Excuse me?

MR. LIPP:
We probably did not finish paying for it. I would have to go back and make sure.

LEG. TROTTA:
So let's just summarize here. We have a 2004 truck with 18,000 miles that we sit in it, talk on the radio and hand out radios for. I've been in trucks like this, I know exactly what goes on. To request to pay another $700,000 for this is absurd, and when we just before paid for communications equipment. The radios work when the radios work, and they don't work when they're not going to work. I went through this again with the other new radios. I mean, this is just absurdity.

MR. VETTER:
Legislator Trotta, I would welcome you, as well as any of the other Legislators, to please come out and look. The infrastructure is aging. BRO sent out their representative. We spent an extensive period of time with them and walked the grounds, showed him everything, discussed it with him in detail. The infrastructure that we're operating on in public safety is beyond age. Don't confuse the communications structure that we use in Fire Rescue as the County 800 system. The 109 Fire Departments and 27 EMS agencies operate in the UHF and VHF spectrum. That's not supported in this County. The VHF side of the project that we're looking to do in the future is over 20 years old.

LEG. D'AMARO:
What's 20 years old?

MR. VETTER:
The VHF side of the system. So the next phases of CAD and some of the other stuff that's coming into play is extremely old.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Can't you just replace the equipment?

MR. VETTER:
No.

LEG. TROTTA:
I have another question.

LEG. D'AMARO:
No? It's impossible?
MR. VETTER:
It's impossible and it's IP based. The new stuff is all computer based, you know, where --

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you. I think that was my question, is couldn't you just retrofit the existing truck with the new communications equipment? That was what I was waiting for to ask. I mean, to put -- and I know what you're saying about the new technology. I understand that -- the trade out there.

MR. VETTER:
The space doesn't allow for it, the weight doesn't allow for it. If we restricted and built it based on what we could fit into it, it would not exceed the life -- increase the life expectancy of the current vehicle within the 5-25-5 rule. It's not going to add that much to the life of the vehicle. So we'd actually be throwing, I would have to estimate, 2 or $300,000 into a vehicle that's not going to make the life any bit longer.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So maybe I -- well, I'll ask it. So I know this is a great vehicle, low mileage, excellent condition, because we're trying to sell it. Who's in the market for this?

MR. VETTER:
I would have to say that a law enforcement background would be looking for something like this. So we've already -- the main -- the original manufacturer of it and a competitor have already been provided photos of it and general estimates of what we're looking for that vehicle.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
What was it doing at the Montauk parade?

MR. VETTER:
We were supporting the law enforcement aspect. So there is a lack of repeater sites out there for the Police Department. So we take the Federal cache of radios, and when all the other police agencies go out there and provide law enforcement, we have to give them radios so that all the law enforcement guys could talk on the same frequency.

LEG. TROTTA:
Did you have to go out there in that thing? It has the repeater on it?

MR. VETTER:
It has the repeater on it. It also took the aspect of the senior police or the -- you know, the Incident Commander into that location for centralized management.

LEG. TROTTA:
Was there any problems at the Montauk parade?
MR. VETTER:
I don't know that, sir. Maybe that was the good side of us being there, subjectively.

LEG. D’AMARO:
But it worked. You didn't have a dispute with the old truck, is the point.

MR. VETTER:
No. But the camera height out there as an issue and it limits us. So you'll see on the new one, the newer technology allows it to flip the other way.

LEG. D’AMARO:
You know, the new height is going to be limited, too. I mean, you know, there are limits to everything that -- even the new technology will have limits. I mean, my point is that I don't disagree, that we should strive to have the newest and best technology, for public safety especially, but it seems to me that in this particular case, that what we have is doing the job and our department is working with it. And maybe, maybe it takes a little extra effort. However, and I don't want to minimize what the responders are doing, but we're kind of asking everyone to make a little extra effort right now to avoid some major expense. And I agree that you don't take lightly the expense, but I'm not sure that I agree that this is the right one. So that's how I feel.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:
If this is tabled, it can wait two weeks, this is not going to cause a major crisis in what we're doing with our FRES system; is that correct? Hello?

MR. VETTER:
I have to think for that for a second. We can't do any type of -- so it would create a ripple effect. If it's two weeks, it's two weeks. I mean, we're working within the system that's provided to us. Maybe that's the most appropriate. I can't -- until it's accepted by resolution, I can't take any type of procurement interactions with that. It would make it an illegal expense.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Browning, you had a question?

LEG. BROWNING:
I vaguely remember asking you the timeline that it would take. If we do purchase the vehicle and we approve this tonight, what’s the timeline to get that vehicle ready? I mean, would it be towards the end of the year, September?

MR. VETTER:
It would be next year.

LEG. BROWNING:
It would be next year?

MR. VETTER:
It would be delivery next year, figuring that we have probably a three months process in purchasing, unless, you know, somebody else could help me out there in purchasing, then evaluation. At the six
months window of it being -- the new one being built, the old one would leave. We'd be recapturing some technology from that. So the helicopter link would be something specifically that doesn't need to be replaced. That would be taken out and sold, you know, the vehicle sold, and then the other one built into the new one.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
I mean, I can't say that you haven't been asked enough questions tonight about this. So, you know, I know it is only a two-week timeline. Personally, I'm not really a fan of holding up something if it's something they truly need. I don't know.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay. Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**
This question I think is for Budget Review. What's the final cost after we pay for the bond on this? That's before the bond, right?

**LEG. LINDSAY:**
Bond is 525.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Right.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**
With the five years, assuming 579.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Five-seventy-nine, is that accurate?

**MR. LIPP:**
Yes, that's correct.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Okay.

**MR. LIPP:**
Well, that's the exact fiscal impact, and assumes a five-year bond.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Thank you.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
DuWayne.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay. Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
This -- the old vehicle and the new vehicle, are they stored inside, and do they have to be stored inside? And do we have that kind of storage available if we bought a new one?
MR. VETTER:
It does fit. It is stored inside. So the only stuff that’s stored outside presently is a significant amount of -- disaster response equipment is probably the easiest way for me to describe it. We do have a different -- we have a facility on the Yaphank component where this is stored, and then we have a secured facility locally that’s leased and funded through grants, 100%.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right. We have a motion and a second to approve.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion to table by Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. TROTTA:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Trotta. Okay. Motion to table goes first. Roll call.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
No.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
No.

LEG. LINDSAY:
No.
LEG. CALARCO:
No.

LEG. ANKER:
No.

LEG. HAHN:
No.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
No.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
No.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
No to table.

P.O. GREGORY:
No.

MR. LAUBE:
Eight.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Motion to approve. Roll call.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
No. This is the bond or just the bill?

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
The bill.

LEG. SPENCER:
Why are we doing a roll call on the bill? I change my -- yes, yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.
LEG. SPENCER:
My bad.

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:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Sixteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. *I.R. 1235A, bond resolution (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $525,000 Bonds to finance the cost of FRES Vehicle Replacement Program (CP 3515.510)).* Same motion, same second. Roll call.
(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. BROWNING:  
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:  
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:  
No.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
No.

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:  
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMANN:  
Yes.
P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Fourteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right.  I.R. 1238 - Approving the reappointment of Rabbi Dr. Steven A. Moss as Chair of the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission (Sponsor: County Executive).

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, second by Legislator Cilmi.  All in favor?  Opposed?  Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Tim, cosponsor.

P.O. GREGORY:
Cosponsor as well.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Cosponsor as well, Tim.

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 1239 - Approving the appointment of Beena Kothari to the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission (Sponsor: County Executive).

LEG. BROWNING:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Muratore.  All in favor?  Opposed?  Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 1240 - Approving the reappointment of Dionne Walker-Belgrave to the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission (Sponsor: County Executive).  I make a motion, second by Legislator Martinez.  All in favor?  Opposed?  Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
I.R. 1241 - Approving the reappointment of Luis E. Rodriguez, Esq. To the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission (Sponsor: County Executive).
LEG. BROWNING:  
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:  
I'll make -- same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:  
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:  
I.R. 1242 - Approving the reappointment of Luis Valenzuela, Ph.D. to the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission (Sponsor: County Executive). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:  
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:  
I.R. 1243 - Approving the reappointment of Michelle Bonnie Cannon to the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission (Sponsor: County Executive).

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Motion by Legislator Schneiderman; I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:  
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:  
I.R. 1244 - Approving the reappointment of Rachel Davis to the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission (Sponsor: County Executive). I'll make a motion.

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
Second.

LEG. CALARCO:  
Second.

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

MR. LAUBE:  
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:  
I.R. 1245 - Approving the reappointment of Dr. Hafiz Ur Rehman to the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission (Sponsor: County Executive).

LEG. BROWNING:  
Motion.
P.O. GREGORY:  
Motion by Legislator Martinez.

LEG. BROWNING:  
Second.

LEG. CILMI:  
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Second by Legislator Browning. She got you. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:  
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:  
I.R. 1246 - Approving the reappointment of Gary Mar to the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission (Sponsor: County Executive).

LEG. CALARCO:  
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Motion by Legislator Calarco. Second by Legislator Cilmi?

LEG. CILMI:  
Sure.

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

MR. LAUBE:  
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:  
I.R. 1275 - Requiring all County departments and agencies to include direct dial 911 in multi-line telephone systems (Sponsor: County Executive).

LEG. CALARCO:  
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Motion by Legislator Calarco; I'll second. On the motion, anyone? Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:  
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Okay. We did 1111, 1112. I.R. 1208 - Authorizing execution of agreement by the Administrative Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 14 Parkland and Bayport Meadow Estates (IS-1636) (Sponsor: County Executive).
LEG. LINDSAY:
Motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion to table by Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. LINDSAY:
On the tabling motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
On the tabling motion.

