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P.O. HORSLEY:
Will all Legislators please come to the horseshoe? We're about to start the meeting. Mr. Clerk, would you please call the roll?

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

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Good morning.

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

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Here.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Here.

LEG. BROWNING:
(Not Present)

LEG. MURATORE:
(Not Present)

LEG. HAHN:
(Not Present)

LEG. ANKER:
Here.

LEG. CALARCO:
(Not Present)

LEG. MONTANO:
(Not Present)

LEG. CILMI:
Here.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Here.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Here.

LEG. NOWICK:
Here.

LEG. GREGORY:
Here.

LEG. STERN:
Here.

**LEG. D’AMARO:**
Here.

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

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Here.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Eleven.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
Tim, sorry.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Tim.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Thirteen.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
I suspect that some of our members are not here because of the snow and traffic is pretty rough in a lot of locations throughout the Island. There's rubbernecking, there's accidents. Ms. Nowick is giving me a traffic report here. She says it's miserable out there.

(*Laughter*)

So everyone be careful today. When you leave here, be careful. I wanted to also note for the record that Legislator Montano has an excused absence for the morning session and he'll be here later. He's got a family obligation that he's very proud of and is attending today. May we all stand for the salute to the flag led by Legislator Cilmi.

**Salutation**

The opening prayer will be given by Reverend Michael Staneck, Associate Pastor at the Trinity Lutheran Church in Islip and is a guest of, of course, of Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Good morning, everybody, and in advance Merry Christmas. Reverend Mike Staneck has been the Associate Pastor of Trinity Lutheran Church in Islip since his ordination on December 18, 2011, and prior to that was a vicar for two years and Commissioned Deacon for six years prior to that. Born and raised in Islip, Pastor Staneck has been a member of Trinity Lutheran Church his entire life, and has also been a small business owner since 1992. He's also a member of the Rotary Club of Islip, of which I'm a member as well, and has also been serving at another Lutheran Church over this past year, St. Luke in Dix Hills.

His wife of almost 31 years, Tricia O’Neill Staneck, was also born and raised in Islip and is a certified Teacher’s Aide at Developmental Disabilities Institute in Bohemia, a great organization here in Suffolk. Together they have raised their three sons; Matthew who is 26, and a pastor in New York City; Alec, who is 23, who just completed the Police Academy in North Carolina and Caleb, who is 15 and is a sophomore at Islip High School. More than all that, Mike is a great friend and I’m wonderfully honored to introduce him for our invocation this morning. Pastor Mike.
MR. CAVANAGH:
Thank you, Tom, and it's actually apropos, I think, with what I've been going through with the last month with the Suffolk County Water Authority, which you know a little bit about. And I won't get into the details too deep here, but I have a bill that's very large that I'm trying to reduce, and they told me I could not negotiate the bill because it was under the direction of the Suffolk County Legislature. So --

(*Laughter*)

-- I have my bill here and I'm just trying to figure out who do I hand my bill to, so.

Let us pray. Worthy are you our Lord and God to receive glory and honor and power, for you created all things and by your will they have existed and were created. For this day we give you all thanks and praise, and we do so as well for the days you graciously grant us going forward. Give us the faith to behold the majesty of your presence and direct us to trust in your word as we seek justice, equity, equality, mercy and compassion for all people. As the Psalm declares, in you I take refuge so let me never be put to shame. So I ask that this legislative body look to you for guidance and direction in all that they do and say as they gather today. I ask for your wisdom and this sermon to be upon their hearts and minds. May their time and meeting today and beyond be pleasing to you and done so through mutual respect for the laws of this land, mutual respect for each other and out of the desire to create good will for all mankind. May mercy, justice and compassion be upon their hearts. May their tongues be kept from evil, their lips from speaking deceit, their hearts pure and their health for themselves and their families strong.

Finally, may the joy and hope that we celebrate during this Christmas and holiday season be entrenched in their hearts and minds for evermore. I pray this in the precious name of Jesus. Amen.

(Amen said in unison)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Pastor Mike. And again, I see there's politics in everything, Legislator Cilmi.

(*Laughter*)

Would we please remain standing for a moment of silence. As always, let us remember all those men and women who put themselves in harm's way every day to protect our country, both home and abroad. As well as I'd like a moment of silence for Carmine Chiusano, who was the Assistant Budget Director of the County Executive's Budget Office for over 20 years and father of two four year-olds, as well as Deputy Chief Jack Hough.

(*Moment of Silence Observed*)

All righty. Good morning everybody, and welcome to the General Meeting of December 17, 2013, our last meeting of the year. And we have -- I'm getting woohoo's from a couple of our Legislators, which is always good to see that our Legislators are in a happy mood. We have a number of proclamations. I understand, Kate, you want to hold off?

LEG. BROWNING:
Yeah.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. We’re going to pass over Legislator Browning and go to our second proclamator, Legislator Anker, who will present proclamations to Mark Yashowitz and Laurie Varriale. These teachers from Rocky Point Schools organized a Veterans Day appreciation assembly. The assembly involved the input of the elementary school students, including a chorus presentation about the service of veterans and artwork. Legislator Anker? There you are.

**LEG. ANKER:**
Okay. I wanted to thank everybody for coming out today. We have a handful of people from Joseph Edgar School of Veterans Day, and this is a very important program. On November 6th the students and faculty of the Joseph A. Edgar Intermediate School in Rocky Point held their annual Veterans Day Assembly to recognize and thank the local veterans of Rocky Point community, and really all the veterans throughout Suffolk County and the United States, because it is a huge celebration that we can remember them and their service that they have, you know, put forth.

The assembly featured patriotic music performed by a student chorus, a book that was displayed at the assembly on a projector and also artistic contributions by students, including special Veterans Days t-shirts. During the assembly the Student Council members distributed letters of thanks that were written by the third, fourth and fifth graders, and the students were asked to speak of words to thank our veterans.

The Veterans Day Assembly was founded 15 years ago by a former teacher, Sal Lentini. For the last ten years Mr. Mark Yashowitz has overseen the coordination of the assembly since Mr. Lentini’s passing, along with the help of Mr. Craig Knapp and Ms. Varriale.

Today we have Mr. Yashowitz and Mrs. Varriale, and also we have some of the -- we have some students here. We have, let’s see, I’m sorry. Jadon Hess and Kayla MacKay. Very Good. Well, thank you for coming out in the snow. I am honored to give you these certificates of recognition and appreciation for the work that you have put forth to create this amazing assembly. It’s like, you know, if the entire Town of Rocky Point could come they would, and there was a lot of people that did participate and visit the event. And as a daughter of a disabled vet, I just want to thank you from the bottom of my heart of all the hard work that you, the students and also the faculty and the members of the Rocky Pointy community have put forth in this event.

So I would like -- would you mind just speaking just for a couple of minutes on the event? I don’t know which -- yeah, that would be great. So, Ms. Varriale, you please step forth?

**MS. VARRIALE:**
Thank you. Well, thank you, Legislator Anker and everyone for having us today. I’m Ms. Varriale. My role in the Veterans Ceremony, I’m the Technology Coordinator for the building and I have a Technology Club of 30 wonderful students. It’s tradition each year to display the POW/MIA remembrance table and the students explain the significance of each piece on that table. And then we change each year, we have some kind of presentation that of course integrates technology into the Assembly. This year students created a virtual picture book, *A is for Armed Forces*, and they discussed important aspects of the military and the veterans. And we actually created a QR Code and integrated that into our program so that the families and the veterans can share the video and watch it at home. I would just like to say that the event is such a wonderful one. It’s one of my favorite days of the school year because it really brings the community together and honors all of our local veterans. Thank you again.

**Applause**

**MR. YASHOWITZ:**
Thank you, Legislature, and thank you, Sarah Anker, for having us here today and allowing us the opportunity to speak on the behalf of the Veterans Day Assembly and recognizing the students as
well. It's very humbling to have an event where we honor our veterans. Veterans come up to me and say, "Mark, thank you for what you're doing for all of us" and they come up to me with tears in their eyes and I look at them and I say, "I should be the one with tears in my eyes because of the service and the sacrifice that you have put forth for our country and your dedication to our country."