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

LEG. LINDSAY:
This project was to hook up to the County sewer system with parkland, District No. 14. And the
developer of the property, originally when he went in and sold the concept of doing this development
to the community, made a promise that -- or a benefit of this project would be the affordable
housing component, and now the developer is looking to offset that component and locate it to
another project which has not been approved yet by the Town and is still before the Town during the
permitting process. This project has already begun, so at this point I'm just asking for support in
tabling it until we get some more information from the developer and find out exactly what his plan
is on that affordable housing component

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
No, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Okay. I was just basically going to say, we did vet the affordable housing component at the agency
and it was acknowledged that it was off-site, wasn't contiguous with the rest of the project, but it
was under the jurisdiction of the Town. The Town, I believe, is requiring 15% affordable housing,
even though we consider -- we require a 20%. And we worked with them to basically approve this,
but if you're saying that the Town hasn't approved the subdivision yet, you know, I can certainly
table it until we get more information from the Town.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yeah, that was my information, that they have not completed their permit process and zoning
process, and there's a lot of opposition to that proposal or that project as well. It's looking to put a
large number of high density units on a small acreage of land plot within the Bayport community and
there's severe opposition within the community to that program, to that project.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Our purpose as a sewer agency is really to deal with the sanitation, and if we have capacity to treat that sanitation, that treatment plant, that's what I would think would be the prime purpose of, you know, the sewer agency and then our recommendation. Certainly we can't control town zoning. The only concern I have is does the Town -- and I don't know; does the Town require our approval before they'll give any approval, or is it something that, you know, we could do after the approval?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
This is something that we did talk about at length at the Sewer Agency and I think it could be one of those chicken and egg things where the County's going to act on whether we have the capacity and the Town has local control on zoning. And the development can't go through without both, so you can't have one without the other and you're not going to build anything. So I am working on legislation to clarify this of the County's law that addresses the affordable housing component and moving these affordable housing units off-site. But without the Town's okay -- you know, we could give all the authorizations we want here. It's like telling you you can drive 80 miles an hour down the road on the way home; I don't have that authority to give you. So we could -- I mean, if you want to table it and get more information. I don't know if two weeks is going to -- it's been quite a while, but it's not illegal for us to approve it and have the -- as opposed -- you know, as it pertains to County law, it's not illegal for us to do it and have them move units off-site, but they can't build anything without the Town's approval anyway.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Which I understand. And, you know, for that reason, for argument's sake, what if that other project does not get, passed then where does the affordable housing component end up? I mean, to me, the primary purpose of the affordable housing component is to not send people in some other part of the town or to another town for the affordable housing component it's to make it affordable that one unit so that you don't have two sides of the track so to speak.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Well, that's what I'm working on in this legislation to try to address that. There might be areas in towns, in all the ten towns where the affordables should be built on-site as part of that project, and there might be appropriate areas in all the ten towns where you could move the affordable units and it would be an appropriate land use and everybody would be very satisfied with it. So without -- you know, that's one of the things that we're going to work on with this legislation as to how to move these around, you know, and how it's appropriate. But it's got to come -- that planning's got to come from the town.

LEG. LINDSAY:
I agree, I'm not looking to supercede their authority. What I would like to do is just hold this over until we have some more information and can get some additional information from the town as well as the developer.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
And we're talking about a two-week cycle? I think that's fine.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Calarco.
LEG. CALARCO:
No, I was just going to support Legislator Lindsay on this. I think it speaks to the issue, that, you know, we passed a law here -- I think Legislator Schneiderman was the sponsor of it -- that requires when a development is hooking up into one of our sewer agencies, that they have to provide a 20% component. And I think what we're talking about here is whether that component should be on-site, or if they should be permitted to do that off-site. And I guess the Sewer Agency, in reviewing these projects, has kind of taken the position that off-site might be acceptable, but I think that's really a policy decision that we need to discuss and I'm glad that Legislator Krupski is working on something. We've had some behind-the-scenes discussions on this, but nonetheless, I think at minimum we should expect these projects to run concurrently. Because if we allow the developer to just build this project, get that up and running, sell those town houses and not have approvals for the affordable side of the project, then who's to say he ever even actually commits to it? And then how do we hold him accountable to that? Is there a mechanism where we claw back revenue, our money? He's still going to be connected, it's not like we could ever say, You're not getting connected now, or We're going to disconnect you. So I think that is at least a reasonable discussion to have to make sure that that project is running concurrently until we could work the policy issue out.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
And we have had that discussion. Specifically what we required in the agreement was -- and I don't have the specifics, was that a number -- actually, all of the affordable component had to be complete before a certain percentage of all of the houses on the non-affordable portion would be given permission to connect.

LEG. CALARCO:
Okay. Yeah, because there reality is without this -- without our connection, he couldn't have built the project he's building.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. CALARCO:
And, you know, my understanding is half a million dollar town houses.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

LEG. CALARCO:
So including a few units at a lower price point -- and they don't need to be the same unit, just units at a lower price point within the project itself -- is actually a better way of designing it.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
Thank you. I don't necessarily disagree with the policy of utilizing the affordable housing component on another project. But as Legislator Lindsay pointed out, this other project has some significant opposition and may or may not happen, and what could ultimately end up happening here is that it puts pressure on those responsible for approving or not to approve. Because, you know, they're looking for the affordable housing, and if we allow this to go forward without the affordable housing, in consideration of the fact that the developer is going to put the affordable housing in this other development, and then, you know, the Town doesn't approve the other development, well then what? So it may put pressure on the Town to approve a project that the community doesn't want,
that the Town maybe doesn't want. So I tend to agree here with Legislator Lindsay, let's, you know, see how that process plays out and deal with it at that point. I don't think we should -- I don't think we should, you know, sort of go on blind faith that this other project will happen and that the affordable housing will be put there when we don't know whether or not that is, in fact, going to happen.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
But we still also do have that other component to the agreement; if you do do the hook-up, you do have to build the affordables first. So you have that -- we have that control, we just don't have the control to say where they're going to be built.

LEG. CILMI:
Right.

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

LEG. D'AMARO:
Thank you. Commissioner Anderson, the Sewer Agency didn't make the policy decision, it just kind of punted up to the Legislature on this particular issue. But have there been other projects that have been approved where the 20% component was met, the requirement was met?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
To be honest with you, this is the first project that I can recall where it wasn't.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Where it wasn't.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Where it wasn't met.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So up until this point, we passed a law that was silent as to whether or not you could build off-site to meet the requirement, and I think, in my opinion, the reason why it's silent is because it's so blatantly obvious that the 20% means in the project that's being constructed in the same location. So every other applicant that's come before the Sewer Agency and then to this body for sewer hook-up approval has met the requirements of this law, as far as you know.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So this is the first time we're being asked now to make an exception.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right. And it was our understanding that the Town -- and this is the first I'm hearing that the Town has some concerns about this project, or the affordable component of the project moving forward. Previous to this, and correct me if I'm wrong, I believe the Town came to the meeting to basically state their -- or maybe they sent a letter basically stating their approval of the off-site component.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right. But my question is do we even -- without changing the law, do we even have the authority to approve this in a bifurcated fashion?
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I would have to turn -- I don't have the answer to that.

LEG. D'AMARO:
I mean, every other applicant has looked at this law, we've approved it on the premise that it requires the affordable component to be on-site, because that's following the law, so how can we just approve something that's not following the law?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I'm not sure that the law was specific to it being on the site, I think there was wiggle room and that's where we had --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
You think it was what? I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
There was wiggle room.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Wiggle room.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Wiggle room, yeah.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Oh, okay (laughter).

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
But I think there was room to -- I couldn't say it (laughter).

LEG. D'AMARO:
That's okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, there seemed to be some play in there that, you know, it wasn't specific that it had to be on that site; and again, that was our understanding of it and that's why we approved it. Again, that's certainly something we can answer within the two-week period, hopefully get an answer for you.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So I'll ask our Counsel if --

MR. NOLAN:
I don't know the answer. This issue is --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Is the law silent as to whether it's on-site or off-site?

MR. NOLAN:
I do not know.
LEG. D'AMARO:
Oh, you don't even know that.

MR. NOLAN:
I don't know.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay.

MR. NOLAN:
I'd have to find a law. This is the first time I’ve heard about this issue.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay, no problem.

MR. NOLAN:
It’s not referenced in this resolution. So I could look again in the next two weeks for sure.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay, thank you. Okay. Well, certainly I would support the tabling motion. Thank you. Thanks, Gil.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Schneiderman.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
You know, on this issue of whether it's silent or not, you know, I was the author of this bill, it took a while to get this bill passed. You know, we all understand that we have a crisis with housing, we had done our study, Rutger's University did a study and tremendous needs and we knew that we had to create a lot of units moving forward and we knew that most of the development was going to occur within sewer districts and one way to get those numbers would be to require 20% of all the units built that connected to County Sewer Districts would have to be affordable. There was no -- even a thought that maybe it would go off-site, that somebody would put them in a different location. So if we had wanted to allow that, I think we would have put language in there creating a provision that would allow them to be off-site. You know, ultimately we needed the number of units, but there are problems when you put them off-site as we're seeing with this -- you know, with this situation where you have community opposition. The idea of mixed-use communities, mixed-income communities, I think philosophically, I think most people would agree, is the way to go, and not to stigmatize areas as low income.

So I am going to support the tabling. Certainly this project shouldn't move forward until we resolve this issue, until we know that there’s a suitable site. And I think that, you know, I'd like to work with Legislator Krupski. If there's going to be a specific, allowable ability to site them in a different location, we need to really think that through, see if that's what we want to do and if we're going to do that, how we do that I think is very important.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right, we have a motion to table and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions to tabling?
MR. LAUBE:
_Eighteen._

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. **IR 1209-15 - Authorizing execution of an agreement by the Administrative Head of SCSD No. 3 – Southwest with 1369-1373 Straight Path (1477.1-009)(County Executive).** I make a motion.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
_Eighteen._

P.O. GREGORY:
**IR 1218-15 - Amending Resolution No. 1215-2012, appropriating funds in connection with Fuel Management/Preventive Maintenance and Parts Inventory Control System (CP 1616)(County Executive).**

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. I'll second. Anyone on the motion?

LEG. CILMI:
Sure.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
So this is $700,000 for construction improvements to County fueling facilities. Maybe Commissioner Anderson can just give us a little description.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, in this -- the funding for this is specifically intended to decommission facilities that we are looking to remove. We have -- there was such a large amount of fueling systems throughout the County, and these isolated systems we're looking to -- basically where we can, where it makes sense -- shut them down, eliminate them and remove them. This funding will allow us to basically remove the physical, you know, empty tanks, gas pumps and stuff like that. The locations we're looking to do it at -- let me find my notes, sorry -- were at BOMARC, Cathedral Pines and the Huntington DPW yard on Oakwood Road.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
We're eliminating them?

LEG. CILMI:
That's what we're eliminating.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
And so the $700,000, where does that -- what does that go to, basically?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Basically we will cut the work order and direct a contractor that we have on contract to eliminate those.

LEG. CILMI:
And so what does that involve exactly, digging up tanks from the ground?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right, removing the pumps, the islands, the tanks, removing any of the monitoring equipment, that type of stuff, disconnecting the ends of it, removing the pipes up to the buildings, if there is a building, things like that.