Words can't express how truly grateful I am with gratitude and appreciation for our veterans, but I can't do it alone and it's really instrumental to get the students involved, like Kayla and Jadon, through technology with Ms. Varriale and Mr. Craig Knapp, to allow the students the opportunity to invite the veterans, to collect letters of donation, to collect donations for food, put out flyers, stuff envelopes inviting our Congress people, our elected officials from the President down to our local Congress people, and the students really have a big hand in that. And without them I could not be successful, and without them the Veterans Day Assembly could not be successful. So without further ado, I would like to thank my students and again, Legislator Sarah Anker, for all of her support. So thank you all for letting us speak today.

Applause

**LEG. ANKER:**
And participating in this event, did you -- what did you do? Did you make a card and did you come up with things to say? Come speak just for about 30 seconds. This is Kayla, Kayla MacKay.

**MS. MacKAY:**
I made a speech for the veterans along with Elana Gold, and we invited about, I want to say 30 veterans, and I want to thank everyone.

(*Laughter*)

Applause

**LEG. ANKER:**
Tell me what you did to participate in this event and how do you feel about, you know, continuing this tradition at the school.

**MR. HESS:**
Well, I sang in the high notes. My grandfather came to participate in the Veterans Assembly and that's it.

**LEG. ANKER:**
Well, thank you so much. And again, thank you for having this amazing program.

Applause

**Photograph Taken**

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Thank you very much, Legislator Anker, and congratulations to all. Nice job. All right. The next speaker -- proclamator is Legislator Cilmi, who will present a proclamation to Charles Russo. I understand Mr. Russo is an attorney and is off to court right after this proclamation.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Yes. Thanks, Mr Chairman. If I could ask Mr. Russo to join me here at the podium as well as our Commissioner of Social Services, John O'Neill. And let's see, I believe Mike Licata, Director of our Child Placement Bureau is here, as well as Janet O'Keefe, Assistant Division Administrator. And if I could ask also Donna Lauricella, who is President of an organization, Foster Parents and Adoptive Parents of Suffolk County.
The holiday season is such an important time. It gives us cause to pause and think about the many gifts that we all have in life, and hopefully to think about those of us who don't share those gifts. Things that many of us take for granted, a roof over our head, family, friends, but it also gives us time to thank individuals who make the lives of those less fortunate a little more fortunate, and here in Suffolk County there are certainly many of those individuals, but Mr. Russo, who stands in back of me, is certainly an outstanding example.

About 30 years ago Charlie, who is an attorney, formed an organization called Christmas Magic, and every year for those 30 years spearheads an effort to fundraise and collect Christmas gifts for the many foster children and families and adopted children and families in Suffolk County. And he just doesn't, you know, buy, you know, a bunch of dolls and stuff. Each gift is personally selected for the children. Last year 10,000 gifts were delivered to children in Suffolk County who are with foster parents and adoptive parents as a result of Mr. Russo's efforts.

In addition to all of that, he is the Chairman of the Board of Hope House Ministries as well as the Long Island Coalition for the Homeless. He serves as the Chair as well for Christmas Magic, the organization he founded. He's a founder and a Director of Empire National Bank. With all of that, maintains a successful law practice, which in and of itself provides free legal service to Hope House Ministries and its residents.

What a blessing it is for all of us to say thank you to Mr. Russo for his generosity and care and love of all of the children here in Suffolk County. So, Charlie, I have a proclamation here for you, and I would be remiss if I didn't thank Donna for bringing this to our attention and sharing such a gift as Charlie Russo's generosity this holiday season. Charlie this is for you. Thank you very much from all of us.

**Applause**

**MR. RUSSO:**

I thought I was having a meeting with the Commissioner this morning because we've been meeting with his office on the issues of homelessness. Unfortunately, it wasn't 10,000 gifts, it was 10,000 kids that we delivered to homeless shelters in Nassau and Suffolk County. I say unfortunately because when we first started this 30 years ago we did one shelter with 24 kids and we're now up to 10,000 kids collectively. So we have been working with the Commissioner's Office and I've got to commend the Department of Social Services because, as you all know, they're overburdened and trying to do the best that they can. But our issues of homelessness are greater than they've ever been.

We are addressing currently the issues of veterans homelessness. I was impressed with the group that was honored before me, but we have now three projects in Suffolk County that will provide shelter for homeless veterans. So we, unfortunately, lead the nation in a couple of these areas, and homeless veterans is one of them. And we all have to recognize this in this holiday season and throughout the year.

I wish that I weren't receiving awards for delivering these type of things to homeless -- the amount of homeless people that we're delivering them to, but again, we're all working hard at it. I know you are. I can tell you that the Department of Social Services is and they're working with the agencies in trying to address these issues.

So on behalf of the just hundreds of volunteers -- we have no paid staff. We do this every year throughout the year with no paid staff and it's completely a volunteer organization. So to all of those people, the high school students, the Girl Scouts, the lacrosse teams, the soccer teams, the football teams, the Judges, the DA's, the Social Workers that all take part in this, it's a wonderful
way to celebrate this season and I wish you all a good New Year.

Applause

COMMISSIONER O'NEILL:
Good morning. I would just like to thank Legislator Cilmi for allowing me to speak on behalf of the proclamation to Charlie Russo. For those that don't know, and Legislator Cilmi covered a lot of this, that Charlie has been doing this for a long, and he's worked on such programs in Hope House, Pax Christi, the Long Island Coalition for the Homeless. With the help of others he's able to keep up, unfortunately as he said, with the demand that is out there for these types of services.

So I would like to honor Charlie for his hard work, his diligent efforts, to provide Christmas Magic to the Department's Children and Foster Care. These children are under the custody of Social Services and Charlie helps make their lives just a little bit easier around Christmastime. They face many challenges and Charlie and his organization, all his volunteers, hopefully are able to springboard these children to a better living.

So I'd just like to thank you again, Charlie, for the Christmas Magic Program as well as for all of what he has done over the years for social services in terms of homelessness and working as a public advocate on behalf of these vulnerable residents. Thank you very much, Charlie.

Applause

(PHOTOGRAPH TAKEN)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Congratulations, Mr. Russo, and on behalf of all of us, thank you very much for Suffolk County. All right. The next proclamation will be given by Legislator Spencer, who will be presenting proclamations to -- Oh, I'm sorry, Kate. I'm sorry. Oh boy, you know, it's a short timer this time, Kate.

LEG. BROWNING:
We'll forgive you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Stacey Kazel is next.

LEG. BROWNING:
I had one more, but he is not going to be able to make it.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. You're on your own now.

LEG. BROWNING:
Thank you. Well, you know, a lot of Yaphank is within my district and a lot of people ask me why, John Kennedy, I know he knows why, having family living there, Yaphank is a very unique community and I would say it's the people in Yaphank is what makes it so special. And I'd like you to meet Stacey Kazel. She is a volunteer of the Yaphank Fire Department. Many of you saw in the news recently the Yaphank Presbyterian Church, a historic church, built in the year of 1851, has been destroyed by a fire. And I've had the pleasure to go inside that church and see the -- how beautiful it is and so many historic items within the church, and many of the items were destroyed.

Now, Stacey is not a member of the Presbyterian Church, she's a member of the Yaphank Fire Department, but knows that church and knows the inside. That's why Yaphank people are so
special, because they know their community in every which way. But on Sunday morning at two o'clock in the morning the fire ripped through the Yaphank church. There were nine departments that responded, 75 firefighters and it took nearly two-and-a-half hours to get the fire under control. And the one thing that's so special about Stacey is knowing that church and knowing what was in it, Stacey, with no regard for her own safety, rushed into the church while it was still burning and saved a family Bible, which dates back to the 1870's. That's probably one of the only things that's left from the church.

So I'm here today to say thank you to Stacey for preserving the Yaphank Presbyterian Church's Bible. I know how much it meant to them and I want to say a special thank you and a proclamation for your bravery to walk in and -- to run in and do what you did. Thank you.

Applause

(PHOTOGRAPH TAKEN)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Browning, do you know if -- are they going to rebuild the church?

LEG. BROWNING:
They are hoping next year. It will be their, what anniversary is it next year, hoping by Christmas Eve, because Christmas Eve is when they had the first service.

P.O. HORSLEY:
That's great, what a blessing. All right. Thank you, Legislator. And congratulations to our esteemed firefighter. Legislator Spencer will be presenting a proclamation to the Huntington High School Football Team, who were Suffolk County Division III Champions. I'm sorry these guys couldn't have played against Babylon, Doc.