LEG. CILMI:
Is that a substantial operation?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It takes heavy equipment. You know, there is manpower and equipment involved in that. It's not complicated once everything's been removed and emptied.

LEG. CILMI:
Right. Is there significant fees to dispose of that equipment and the materials that they remove from those facilities?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The fee would be --

LEG. CILMI:
Is that part of the $700,000.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
That would be part of what we're paying, yeah.

LEG. CILMI:
And how much of a part of it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I don't know that.

LEG. CILMI:
Do you have any idea?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I could get that for you. Generally, and I can't say specifically here, normally that's part of the cost of the removal. So whatever we're paying per cubic yard or per ton --
LEG. CILMI:
So you're going to send heavy equipment into three locations and dig up a couple of tanks in each location and remove a couple of gas -- you know, surface gas tanks from those locations.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
And you're comfortable with the $700,000 cost in order to do that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, I am. It would have been work bid out under a requirements contract for these specific purposes.

LEG. CILMI:
And what happens if we don't remove them?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
In some cases there could be a fine associated. I can't say that these are them, and it would just have to sit there until we appropriate the funding and get them removed. There are issues, you know, with leaving a system in place and not operational.

LEG. CILMI:
Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
There is a temptation to use it somewhere. Normally in the case of a tank, you know, once it's emptied, it's cleaned and then it's generally filled if it's abandoned in place, or, you know -- filled with sand, I apologize, or with the intent that at some point it's going to be removed from where it is.

LEG. CILMI:
Are these three facilities operational at this point?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, they are.

LEG. CILMI:
They are.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
What does it cost us to operate them?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Oh, you mean the pumps themselves?

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right now, no, they're not operational.

LEG. CILMI:
They're not.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, they're off-line.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. And they couldn't be -- there would be no reason to operate them or we could operate them?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We could operate them, we'd have to update them, they're older; again, they're remote. There are most likely, in the case of say BOMARC, you know, we have a fueling facility right down the road at our highway yard right next to the airport. I'm trying to think. You know, Cathedral Pines, there's our Yaphank facility right down the road. So --

LEG. CILMI:
It's regular gasoline or diesel?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I don't know that.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I'm assuming they are, they're probably both. They may be just one if it a small facility.

LEG. CILMI:
Right. Okay. Thanks you, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
You're welcome.

P.O. GREGORY:
Commissioner, is this the part of the settlement, that lawsuit that we had?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No. No, this is just our --

P.O. GREGORY:
This is different?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We've been working internally at DPW, not only to upgrade our facilities to get them up to code, but also where there was -- in the past, there was -- everybody wanted their own gas pump at their own facility so they didn't have to drive down the road. We're trying to get rid of those. We're trying to make it so that they're more centrally located so that, you know, it makes it more manageable and we have more control over where the fueling takes place and we can monitor it better.
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Trotta, you had a question?

LEG. TROTTA:
How did you come up with the $700,000 figure?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It's based on either an existing requirements contract that we've already bid, or it's based on previous work that we've done similar to this.

LEG. TROTTA:
Is there gas in these things now that has to be drained?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, they would have already been drained. Once we stopped using them, we would have drained the gas tanks and filled them back in; but that's a temporary fix, it's not a long-term fix.

LEG. TROTTA:
Are they filled with sand now, or dirt or whatever you put in them?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It would either be filled with sand -- yeah, more than likely it would be filled with sand. I don't think we would leave them --

LEG. TROTTA:
By law we have to take them out?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, we do.

LEG. TROTTA:
This seems like a lot of money, 700 -- do we have a back hoe? Can we do this? Because $700,000 is really a lot of money.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
There is --

LEG. TROTTA:
And you know what we're getting for it? Nothing.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
-- a certain functionality to this. We'll have better compliance, we have better control, we can monitor them better, we're basically reducing risk of future, not only repairs, but future fines if they failed.

LEG. TROTTA:
There's nothing in them. How are they going to fail?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, I'm saying over all, the plan of trying to, you know, eliminate --
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LEGG. TROTTA:
Are you sure that we have to do this? Like there's a law that says -- you know, they're already not functional, they're filled with sand, and now we're going to spend $700,000 to dig them up.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Even if the tank was not being removed, there's still the island and the equipment that has to come out as well.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yeah, there is a --

LEGG. TROTTA:
Listen, I'm not a construction maven, but I'm certain that you can take a couple of Islands out for less than $700,000.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I have to trust my staff that are saying that this has to come out and the tanks have to come out. You know, again, this is not something we're doing on a whim. We do have, you know, a number of regulatory compliance requirements that --

LEGG. TROTTA:
But you're not sure that you're being -- until the EPA -- I mean, it just seems to me they're filled in. I mean, when I had an oil tank filled in, once you filled it with sand you were done. It might be different for a gas thing, but --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
In my experience -- again, in Nassau County -- we were required to remove the tanks. We could get a by for a couple of years if we filled the tanks in with sand, but eventually they had to be removed from where they were.

LEGG. TROTTA:
And who -- the EPA does that, the Federal Government?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Generally it's -- the jurisdiction is handed down from the EPA to the DEC down to Suffolk County Health Department.

LEGG. TROTTA:
And you've been told to do this.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We haven't been told to do this, we're trying to do this in compliance with the current regulations.

P.O. GREGORY:
We have been told to do this.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, we have to -- we obviously have to meet the requirements of the EPA.

LEGG. TROTTA:
So the EPA or the DEC told you in a letter and said, Listen, you have to dig these tanks up.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
There are guidelines that -- you know, requirements that have to be met.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yeah, there was a lawsuit a few years ago -- not necessarily these tanks, but several other abandoned tanks -- and we lost and the settlement was that we had to come up with a new system, management system to track our tanks as well as come up with environmental land that we had to designate for, you know --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
There was a monetary fine.

P.O. GREGORY:
Monetary fines, a whole bunch of stuff that --

LEG. HAHN:
Dennis Brown is here.

P.O. GREGORY:
It was, I don't know, at least a couple of years ago.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The monetary fine was 500,000.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I remember that very explicitly, and then it was 150 in land -- 150 million -- I'm sorry, 1.5 million.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
My decimal was screwed up.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right, right. Okay, Legislator Cilmi. Oh, I'm sorry, Jay, you were first.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Gil, you said BOMARC, Cathedral Pines; what was the third location?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It's our Huntington DPW Yard on Oakwood Road.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
And that also is not needed, that's redundant?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right. The yard -- yeah, we don't feel we need it there.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
And these are all like probably single-wall tanks.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
They're older facilities, absolutely.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
So if you ever wanted to use them again, it would cost so much money to make them meet the current regulatory requirements, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Absolutely.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
And it is my understanding that you can't just leave them, you can't just abandon them, you have to take them out of the ground.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I could be wrong. But can I ask you? You didn't mention Cedar Point Park which has a real old pump station out there. Have we already abandoned that one, or is it still going, are we planning on keeping it there?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
My understanding was we were looking to get rid of it, but I don't know that we have yet.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
And there was an offer, or at least a conversation with the Town, maybe it was Town Highway, that they were building a facility in East Hampton.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
And they were, I think, willing to entertain having the County as a partner, at least let us purchase the way we let fire departments and things purchase from us.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I don't know if that -- do you know if that conversation is still ongoing?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I believe we were waiting for the Town to finish their facility, construction of their facility. I don't know where it is right now, but I can find out and I'll get back to you.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. The reason why I mentioned at Cedar Point is because that's really an environmentally-sensitive area where that pump is located. It's a very old pump, as you know, it's just a single pump and it's very close to the harbor there, very shallow depth-to-groundwater and really, for County purposes, not a particularly good location to begin with because it's so remote. You know, for DPW to get there, for any other County employees that, you know, are on the system, it's really not a good location. The other location the Town is offering is much better, so.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
But I just was curious why it wasn't included in this conversation, but I guess you're going to try to keep it going a little bit longer.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I'm assuming until we get, you know, the agreement with the Town and they've got their facility complete.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
Thanks again, Commissioner. I'm just noticing that this resolution is actually an amending resolution. And while the description tells me that it's $700,000 that needs to be appropriated here, there's no Bond Resolution associated with this. So could you just expound on that a little bit for us? I mean, what exactly are we amending? Why is there no bond attached to this? Have we already approved the bond and this is just changing something technical in the resolution?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah. From what I can see, the resolution to amend, this amends Resolution 1215-2012, Appropriating funds in connection with the Fuel Management/Preventative Maintenance and Parts Inventory Control System.

MR. NOLAN:
We're moving money from equipment to construction within that Capital Project. There was a Bond Resolution associated with the earlier resolution. We did ask the Budget Office if there needed to be a budget -- a Bond Resolution with this to amend the prior Bond Resolution, we were told it was not needed, so.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. So the money was already appropriated for a different aspect of this same project?

MR. NOLAN:
Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right. Well, it sounds like equipment rather than --

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. So we're basically using money that we've already appropriated for the same project, only a different part of that project.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. Let the record show that Dr. Lipp is shaking his head yes.

MR. LIPP:
(Indicated thumb's up).
P.O. GREGORY: Okay. All right, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE: Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Spencer).

P.O. GREGORY: Okay. I have a request to take IR 1261 out of order, it’s Authorizing the extension of an Intermunicipal Agreement with the Town of Brookhaven (County Executive).

LEG. KRUPSKI: Motion.

P.O. GREGORY: Motion by Legislator Krupski.

LEG. CALARCO: Second.

P.O. GREGORY: Page 13, I'm sorry. And second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

We have Ms. Fahey, who it is her second to last day --

MR. LAUBE: Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY: She's been sitting in the back, I'd like to get her out. So I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. CALARCO: Second.


LEG. KRUPSKI: On the motion. I did want to make Carolyn stay for the rest of the meeting.

(*Laughter*)

Carolyn is someone that coached my son in Little League, we've known Carolyn and Don for a long time. I just wanted to take this opportunity to thank her. All those years we never knew what you did, this is really surprising. We want to thank her for her service, you know, to the County and wish her well in the future. And then when we have all these committee meetings out here in Riverhead, she'll be able to come and attend now as a citizen and give us good, positive suggestions about what we should do.

LEG. CILMI: I'm sure that'll happen.
LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yeah (laughter).

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
On a point of personal privilege, too, I would also -- I said this in committee. We've been very fortunate, Carolyn, to have you all these years with the County. It's a great loss, but we wish you well in your future endeavors. And I've had the great pleasure of working with you on so many different issues; economic development, the Gabreski Airport, downtown revitalization, on and on and on, and you've been nothing but a consummate professional and it's been just a joy to work with you. So thank you for all your service.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes, thank you for all your many years of service, Carolyn. We wish you best and keep smiling.

Applause & Standing Ovation

Okay. So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions.

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. And back to page eleven, IR 1219-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with Rehabilitation of Various Bridges and Embankments (CP 5850)(County Executive).

LEG. STERN:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Stern. Second by Legislator -- I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion?

P.O. GREGORY:
I'm sorry. Who was that? Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Commissioner? Thank you. This is a -- one of the bridges is the Peconic Avenue Bridge right here. Is this -- what's the schedule for rebuilding that? And is it -- not to the day, just a rough idea. And is that schedule in any way related to rebuilding the traffic circle there in Flanders?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, neither are connected. This is really a maintenance project. We're not looking to rebuild the project, we're looking to rehabilitate the approaches in both directions, basically rehabilitate the bridge in general so it'll last longer. So there is no plan to replace the bridge and it is not connected to the circle.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
You're welcome.
P.O. GREGORY: Okay. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE: Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY: Okay, 1219A, Bond Resolution (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $2,000,000 Bonds to finance the rehabilitation of various bridges and embankments (CP 5850.328), same motion, same second. Roll call.

(*Roll was called by Mr. Laube - Clerk of the Legislature*)

LEG. STERN: Yes.

P.O. GREGORY: Yes.

LEG. SPENCER: Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO: Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY: Yes.

LEG. TROTTA: Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY: Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA: Yes.

LEG. CILMI: Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ: Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY: Yes.

LEG. CALARCO: Yes.

LEG. ANKER: Yes.
LEG. HAHN: Yes.

LEG. MURATORE: Yes.

LEG. BROWNING: Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI: Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN: Yes.

MR. LAUBE: Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY: Okay, IR 1220-15 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Strengthening and Improving County Roads (CP 5014)(County Executive).

LEG. STERN: Motion.

P.O. GREGORY: Motion by Legislator Stern. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE: Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY: IR 1220A, Bond Resolution (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York authorizing the issuance of $6,525,000 in bonds to finance the cost of strengthening and improving of County roads (CP 5014 .110 and .356), same motion, same second. Roll call.

(*Roll was called by Mr. Laube - Clerk of the Legislature*)

LEG. STERN: Yes.

P.O. GREGORY: Yes.

LEG. SPENCER: Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO: Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY: Yes.
LEG. TROTTA:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMANN:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, IR 1221-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with Reconstruction of Drainage Systems on Various County Roads(CP 5024)(County Executive).

LEG. STERN:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Same motion, same second.
LEG. HAHN: On the motion?

P.O. GREGORY: On the motion?

LEG. HAHN: I'm sorry, I wanted to ask Gil just a little --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yep.

LEG. HAHN: So just remind me, when you reconstruct drainage systems, what kind of -- are we doing anything for filtering, or what are we doing?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: In general, no. What we're normally doing -- and again, I'm being frank. Most cases --

LEG. HAHN: It's just getting the water off the road for safety.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Getting the water off the road. If there is an outfall nearby or there isn't an area nearby that we would discharge to, we would then, yes, put in -- look to put in what we consider a water quality train, which includes a swirl separator and then a secondary treatment for heavy metals, similar to what the -- those bags, the same type of treatment facilities.

LEG. HAHN: Are we also looking to improve leaching opportunities instead of -- you know, instead of the outfall? Or increase, I'm sorry.

LEG. KRUPSKI: Groundwater leaching.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Groundwater leaching?

LEG. HAHN: Yeah, groundwater, sorry.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: In most cases, yeah. This specific Capital Project is generally the sister project of our repaving project. So we come in and we're going to repave County Road 55. We're going to go in there and then we use the funds from this project to help do the drainage improvements. Yes, in fact, I guess to answer your question, it would be yes.

LEG. HAHN: Okay, good. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Okay.
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1221A (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $400,000 Bonds to finance a portion of the cost of reconstruction of drainage systems on various County roads (CP 5024.310), same motion, same second. Roll call.

(*Roll was called by Mr. Laube - Clerk of the Legislature*)

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yes yeah.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.
LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, **IR 1251-15 -Appropriating funds in connection with reconstruction of CR 97, Nicolls Road (CP 5512)(County Executive).**

LEG. HAHN:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Hahn. I'll second.

LEG. MURATORE:
(Raised hand).

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

LEG. CILMI:
No, no. I have a question before you call the vote, sorry. So this is 1251 we're talking about, right; connection with reconstruction of County Route 97.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. CILMI:
Exactly what are we doing with this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Okay, at the northerly terminus of 97 we intersect with 25A. There's an eastbound-to-southbound turning lane off of 25A onto 97 that we're looking to make a safety improvement by essentially eliminating that turning lane where it is, and it allows a high-speed turn from 25A into or onto 97. At that intersection and the intersection to the south which is very close, it's northerly entrance to Stony Brook as well as Upper Sheep Pasture Road, there's a lot of weaving that goes on. So what we're looking to do is to basically bring the cars, rather than allowing them a high-speed turn, bring them up to the intersection and then allow them to turn at that point rather then -- so that you're not having weaving from people coming south, from west to south and trying to get into the school.
To make a long story short, we're trying to improve the safety by eliminating that high-speed turn.

We're also going to be doing a lot of pedestrian improvements in there. We've been working with the State over the past few years to put in a sidewalk. They came in a year or two ago, I can't remember, and they put a sidewalk along 25A. We've done similar sidewalk and we will be doing similar sidewalk on the westerly side, they will then come in after we're finished and put in some more sidewalk improvements for pedestrians coming -- you know, for students and pedestrians coming from Stony Brook into the community up to the north.

**LEG. CILMI:**
And this is $600,000?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
I believe so.

**LEG. CILMI:**
What percentage of that would be related to the sidewalk and what percentage related to the roadwork?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
I don't have the estimate on me, but I can get that for you.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Okay.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
I would anticipate the sidewalk would be the lesser component.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Yeah.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
Because you're basically demolishing a road and then you're going to have to build a turning lane up along the eastbound side of 25A.

**LEG. CILMI:**
And the roadwork -- I'm trying to envision it. The roadwork is substantial enough --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
I have a plan.

**LEG. CILMI:**
-- that it will cost the better part of $600,000?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
Yes, Sir.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Okay.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Legislator Hahn, you're up.
LEG. HAHN:
Okay. So I did make a motion to approve, but I do have a question, or several. Did we -- do you have plans?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Okay. So did you do community outreach?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
That I don't know.

LEG. HAHN:
Because this is a big -- this is a big change here.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I don't recall it, so I would assume we didn't yet.

LEG. HAHN:
And I'm nervous about how 25A would back up, because it already does back up quite considerably at the light at Nicolls Road.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yep.

LEG. HAHN:
As well as when you're heading up, you know, past CVS, etcetera.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

LEG. HAHN:
And so --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The impact would be to the west -- sorry, the eastbound side.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I don't know -- I don't have the traffic engineering information.

LEG. HAHN:
Look, if you're adding a lane, a turn -- a very, very, very, very, very, very long turn lane then, you know, it might not impact traffic (laughter).

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right. And again, let me see if the plans show --

LEG. HAHN:
I haven't seen -- yeah, I'd like to see that.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, I'm going to send that to you.

LEG. HAHN:
Do you have something you can show?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It is actually a pretty long turn lane. Again, I can either scan it to you or I can give it to you now if you want.

LEG. HAHN:
I might want -- I might ask for a tabling motion on this, because I think that we need to have some pretty serious public outreach to the community on this. I know that the safety there in terms of folks that may be crossing over the exit ramp, or exit off of 25A, but getting onto the on-ramp onto Nicolls heading south, it would be incredibly dangerous. Folks don't want to stop there if there are individuals, pedestrians crossing. And as you mentioned, the merging, when you're merging in from both -- when the west and the east are at the -- when the light goes and the west and the east are merging into the southbound lanes at the same time, it's very complicated, especially for those folks who want to cross over Nicolls and make the left onto Lower Sheep Pasture. So, you know, I know we need safety improvements, but this is very -- this would be a very significant change for our community and I'm just imagining we'll want some sort of community notification.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We -- again, if you look at the plan, you'll see that we've made it safer, there's more sidewalk to walk through. You don't have to cross the eastbound-southbound turn lane, that one when you presently have right now, that will eliminate any pedestrian having to cross that. They can then go up to the corner and cross, there's the Island right near it. I mean, I have the plans here, I can give them to you, you can take a look at that. I would --

LEG. HAHN:
Yes, I'd like to see that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah. You want to see it now?

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Absolutely.

LEG. HAHN:
I still think we need to have a community --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Without question, and we would do that before construction. But again, the elimination of that turning lane is going to eliminate -- is going to provide more pedestrian safety. It's also going to provide a higher level of safety for cars passing through the corridor between 25A and Upper Sheep Pasture.

LEG. HAHN:
I'm just not sure that I want to approve it before we do the community outreach, that's my concern. So what's the timeline on -- you know, what was your plan for the timeline and how could we fit in a
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I mean, you know, we would -- I don't know what the meeting is after this next one. I mean, we're -- when is the next meeting? I don't even know.

LEG. HAHN:
May 12th.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
May 12th. And then the meeting following that? Yeah, June. So, I mean, if we have to table it until June to get a public meeting, I'm fine with that.

LEG. HAHN:
Okay, thank you. If --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I just think it's a good project, it's going to make it safer.

LEG. HAHN:
No, I understand that. I just think it's such a central location for us. The intersection of the two largest roads in my -- well.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, there's no question of that.

LEG. HAHN:
Two of the three largest roads in my district.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

LEG. HAHN:
Or maybe 2 or 4, but yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
And again, it's going to provide -- look, my concern is -- and I'm fully willing to wait, is that we're going to, you know, have a public forum and people are going to be very nervous about a change. Our engineers have looked at this, and I agree with the change, that it's going to make the intersection much safer for pedestrians coming from the north entrance up into the, you know, the business community along 25A, and it's also going to make vehicles traveling southbound from 25A, either trying to weave in to make a right into the college or a left onto Sheep Pasture Road, much safer. So again, I have no problem tabling this, if that's what you would like. But I think this is a project that has a lot of merit and will make a significant improvement to that intersection.