LEG. SPENCER:
I feel very secure. So you can see that I'm the most protected Legislator in the County.

(*LAUGHTER*)

I'm very happy about that, to see all of these fine young men here this morning. And this is just a great opportunity to be able to recognize our young people and what they're doing in terms of bettering their bodies and their minds and to see them come together and work as a team. And on November 23rd the Hunting High School Blue Devils played Sayville at Stony Brook University to determine the Division III Champion, County Champion, and the Blue Devils emerged victorious, winning by a score of 26 to 18. And so they had a highly successful season under Head Coach Steve Muller. Twelve players went on to receive special honors and recognition for their fine play throughout the season. Senior leadership, team unity and dedicated commitment to the game has been the hallmark of the 45 player Blue Devils squad. Time and again they have demonstrated their ability to meet tough challenges, responding with determination and persistence.

So as the Legislator of the district it gives me great pleasure to recognize them with a team proclamation and also certificates for each member of the team. Let's give them a big hand. Congratulations.

Applause

And we do have men and women, so again, I do see a young woman amongst them. I think I said men, so men and women. So congratulations, guys.
LEG. SPENCER:
Mr. Presiding Officer, I have one more.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes you do, Legislator. Why don't you present to -- I understand it's the Youth Panel for Distracted Driving at Hofstra University.

LEG. SPENCER:
Thank you. So I think some of my other colleagues also have youth panel members that they're recognizing, so I don't know if we can --

P.O. HORSLEY:
I think we can. Would you like to do them?

LEG. SPENCER:
Certainly.

P.O. HORSLEY:
It's my understanding that some of the Legislators do not have proclamations today, but will be forwarding the proclamations to them in the very near future. So I have, besides yourself, I have Legislator Kennedy and Cilmi, I understand, who have several recipients. Legislator Calarco as well as Legislator Krupski, and I believe I have one that I'm going to represent for Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. SPENCER:
Excellent.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Let's see if we can do this without getting mixed up.

LEG. SPENCER:
It gives me great pleasure with several of my colleagues, and they can express theirself in whatever way they chose, but the obstacles that our young people face today are significantly encountered than when I was growing up. I mean, it's really with technology, everything from cars and computers and social media. They really have a lot of challenges and have to make really appropriate decisions in an information age where they have a lot of potential dangers that they could face if they're not careful.

On December the 10th, four of my Northport High School students shared their experience, both personal and observational, with regards to distracted driving. Each panel member presented one point of a distracted driving issue which was of concern to them, and three proposals were argued by the panel. The question and answer session enabled attendees to probe more deeply into understanding why teens take certain risks. The panel members provided the same take home message for everyone, and that was to encourage drivers to pay attention to the road at all times. This has been a major issue the State has taken action on and it's something that really claims countless lives every year, and it's great that the young people have now taken this issue to heart.

So as Legislator of the 18th District, my four members of the panel, Casey Burke, Katie Carroll, Melissa Carroll and Brittany Rohrssen, I am presenting them with a proclamation for their participation. I have Casey and Brittany who are here with me today and I would like to give them a round of applause.
LEG. KENNEDY:
Go ahead, Mr. Presiding Officer.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Congratulations to all. I'd like to, and I'm not sure if he is here, but Ahran Kilmeade?

MR. KILMEADE:
Hi, how are you?

P.O. HORSLEY:
It's very much a pleasure, Ahran, and congratulations. I wanted -- I am up here, I am not your Legislator, but I know -- thank you for excusing me, but I wanted to -- the reason why your Legislator is not here is because Legislator Lindsay is Legislator Lindsay elect and he will not be taking office until January first. He gives his apologies for not being here today for you, but you got me. We are going to forward to you, when the Legislator comes on board, a proclamation. But the whole issue itself is just so concerning. I read in the paper today that a recent study saying that young people are still texting and driving, and they took a poll and it was a huge number that are still not heeding your warning. So with that, I wanted to congratulate you and thank you very much on behalf of Legislator Lindsay. Congratulations.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Thank you. We have Jocelyn Aptowitz, Nicholas Karavolias and Christina Fives, all from Hauppauge. All -- each of you very prominent in your class positions. Who's the class President? Nicholas. Here you go. I want to commend the Center for facilitating this and also for you stepping forward and using your skills to basically go ahead and debate an important point. As you see here, that's the essence of what we do as Legislators to try to go ahead and bring forward better measures and solutions for all our constituents. And you, as young people taking on this important issue, it's outstanding and absolutely commendable. How better to go ahead and help other teens to understand you really do have to pay attention to driving. You can't work the electronic device. Many of us, when I started driving, we were still working with, you know, hand held phones that had that wire and those kind of things, but -- yeah, he'll tell you about it, with a horse and buggy.