LEG. HAHN:
Thank you. I'd still like to just table it so that we can do some civic education of the folks, because it's just such a big intersection. You know, I agree, there's something -- safety improvements that need to happen, but there may be input from the community that will be valuable in that process, so.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
That's fine.
LEG. HAHN:
Thank you. So if we don't mind, if I can change my motion to a motion to table?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Second.

MR. NOLAN:
Jay, she changed her motion.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right, we have a motion to table. Is there a second? Second by Legislator Muratore. Oh, wait, I don't think we're done discussing the bill. Is there anybody else who wanted to be heard? Okay. So we only -- we have a motion to table and a second, I'll call the vote; all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, it's a tabled.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen (Not Present: P O Gregory).

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
We can then skip the Bond.

All right, we'll move on to 1253-15 - Amending Resolution No. 585-2014 which accepted and appropriated funds in connection with the reconstruction of the Fire Island Barrier Beach and Dune Network from the Fire Island Inlet to Moriches Inlet (FIMI)(County Executive).

LEG. CALARCO:
Motion.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
We have a motion by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Second.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen (Not Present: P O Gregory).

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay, there's no Bond with that.

1254-15 - Amending the 2015 Adopted Operating Budget to accept and appropriate funds in connection with the reconstruction of the Fire Island Barrier Beach and Dune Network from the Fire Island Inlet to Moriches Inlet (FIMI)(County Executive). Motion.

LEG. CALARCO:
Motion.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion by Legislator Calarco.
LEG. BARRAGA:
Second.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Second by Legislator Barraga. Any questions for the Commissioner? All right, seeing none, I'll call the vote; all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen (Not Present: P O Gregory).

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
1279-15 - A resolution making certain Findings and Determinations and issuing an order in relation to the increase and improvements of facilities -- no, I'm skipping one, aren't I?

LEG. CILMI:
No.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
No, that's right? Okay. -- facilities for Sewer District No. 3 – Southwest (CP 8108) (County Executive).

LEG. CALARCO:
Motion.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yeah, but $207 million; does that include replacement of the outfall pipe?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, Sir.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Okay.

LEG. CILMI:
We're just -- Jay, if I may?

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
And this is not approving that funding at this point, this is just finding its determinations --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. CILMI:
-- which are relative to what exactly, Gil?
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: A portion of the funding. We’ve appropriated a certain part of it. This is, I believe, the final part of it, and actually funding that we will -- we are getting assistance with.

LEG. CILMI: But what do the findings and determinations relate to?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: It’s a public hearing that is part of the process of appropriating the funds.

LEG. CILMI: Gotcha. Okay, thanks.


LEG. MCCAFFREY: Commissioner, our expectation is that we’re going to get some sort of assistance on this, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: This portion of the funding, yes.

LEG. MCCAFFREY: Yes. Okay, thank you.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN: Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI: As this repiping is being considered, is there any consideration for using the Riverhead model and reusing some of the effluent of the golf course while all the plumbing's under review there?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: No, because the treatment level isn't as high as the one in Riverhead. Right now because it's an ocean outfall, we don't have to treat the same level of treatment that River does -- Riverhead does.

LEG. KRUPSKI: So it's too funky to use on the golf course. Is there any other reuse that you could think of?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Not off the top of my head (laughter).

LEG. KRUPSKI: Thank you (laughter).

LEG. TROTTA: A scientific term.

LEG. McCAFFREY: Maybe at nine o'clock we'll come up with one.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN: Anyone else? All right, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Veterans & Seniors:

IR 1231-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase and replacement of Nutrition Vehicles for the Office for the Aging (CP 1749)(County Executive).

LEG. STERN:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Stern.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Second.

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

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
1231A, Bond Resolution (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $112,058 Bonds to finance the purchase and replacement of nutrition vehicles for the Office For the Aging (CP 1749.525), same motion, same second. Roll call.

(*Roll was called by Mr. Laube - Clerk of the Legislature*)

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
No.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.
LEG. BARRAGA:  
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:  
Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:  
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:  
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:  
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:  
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:  
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:  
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:  
Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:  
Seventeen (Opposed: Legislator Trotta).

P.O. GREGORY:  
Okay, **Ways & Means:**

**IR 1154-15 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Charter Law to clarify and strengthen the procedures for filling County Legislature vacancies (Presiding Officer Gregory).** I'll make a motion to approve.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Second by Legislator Schneiderman. On the motion; George, if you could please explain.

MR. NOLAN:  
Could I offer a motion to table? No.

(*Laughter*)
I think all of you should have gotten a memo I wrote a couple of weeks ago about this particular resolution. It basically has to do with how we fill vacancies in the County Legislature. It basically, as the memo explains, leaves the basic rule which is if we have a vacancy, we hold a special election within 90-days and that is left in-tact. The only exceptions have to do when the vacancies occur very close to a general election. You know, the Charter states now that it in all cases we have to hold a special election within 90-days of the vacancy. And basically we address three scenarios, which is, one, where a vacancy occurs within a 90-day period prior to a general election in an even-numbered year when Legislators are not running. The current law provides that the vacancy is going to be filled at the general election, however the current law doesn't contemplate what you do if the vacancy occurs so close to a general election that it's just impossible to do it on that particular date. So this law basically says in that scenario, if a vacancy occurs within a 90-day period prior to the General, we'll hold a special, unless the Board of Elections tells us it's physically impossible for us to do it on that date, in which case we'll hold a special within 60-days after the general election is held.

Then the second scenario is where the vacancy occurs within a 90-day period prior to a general election in an odd-numbered year when Legislators are running. And again, the law currently, as it's written, it doesn't address the situation where you don't have time to run the general -- a special election on that date. And also, if you had time, you would have -- you would face a possibility -- not a possibility, you would have the special election on the ballot and also the general election for the new term. So in order to avoid these problems, this law provides then, "In the event a vacancy occurs within a 90-day period prior to a general election in an odd-numbered year, the office will remain vacant until the general election is held. The winner of the general election will automatically fill the vacancy before he or she begins the term they're elected to in January."

And then the third situation, and this actually happened a couple of years ago, we had a vacancy occur within a 90-day period prior to the general election in an odd-numbered year when Legislators were running under new boundaries. And what this law provides, that if a vacancy occurs within 90-days of the General Election in that scenario, the office will remain vacant until the general election is held. The winner of the general election will not fill the vacancy automatically because he or she will have been elected by a different group of voters under new boundaries. So the law provides that the Legislature, after the election, they can appoint somebody to serve for the balance of the term if they so desire, but they don't have to. I think the thinking there is if the winner of the election, the general election, lived in the old district boundaries and got elected from the new district boundaries, the Legislature probably would appoint that person in that scenario.

And finally, the current law provides that if a Legislative vacancy occurs after a general election in the office of an incumbent who has not been reelected -- so an incumbent is running in odd-numbered years and he loses and if, for whatever reason, he resigns or leaves office before the end of the year, the law says now we must fill that vacancy for that very short period of time, and the change we made was now the Legislature may fill that vacancy if they think it makes sense. It probably, in most cases, wouldn't make sense to appoint somebody for a five or a 6-week period, a 4-week period, but it leaves that discretion with the Legislature instead of the mandatory language that the Legislature would have to fill that vacancy. And that's what this law does.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay, Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Thank you. So in the last scenario that you described, presently the law says that we must fill the vacancy. Does it prescribe how we are to fill that vacancy?
MR. NOLAN:
It does not. But we've always felt it would presumably be by a resolution.

LEG. CILMI:
And have we done that before?

MR. NOLAN:
I don't -- I've been around a long time, I don't remember that ever happening.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay.

MR. NOLAN:
You know, frankly, a lot of these scenarios probably will never happen --

LEG. CILMI:
Right.

MR. NOLAN:
-- in our lifetime.

LEG. CILMI:
Right.

MR. NOLAN:
So this is a law only a municipal lawyer could love. You know, it's just -- when we had the situation with the special election --

LEG. CILMI:
I could see your eyes light up as soon as we asked you to talk about it.

MR. NOLAN:
I just love it. But we had a situation a couple of years ago and it was a very unlikely situation. You know, we had a Legislator pass away very close to a general election in a reapportionment year, and we really found that what we had in the Charter was not sufficient to deal with that situation. So that's how I got started on this with the Presiding Officer and that's why we're putting it before you.

LEG. CILMI:
Under the third scenario that you detailed, presently the seat would remain vacant, I guess, until such time as a special election could be held and the seat could be filled by the voters; correct?

MR. NOLAN:
You're talking about the -- clarify the situation.

LEG. CILMI:
I guess the third situation that you described was in an even-numbered year for us, a vacancy occurs at such a time where there's not enough time to. For the general -- you know, not enough time to put a new person on the ballot for a general election.

MR. NOLAN:
Right.
LEG. CILMI:
And so a special election would have to be scheduled at that point and ostensibly it couldn’t be scheduled for the general election because of time. So at that point, under the current law, a special election would be scheduled at some point in time subsequent to the general election and the seat would remain vacant until such time as that election could take place; correct?

MR. NOLAN:
This is the even-numbered year.

LEG. CILMI:
Right.

MR. NOLAN:
Legislators not running.

LEG. CILMI:
Right.

MR. NOLAN:
A vacancy occurs 45-days, 40-days before the general election. Under the current law it says if the vacancy occurs within 90-days prior to the general election, we must hold a special election on the day of the general election, and it's just not always going to be possible. So this law states that if the Board of Election says to us there is not time to have the party convention and do the circulation of the Independent petition and all the stuff that's involved in a special election, then the special election in that case would be held within 60-days after the date of the general election.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay.

MR. NOLAN:
And the thinking was the 60-days was that would give the Board of Elections time to do their re-canvas of the general election results before they undertook running a special election in the district.

LEG. CILMI:
And the proposal further goes on to say that in that time, during -- you know, between -- I don't know what time it would be, but between the vacancy, I suppose, and such time as we could hold a special election, that the Legislature may appoint somebody to that seat?

MR. NOLAN:
No, not in that situation, no.

LEG. CILMI:
There were two situations in which you said that the Legislature may appoint somebody. The first one we talked about -- or the second one we talked about first; what was the other one?

MR. NOLAN:
It's in the reapportionment year.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay.
MR. NOLAN:
In that situation, after the election, in that interim period between the election and when the new Legislator would take place, the Legislature would have the option, they wouldn't have to, but they would have the option of appointing somebody during that interim period. And like I said earlier, I think that would be a situation where the winner of the election, if they had been a resident of the old district and won this election to represent the new district, that would be the situation where I believe Legislature would want to appoint that person to fill that interim period before beginning his new term, or her new term.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. I'm interested to hear what others on the Legislature think about the ability of the Legislature to appoint somebody for a short period of time while we wait for an elected person to actually take the office. So I'll yield for the time being and I'll listen. Thanks.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Anyone else?

LEG. CILMI:
If nobody asks any questions, then --

P.O. GREGORY:
(Laughter) Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:
No, I don't have anything. I like the fifth scenario, where if a Legislator was in his last term and he changed his middle initial, he gets another twelve.

(*Laughter*)

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'll go for that.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yeah. Here here. No one else?

LEG. BROWNING:
Or she.

P.O. GREGORY:
Gender neutral.

LEG. D'AMARO:
I have a question.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:
George, why not -- why not just make it that the person -- in the two scenarios where you would appoint, or could appoint, why not just make it that that person, if the vacancy occurs, it could just automatically be seated?
MR. NOLAN:
Well, I mean --

LEG. D'AMARO:
I mean, there's been redistricting --

MR. NOLAN:
In the reapportionment scenario, I don't you can do do -- you couldn't state that automatically that person is going to be appointed, because the person who won the general election was elected by a different group of voters than elected the person who had left office. So I don't think you could automatically say that that person could fill the vacancy.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right, because they --

MR. NOLAN:
They may not have be a resident of the old district.

LEG. D'AMARO:
The lines may have changed or they're not a resident of the old district, a different electorate.

MR. NOLAN:
Right.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah, okay.

MR. NOLAN:
The other scenario where an incumbent loses the election, you know, I guess it would be -- an alternative would be to say that to whatever be that guy or gal in the election would automatically seat at that point, I think it's, myself, better to leave it up to the discretion of the Legislature, assuming that if they have the opportunity, they will appoint the person who won that election.

LEG. D'AMARO:
And then the other scenario where you have to wait -- in an even year where you have to wait until 60-days after the general election to have the special, because if the vacancy occurs three days before Election Day, it's just simply impossible to get that person or the contenders for that seat onto the ballot.

MR. NOLAN:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So what would happen before this law? What would happen under those circumstances?

MR. NOLAN:
It really doesn't say. The law just simply says, "Where a vacancy may be filled by a general election to be held no more than 90 days after the vacancy occurs and the person selected shall serve for the balance of the unexpired term." So it's possible you could -- I think if you got into that impossible situation, I think the Legislature would just have to kind of throw this out and set the election, you know --
LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

MR. NOLAN:
On a day when it could be --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Just as a matter of logistics, you can't get it done for the general.

MR. NOLAN:
Right.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So you'd probably just have a vacancy until we can set the special anyway.

MR. NOLAN:
Right. Yeah.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah.

MR. NOLAN:
But, you know, I think it's better to have the rules, you know, clearly set forth if you can do it.

LEG. D'AMARO:
I think you did a nice job. Thank you.

MR. NOLAN:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Anyone else? Okay. Legislator Cilmi, are you -- anything else?

LEG. CILMI:
No, I guess that's it. Thank you.

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

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right, IR 1196-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with upgrading Court Minutes Application (CP 1681)(Presiding Office Gregory).

LEG. STERN:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Stern. I’ll second. Anyone on the question? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1196A, Bond Resolution (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $75,000 Bonds to finance the cost of planning for upgrading of the court minutes application used by the County Clerk’s Office (CP 1681.112), same motion, same second.
Roll call.

(*Roll was called by Mr. Laube - Clerk of the Legislature*)

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D’AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
No.

LEG. TROTTA:
No.

LEG. KENNEDY:
No.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.
LEG. MURATORE:
No.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Fourteen (Opposed: Legislators McCaffrey, Trotta, Kennedy & Muratore).

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right, IR 1197-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with the Optical Disk Imaging System (CP 1751) (Presiding Officer Gregory).

LEG. STERN:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Same motion, same second. Anyone on the question?

LEG. CILMI:
Yeah, on the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
On the motion, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
Can anybody here distinguish between this resolution and the one that we just passed, in terms of the practical application of the funding? 1196, which we passed, was $75,000, the {Delwith} Court Minutes. This resolution is also $75,000, and I believe also deals with court minutes. So I'm curious to know, I see a head shaking in the back. I'm not sure if that person wants to opine on -- Mr. Presiding Officer, if I could, through the Chair, ask Comptroller Kennedy to --

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.

LEG. CILMI:
There's no precedent baby (laughter).

LEG. KENNEDY:
Good evening. Certainly I'm not here speaking on behalf of the County Clerk, but having spent nine years there, I do know both of those systems and programs directly. Court minutes is basically a function that we see over in our Juliette Kunsella Court Annex that basically identifies all of the various steps that go on with a Supreme Court proceeding, it allows parties to go ahead and to sign in and find out when a summons and complaint has been put in, motions have been filed, whether a court date has been sent down, whether depositions have occurred, whether there's been a determination by the judge, and basically gives counsel and a lot of the parties involved in the court systems the opportunity to be able to go ahead and view that remotely.
LEG. CILMI:
Okay. With that being said, do you know -- and if you don't, it's fine -- the distinction between these two resolutions?

COMPTROLLER KENNEDY:
Absolutely, yes.

LEG. CILMI:
You do. Okay, go ahead.

MR. NOLAN:
As a matter of fact, the second resolution speaks to the optical disk storage mechanism. That is the actual believe it or not, it looks like fairly large racks on which platters sit that actually hold the imagines associated with all of the land records that are processed through the Clerk's Office, which part of what we initially put in back in 1999-2000.

LEG. CILMI:
So is it fair to say --

COMPTROLLER KENNEDY:
-- for the scanning program.

LEG. CILMI:
So is it fair to say, John, that 1196 is a software expense, basically, and 1197 is a hardware expense?

COMPTROLLER KENNEDY:
Without having the resolutions in front of me, I think that would be the case, Legislator Cilmi. Although there may be some aspect of hardware upgrade to it as well.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay.

COMPTROLLER KENNEDY:
The only other item that I'll add and share with you, as all of you know, the County Clerk's Office is the largest revenue-generating entity for the County and consistently remits -- I think this past year it was somewhere in the neighborhood of around 14 to 15 million for the General Fund. So not to belittle or belie any decision associated with bonding or indebtedness, which, as you know, I get to see, we're racking up the spring borrowing now. Nevertheless, this is one of those things where, look, if you don't change the oil in the car, the block's going to cease and then you have nothing.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. Thank you.

COMPTROLLER KENNEDY:
You're welcome.

P.O. GREGORY:
Am I sensing a merger in the offering there?

(*Laughter*)
P.O. GREGORY:
Judy says keep your hands off her department.

LEG. D'AMARO:
(Raised hand).

All right, 1197. We have a motion and a second.

LEG. D'AMARO:
On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Oh, I'm sorry, Lou.

LEG. D'AMARO:
I just wanted to ask BRO the -- on this bill, Capital Project 1751, what the total authorized amount is and what it contemplates.

MR. LIPP:
So the total cost has already been a quest prior to the end of December of 2.4 million, and what the current budget is -- current proposed capital program --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

MR. LIPP:
-- has 75,000 for this year.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

MR. LIPP:
And another 75,000 for 2016, and that's what they have in the proposed Capital Program.

LEG. D'AMARO:
What's the purpose for the 2016 funding; does it state? We've already spent 2.4.

MR. LIPP:
I'm reading this now, "Successfully incorporated the bookkeeping, recording and imaging functions into one unified system. Additional funding is requested to incorporate the electronic management of court-related documents providing for the same real-time access as the Land Record System."

LEG. D'AMARO:
Oh, okay. So it's an expansion --

MR. LIPP:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
-- of the system.

MR. LIPP:
Uh-huh
LEG. D'AMARO:
All right, that's fine. Thank you. I'm good.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Anyone else? Okay, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, IR 1197A, Bond Resolution (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $75,000 Bonds to finance the cost of planning for the Optical Disk Imaging System used by the County Clerk’s Office (CP 1751.114), same motion, same second. Roll call.

(*Roll was called by Mr. Laube - Clerk of the Legislature*)

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
No.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.
LEG. ANKER:  
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:  
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:  
No.

LEG. BROWNING:  
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:  
Sixteen (Opposed: Legislators Muratore & Trotta).

P.O. GREGORY:  
Okay, **1198-15 - Authorizing the County Clerk to file an application for additional State mortgage tax reimbursement (Presiding Officer Gregory).**

LEG. STERN:  
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Motion by Legislator Stern. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:  
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Okay, **IR 1201-15 - Authorizing the reconveyance of County-owned real estate pursuant to Section 215, New York State County Law to Mark and Stefanie DeVoe (Spencer).** It has to be tabled, so I'll make a motion -- Legislator Spencer will make a motion to table.

LEG. SPENCER:  
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:  
I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:  
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:  
**IR 1205-15 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Daniel Kane Realty, Inc. (SCTM No. 0500-366.00-02.00-107.000). (County Executive).**
LEG. STERN:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Stern. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1210-115 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law Town of Brookhaven (SCTM No. 0200-981.10-01.00-005.000)(County Executive). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1211-15 - Authorizing the renewal of the lease of premises located at 1869 Brentwood Road, Brentwood, NY for use by the Department of Health Services (County Executive).

LEG. D'AMARO:
Legislator -- Presiding Officer, please note my recusal on the record.

P.O. GREGORY:
Sure. Motion by Legislator Martinez. I'll second. All in favor?

LEG. CILMI:
Wait. So this is -- are we leasing this property or is somebody else leasing this property from us? We are leasing this property; George, I guess?

MR. NOLAN:
Yes, we are leasing the property. We are extending our lease.

LEG. CILMI:
We're extending our lease for 15 years? And what do we use the facility for?

LEG. MARTINEZ:
The Health Center.

MS. CULP:
This is for the Brentwood Health Center and the Brentwood Mental Health Clinic. How are you?

LEG. CILMI:
Good. Okay. How long is the lease for?

MS. CULP:
This is a 15-year lease. This is a renewal of the current lease and it will be 15 years, with the option to extend up to ten additional.

LEG. CILMI:
Aren't we contemplating entering into an agreement with HRH to operate this facility?
MS. CULP: Right. There apparently is a proposal to transition to HRH. However, regardless, we need a lease for our current facility.

LEG. CILMI: Yeah.