(*Laughter*)

It is critical that, you know, you use this experience and your knowledge to help other teens to understand. You just can't do it. Pay attention to what goes on behind the wheel and stay focused on getting back and forth safely so you can do all the other great things that you do. Thank you and congratulations.

LEG. CILMI:
So how many of you are 17 years old? Just raise your hands. Okay, you can put them down.

STUDENT:
Sixteen.

LEG. CILMI:
General Meeting 12/17/13

Sixteen? Okay. Well, Destiny Dyal. Destiny Dyal is, or was, a 17 year old young lady from Florida, who was killed a short time ago as a result of texting and driving. We're not honoring her today, but when young folks like yourselves have a chance to make an impact on life in general, those are the kinds of folks that we enjoy honoring and that deserve to be honored. Destiny had a family of brothers and sisters, Mom and Dad, grandparents. All of you -- many of you have families such as Destiny's. And as a parent myself to even contemplate one of my children being taken from me as a result of such a destructive decision is unfathomable. So God bless each and every one of you for the work that you're doing. It's incredibly important and I guarantee you, to some Mom or Dad or brother and sister or grandmother or grandfather it's making a huge difference. So thank you all.

*Applause*

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Good morning. It's a pleasure to be here. I'm here to recognize my constituent, John Auwaerter and what they've -- John's done with the panel here of young people who are addressing this important issue. And, you know, Suffolk County was the first to make driving while speaking on a cell phone illegal, was the first to make texting and driving illegal, but it's easy enough to say you're not allowed to do it. To really impress upon people not to do some of these behaviors of distracted driving that are so dangerous is not always so easy to do, so to have young people doing that brainstorming, giving us the ideas that matter to them, the things that would work to them, because sometimes we think above or we're not quite connecting with what's actually important is really a great thing to see. And it will certainly help you all in the future as you choose your career paths after college. So, John, thank you very much and congratulations.

*Applause*

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Okay. I'm here with a proclamation for Sara Mo ttern from Riverhead and from Kylie Nolan from Center Moriches, and it's really good -- and I have three children. It's really good when people take responsibility for their own actions. It's really good, and I think the youth today might be a lot smarter than the youth when we were youth. And it's -- but it's good because you're more engaged in what you're doing, and believe me, when you take responsibility for your actions you will go further in life. It's hard to see that when you're 17, but when you get to our age you realize that that's the truth. So congratulations to all of you.

*Applause*

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Robin, do you want to say a word?

**MS. McKINNON:**
Yes, thank you. I appreciate everyone's effort on this. It's obviously a group effort and that's always the best kind. And speaking on that, I just want to say that I represent the Prevention Resource Center, and the main goal and mission of the Prevention Resource Center is to bring communities together. Our mission is to reduce substance abuse in Suffolk County and we do that through many, many different ways, but we know more than anything we need the youth voice involved in the decisions that we make in a whole community.

When I put an ask out to everyone I knew in school districts, you know, bring some kids together, let's get some kids together and let's talk about some issues that they care about. I had about 27 kids respond. I was able to get 11 different students to come together who have never met each other before. You know how hard it is, for those of you who have teenagers, in terms of free time, getting them together. We only met four times and they did a phenomenal job at Hofstra in front of
an audience that they've never done before on issues that they deeply care about.

They came prepared, they came confident and they came ready to kind of throw adults right there on the road and say we need you as role models. It was a distracted driving workshop, but it started with substance abuse. It started with drinking and driving. That was the main issue. It kind of delved into all different issues, the texting. The kids brought up issues of how to deal with communication with their friends in the car, how to -- how do I tell my Dad that he can't check his business mail and text and talk all at the same time, how do I do that. How do I communicate with my father it really scares me. Those are the things that they spoke about. I'm so deeply proud to be a part of this group and I thank you very much.