MS. CULP: And as with all of the other proposals, that the County remains responsible for the space costs, going back to Coram in 2012.

LEG. CILMI: Okay. So all of the other agreements that we've had with Hudson River, we provide for the cost of the space.

MS. CULP: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Can I just say something?

MS. CULP: Sure.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Can I just make one statement?

LEG. CILMI: Sure.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Just so you know, the new lease, the base rental rate is dropping from $16.64 per square foot to 14.07 -- $14.07 per square foot. And we also have the option to reduce the area as we need down to 51,000 square feet down to as little as 36,000 square feet. So as -- if we feel during the redevelopment of the site we need to reduce it, we can do that under the new lease.

LEG. CILMI: Is that the result of your amazingly good negotiating skills?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: My smile.

LEG. CILMI: Ah, okay.

(*Laughter*)

Okay. So my understanding is that the rent -- the yearly rent is a little more than $700,000 or something like that; is that right? And we're happy with the space in general?

MS. CULP: It's a good location in terms of access to the Brentwood community, there's public transportation. The Legislator --
LEG. CILMI:
But in terms of the -- you know, the landlord, the owner of the building, we work well with whoever that is?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We get him to do what we need.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. CILMI:
Yeah, I bet we do. I bet we do. Okay, thanks very much.

P.O. GREGORY:
And Ms. Culp, we are -- the savings that have been presented, just to the members of the Legislature, this has already been factored in, so the millions of dollars that are being saved accounts for the lease, or not?

MR. LIPP:
Well, I could answer that, too.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.

MR. LIPP:
So we did the A-96 report to see we had at least 10% per year first five years, and this was included in that.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right. So there is -- my point is there's a savings.

MR. LIPP:
Correct.

P.O. GREGORY:
This is not in addition to. Okay. And although we don't own the facility, we rent the facility, there's still a significant savings.

MR. LIPP:
Correct.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right. Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
Is this the only one that we -- like the other ones we own the buildings, correct?

MS. CULP:
No, we also rent MLK and we rent --

LEG. CALARCO:
Patchogue.
MS. CULP: Patchogue.

LEG. TROTTA: And we're paying the rent on them.

MS. CULP: Yes, and Coram.

LEG. TROTTA: And for eternity we have to pay the rent on them?

MS. CULP: No. I want to say they're about like 12 or 15 years.

LEG. TROTTA: But in terms of our agreement with whatever the health company is, Hudson River.

MS. CULP: No, it's not eternity, it's in the subleases. I don't have the exact --

LEG. TROTTA: I thought that -- you know, I was under the impression that after five years they get weaned off of this, but apparently not.

MS. CULP: Right. Well, that's for operating, that's in terms of the community benefit grant, the operating costs.

LEG. TROTTA: So this isn't a contract, I'm assuming. There's no way we can't -- if everyone voted no right now, what would happen?

MS. CULP: If the --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: We wouldn't be able to resign the lease.

MS. CULP: Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I mean, you know, we'd be out of a medical center. You know, if the landlord wouldn't want to --

LEG. TROTTA: Have we signed the agreement with Brentwood yet, or no?

MS. CULP: For the transition to HRH?

LEG. TROTTA: Yeah.
MS. CULP:  
No, that was tabled today, so before you in May.

LEG. TROTTA:  
Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:  
All right, Legislator Martinez.

LEG. MARTINEZ:  
Just to clarify, Legislator Cilmi. The location where it's now, it's centrally located Brentwood Road/Second Avenue. You know, there were talks of moving the center and to a location which was, one, out of the Brentwood District, and really not on the roads of public transportation, which many constituents use to get there. So like the Commissioner just said, we got them to do what, you know, we really asked for them to do, so they definitely did come through.

LEG. CILMI:  
Fair enough.

P.O. GREGORY:  

LEG. TROTTA:  
Opposed.

MR. LAUBE:  

P.O. GREGORY:  
Okay, **IR 1212-15 - Authorizing the lease of premises to the United States Department of Agriculture (County Executive)**.

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
Mr. Presiding Officer? As per the letter that we have on file with you and the Board of Ethics, I'd like to recuse myself from this IR, 1212. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Okay.

MR. LAUBE:  
That last vote was 16.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Motion by Legislator Stern. I'll second. On the motion, anyone?
All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:  
Seventeen (Recused: Legislator Krupski).

P.O. GREGORY:  
**IR 1252-15 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Chien I. Chiang (SCTM No. 0400-071.00-01.00-014.000) (County Executive)**.
LEG. CALARCO:  
Motion.

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

MR. LAUBE:  
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Okay, 1261 we did.

**IR 1266-15 - Reappoint member to the Suffolk County Board of Ethics (Heather M. Palmore, Esq.) (Calarco).** I'll make a motion to approve. Second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. LAUBE:  
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Okay, we saved the best for last.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Motion to approve.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Procedural Motion No. 4-2015 - To amend the Rules of the Suffolk County Legislature to authorize Riverhead Committee Meetings (Krupski), and torture all the west-end Legislators to come to the east.

(*Laughter*)

May I have a motion by the East End Legislator from the north fork.

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
Motion.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Seconded by --

P.O. GREGORY:  
Legislator Krupski. Seconded by Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:  
Second, the middle.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
All right, I'll take it.

LEG. McCAFFREY:  
Motion to table.
P.O. GREGORY:
Motion to table by Legislator McCaffrey (laughter), all too happily. Seconded by Legislator Trotta. On the motion?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion. We have had a lot of discussion about this and I appreciate everyone's candor. We did hear some testimony from some of our constituents on the East End this morning, how important this is. How, you know, it's physically difficult to get to Hauppauge to get your three minutes of time in. So I won't belabor this. I will ask for your consideration, because it is making government more accessible to everyone to have the committees. This Procedural Motion only allows for one meeting this year in December, and I would like to ask for your consideration for that for this one meeting to give -- what's that?

LEG. D'AMARO:
For one week.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
The whole committee, yes, all 12 committees to meet in Riverhead for the one week. We are set up for that here, this is the County Center. It would give people -- and if we had that done, people could plan, people could come for those committees and address all the committees and take part in it in a reasonable manner.

Riverhead used to be the middle of the County and now it's seemed to have gotten a little bit further to the east, but I don't think it's that much to ask to have one meeting this year, for all the committees to be held out in Riverhead.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:
I'm supportive of this. I think we have a large County, but we do have two horseshoes. You know, we spent a lot of money renovating this site here. We have a large population who this would be convenient for -- maybe not as large as the west end, but we're not making it 50/50 -- and I think that we should try it. And I think that it's important that these residents feel like they have access and they have the ability to come and have an interactive experience on these -- you know, on policy issues and that it's convenient for them. And again, as the sponsor has stated, it is just for once this year, so I'm very supportive.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Schneiderman.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Well, we -- this is the County seat. This is historically -- this is the center of the County, this was once the power base of Suffolk County. I understand the population grew in western Suffolk faster than it grew here. For me, being from Montauk, you know, still, it's over an hour for me to drive here, believe it or not. So it is -- you know, I know some of you maybe from Huntington or Amityville, maybe it's a similar trip for you, but that seems kind of fair to have meetings once in a while. Being the County seat, you would think you would have all the meetings here, but that's not what Legislator Krupski is asking for; he's asking for just the committee meetings preceding a General Meeting. If this goes through, it's only going to affect one committee cycle at the end of
this year.

This bill basically is changing the rules, and the rules get adopted every year. So if it works, next year when you do the rules, I won't be here, but I would like to come and visit once in a while, and it would be nice to have committee meeting here once in a while as well. But when you do the rules next year, you can decide to keep it as a policy or eliminate it as a policy, but it seems only fair to give it a shot.

Now, you know, the one problem for me is that to me, it should have happened a long time ago, so I really applaud Legislator Krupski for getting it moved forward. There were times when I had committees on three separate days and I would be driving from Montauk to Hauppauge, you know, three or four times a week. It was a lot of travel and that could happen to future Legislators, and it would be nice to know that once in a while they would have a slightly shorter trip. So I commend you, Legislator Krupski, for doing this, I'm cosponsoring with you. I hope that the other Legislators will give this a chance. It really is the fair thing to do. It's not going to happen very often, but once in a while before those Riverhead Committee -- before those Riverhead Legislative Sessions, we could have committees in the same location.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:
I have a question for Robert. Have you done an evaluation as to how much it will cost to have the meetings here as opposed to in Hauppauge?

MR. LIPP:
Yes, we provided a memo last week. Yes. Okay, I'm sorry, I apologize. I guess you weren't -- I guess Cary will have to change that; I think I did Legislators All, and I assumed; you know what they say about the word assume.

MR. NOLAN:
Summarize it.

MR. LIPP:
Okay. So the summary is, what we did is we had three scenarios. The first scenario is travel only, that's what would happen if you did it once here, and estimated what the travel expense would be based upon the difference from Legislative offices to here versus to Hauppauge, and also made assumptions about department heads coming in, blah, blah, blah. And so that cost would be $2,159 estimate for that one meeting.

That being said, you could increase that cost, I guess, times five if you had it for a full year.

The second and third options were to do it in a more complete way and that is to provide equipment which would cost -- for the equipment it would cost $15,200, and that's basically six computers, software licenses and network upgrades. And also, eventually, in order to make this work properly, you'd probably want to do some renovations and put in six cubicles with associated costs, that would be $23,000. The two costs of the equipment and the infrastructure could be either borrowed or operating. That's as quick as I can do it; I don't know if you understood me or not.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Calarco.
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LEG. CALARCO:
I just wanted to support this resolution. I think it's important to try to give folks on the East End an opportunity. I think what Legislator Krupski is looking to do here is a fair approach in just asking to do this one week this year as a trial run, so to speak, to see how it works out, see how we're able to accommodate it. I think if we then decide to do this in the future on a more regular basis, that it also allows us to have the ability to then make appropriate accommodations so that individual Legislators who are coming from points very far west would be able to make sure their schedules are accommodating, because for those that may have to travel three days a week or two days a week to come out here for committee meetings, it's difficult. And I think for some on the East End they specifically had it set up so they're only doing it once a week, so they're not making that long drive on a regular basis for a single committee and then have to do it day after day. So we do it once this year, we give it a trial run and we see how it works out, and then, you know, if we want to keep doing it then we can make sure we accommodate people's schedules accordingly.

P.O. GREGORY:

LEG. BARRAGA:
I'm looking at the different scenarios that you've given. One has to do with travel expenses only; travel and equipment; travel, equipment and infrastructure improvements. The numbers are all over the place predicated on the number of times you wind up having meetings out here. There's one set of figures for one time, and then it goes up to if you have it five times a year, all right, and then you projected it out over 10, 15, 20 years.

I guess the question I have is that I think there's an inter-relationship between this kind of bill, which increases our expenses overall, our operating expenses, and what we're trying to accomplish hopefully as a Legislature and the County Executive Branch. I know Mr. D'Amaro is the Chairman of the Budget Committee. Last week, although I didn't get a chance to hear it, I'm sure there was an in-depth interaction between his committee and representatives from the County Executive's Office in terms of the fiscal situation in Suffolk County. And I remember reading that figures were all over the place in terms of the structural deficit. The next day people were talking about $170 million and then they said well, if you amortize the debt service associated with the pensions it might reduce it $60 million. If you borrow from the Sewer Fund maybe you’d reduce it another 20, 25 million, so you probably have a structural deficit between 80 and $90 million. That means, you know, your expenses are exceeding your revenues on an annual basis by that amount of money.

There aren't a lot of options when you have a structural deficit, and we've taken many, many major decisions to reduce it. If you take a look at the revenue side, I mean, what are the options. We're heavily dependent upon sales tax and we don't control that. Every time somebody comes up with an idea that generates revenue, the public goes crazy, so you're very limited. On the expense side, we've made some major, major decisions with reference to nursing homes and employees. I remember under the previous County Executive, some of you were sitting here, we were always complaining -- people were complaining about the number of vacancies, 1300, 1500 vacancies, and yet with the new County Executives we never filled those and now we have a thousand fewer people saving $100 million a year.

But the last thing you want to do, I mean, if you really can't do too much as far as increasing revenue or if you're down to the bone as far as, and I think you are from an employee perspective, on the expense side, is to take actions like this to increase your expenses. You know, you're going against the grain. I mean, in terms of the transportation of people, Suffolk County is not 780 miles
long, it's 78 miles long. When someone gets up there and says I have to travel 40 minutes to a meeting, well, travel 40 minutes, travel 40 minutes. That person is not going to show up at every committee meeting we have out here. That person will show up when they have an interest, if they have an interest at all in what that committee is doing on a particular issue. On the other hand, everybody has to come out here. The members, the staff. You know, in Hauppauge, frankly, if I'm at a committee meeting and somebody wants to see a Commissioner, the guy's right there. I don't know where the Commissioners -- I think most of them are in there, they're not out here.

So I understand where you're coming from. I just think from a fiscal perspective it's not the appropriate time to do it. If there was a -- if you said to me, Tom, there's a need, a real need, an emergency, I'm for this. Or if you said to me, you know, we're going to do this for one week and the next year we'll do it four or five times and you have an offset, something the East End has now because you think it's so important to do this, that they're willing to give up to get this, I'm with you, but I don't see that. I don't see that. So I'm going to vote in the negative.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Just to remind everyone, it's not about the Legislators, it's about the public and letting the public have access to government.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:
Can you give me -- when you say travel, whose travel are you talking?

MR. LIPP:
Okay. So, for instance, Aides and other staff, everybody, they could get mileage reimbursement, which I believe is 57.5 cents per mile. So what we did is we looked at the distances that people would travel here relative to Hauppauge and, you know, we calculated the extra miles for some districts. Legislators, a couple of them, would have lesser cost, but obviously most of them a greater cost. And, for instance, their Aides and everybody else that's doing the traveling could put in for the mileage reimbursement.

LEG. BROWNING:
Well, I wouldn't want to necessarily consider that personally, because, I mean, I don't have a County car. I don't charge the County for my gas. I pay for my gas. I come here to work. This is where I come to work and I drive home. Like my husband drives to Brooklyn to go to work. That's his choice, he drives to Brooklyn. So, you know, I wouldn't necessarily take this into consideration.

And, Tom, quite a few of the people that were here from the various departments all work in Yaphank, which is pretty much in the middle, so for them to come from Yaphank to here versus Hauppauge, not much difference. I know that we have a couple of the County Executive staff that have been here all day actually live closer to here than they do to Hauppauge. So I think that -- or pretty much in between.

So, you know, again, when we want to look at staff and I agree with Al, you know, it's one time this year. Let's see how it works. You know, my constituents, I think they would prefer to come to Riverhead than go to Hauppauge. It's for me going to Hauppauge in the morning, traffic, you know, thank God I have a hybrid, I can get on the HOV now, but the reality is, is sometimes the traffic is horrendous for us to go from, you know, east to west. Coming west to east is always a much nicer
drive. So I'm going to support this. I don't think it's a bad idea to at least give it one shot this year, and try it for next year if it works.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay. You know, I'm going to support it. I think it's something that's worth trying. I'm not sure what the result is going to be. I know you are someone that is very conscious of staff being present at meetings and trying to get them out at meetings. The concern that I have is, you know, you are going to have people from the Administration and people from Hauppauge that are going to be sitting here all day just in case a question comes up, because that's just going to be the way it is, because you're not going to be able to wait 45 minutes to get someone on the phone and get them out here. It can be a very logistical nightmare for me, and several people who have pointed this out, the inconvenience for me. You know, I have an office in Hauppauge. I don't have an office here. George doesn't have an office. So we're going to have to work out some arrangements for that. It's not going to be easy, but I think it's certainly worth trying.

Having said that, we have several other people on the list. Legislator Cilmi and then Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. CILMI:**
I just have a question, maybe Counsel can answer. Is there anything that precludes the Presiding Officer, I suppose, from calling a committee meeting or changing the location of a committee meeting if there's something of particular interest to the East End in a given committee from actually having that committee meeting, you know, on an as needed basis out here?

**MR. NOLAN:**
I think he could do it.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Okay. Thanks.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Okay. Legislator Schneiderman.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
First to Legislator Barraga's point about the cost. You know, this to me is about public access. It might be more cost effective to hold all the meetings in Amityville so you wouldn't have to drive.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
That's a cheap shot, come on.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
No, no, I'm just saying, or in Melville or in Huntington, wherever it might be. But, you know, trying to reach out to the public, where the public is to try to give them better access so that they can weigh in on the business of the County, which could affect them, I think is really what -- what's at the core here. If you look at the East End itself, we're roughly a third of the real property tax assessment of this County. The sales tax, I believe, it's somewhere in that range, too. We provide probably a third of the $1.3 billion that come in in sales tax. You know, to ask for a meeting out on the East End, even if it may cost $2,000 more, you know, considering the economics, this area is an economic engine for the County, you know, I think it's minor.
I think we should give this a try. It would be interesting for me as the outgoing Legislator at the horseshoe from the East End, the last meeting, the last committee cycle of my 12 years here, to have it on the East End would be a nice parting gift. So I hope you'll consider it.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I don't have anyone else. Oh, Doc -- Legislator Spencer.

LEG. SPENCER:
I wanted to not say anything for or against. I had some representations with the sponsor. You know, I have my own personal opinion. But one of the things I did think was important to consider is that we have other options regardless of this passing or failing. And the fact that we feel that we are confined to this space, and I understand the need for -- to actually feel and touch and shake hands and everything, but, you know, we now have the capability where a lot of our government functions and corporate companies are international and that there could -- I'm introducing a bill where someone could stand at that podium, be seen by us on the monitors in one horseshoe, and it could go both ways so this does not take anything away from Legislator Krupski's bill. But the technology is there. We're doing robotic surgery remotely in India from a console 4,000 miles away where we're literally operating on people. So we have the technology where someone can come here and be heard and we can see them, and they can see us, and they can interact, and I envision a day where that technology will be available where all of our meetings, regardless of where we are, the public could go to either venue. And I'm introducing a resolution to look at a feasibility of being able to do that.

So again, I think that would give everyone access all the time. But this, again, does not -- I represented to the sponsor that I would listen to the debate and I respect the sponsor for what he's trying to do, and, you know, I'm going vote according to my conscience on this, but I appreciate what you're doing.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. So we have a motion to table, right?

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
I'd like to withdraw my motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right. We have a motion to approve. All right. Roll call.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Roll call.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
No.

LEG. D'AMARO:
No.
LEG. STERN:
No.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:
No.

LEG. TROTTA:
No.

LEG. KENNEDY:
No.

LEG. BARRAGA:
No.

LEG. CILMI:
No.

LEG. MARTINEZ:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Pass.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Pass.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
No.

MR. LAUBE:
Nine.
P.O. GREGORY:
All right. All right. So in your manila folders we have IR 1380 - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York authorizing the issuance of $250,000 bonds to finance the cost of infrastructure improvements under the Suffolk County Affordable Housing Opportunities Program (Woolworth Building - Riverhead) (CP 6411.310).

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
It's not going to kill it, is it?

P.O. GREGORY:
I don't know. I can put it in for you if you want. I'll second.

LEG. CILMI:
Is this something that Al wants?

P.O. GREGORY:
Well, he's been arguing for it, right?

LEG. CILMI:
Is this something that Legislator Krupski's been supporting?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
What's that?

LEG. CILMI:
This bill. This bill.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
What about it?

LEG. CILMI:
Is this something that you're supporting?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes, I made the motion.

LEG. CILMI:
In that case, as long as you're supporting it, I'm in favor of it.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Generous, generous.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. We have a motion and a second. It's a Bond Resolution. Roll call.

(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)
LEG. KRUPSKI:  
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:  
Yes, I'm for you, Al.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
Yes for Krupski.

LEG. STERN:  
Yes.

LEG. MC CAFFREY:  
Yes for Krupski.

LEG. TROTTA:  
Yes for Krupski.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:  
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:  
Yes.

LEG. MARTINEZ:  
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:  
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:  
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:  
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:  
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:  
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:  
Yes.

D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Yes.
General Meeting - April 28, 2015

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I'd like to waive the rules and lay the following resolutions on the table as late starters: IR 1376, Health; IR 1377, Public Safety; IR 1378, Government Ops; IR 1379, Ways and Means; IR 1381, Public Works; IR 1382, Health; and set the public hearing May 12th, 2:30 P.M., in Hauppauge.

LEG. CILMI:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1383, Ways and Means; IR 1384, Government Ops. I'd like to also set the Public Hearing May 12th at 2:30 in Hauppauge. IR 1385, Health; 1386, Public Safety; IR 1387, EPA. Second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? That's our agenda.

MR. LAUBE:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
We stand adjourned. Thank you.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 8:46 p.m.*)

{   } - Denotes spelled Phonetically