Applause

MR. KILMEADE:
Thank you. I appreciate that. I think we also need to thank Robin McKinnon for bringing us all together so that we could get our point across to everyone else, and I just wanted to make a round of applause for Robin.

Applause

LEG. KENNEDY:
Good job, young man. Come on, let's go take a picture.

P.O. HORSLEY:
He's my guy.

(*Laughter*)

*Photograph Taken*

P.O. HORSLEY:
All righty. The next proclamation will be given out by Legislator Gregory, who will present proclamations Edmund W. Miles Middle School Coaches Isha Hamilton and Greg McCoy for their heroic actions which led to saving a young girl's life.

LEG. GREGORY:
Good morning, everyone. I would like to call up Dr. Lange, Assistant Superintendent Amityville Schools, as well as Dr. Michele Darby, the Principal of the Edmund Miles Middle School, Isha Hamilton, Coach and teacher, and Coach Greg McCoy, as well as Cynthia {Adrovo} and Evelyn Nunez and Kiavelyn Altagarcia.

Well, it's my pleasure to stand before my colleagues and all those in the audience this morning to say Merry Christmas, Happy Holidays, but today we have two heroes, who a few months ago we were trying to get them in and we weren't able to do it until now, get them in before us and to recognize their efforts. As we all know, our former late Presiding Officer Bill Lindsay was a big advocate for defibrillators. He really brought a lot of attention to the issue for safety reasons throughout Suffolk County, but particularly in our County facilities. A few months ago, Kiavelyn, a middle school student, was at tryouts for soccer, and I'm a soccer player, I played soccer in college so we have something in common, she collapsed. Her coaches and teachers, Ms. Hamilton and Coach McCoy, responded quickly and they were able to obviously save a young Kiavelyn, who stands before us today. And I certainly think that that is worthy of recognition and I would ask that you all give a round of applause for those efforts.

Applause
General Meeting 12/17/13

So from my office and on behalf of the Suffolk County Legislature, we have a proclamation for Coach Hamilton as well as Coach McCoy. Would any of you like to say anything?

MS. HAMILTON:
Thank you to everyone for this recognition. It was just quick thinking and never in all my life did I ever think that I'd have to do something like this and fortunately it turned out well. She's here with us today and all is well. Thank you all very much.

Applause

LEG. GREGORY:
We're all very proud of you and my staff came up with this idea, not to take away from the importance of your actions, but we have lifesavers for the life savers.

(*Laughter*)

For you to enjoy.

Applause

And we have some for Kiavelyn, you can share with your sister, not too much.

(*Laughter*)

Happy Holidays and thank you all for coming. I love your smile.
Keep smiling guys.

Applause

(Photograph Taken)

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. I'm not sure how we're going to do this, but it is an honor for me to -- as the audience may know, and this is as much for my colleagues on the Legislature. Several of us will be leaving the Legislature at the end of today and I am up here to honor not only a friend, but a person who I respect and frankly, many, many years I sat on this Legislature I sat next to her as -- and we just laughed time and time again. I'd like to bring up Legislator Lynne Nowick, who will be leaving at the end of today after a tremendous career. Everyone give her a hand.

Applause and Standing Ovation

LEG. NOWICK:
Do I have to do this to you now?

P.O. HORSLEY:
Right, Lynne and I are going to be doing this to each other. But Lynne is certainly a Legislator's Legislator, because if -- there were times when we were doing budgets and it became that Republican-Democratic thing, and the person who was always there in the middle, in the middle, saying, "Hey listen guys, we're here for Suffolk County" and was able to bring the parties together, and that is a rare talent. And I know that, Lynne, we, you know, we did things like mental health programs together, the Opium Task Force, the list goes on and on. Her legislative record is second to none, and so it is -- and by the way, your staff wrote a humorous proclamation. I decided I wasn't going to read it.
(*Laughter*)

I figured this is time for seriousness.

MR. MORAN:
Read it.

P.O. HORSLEY:
You want me to read it. All right. See, I was being serious.

LEG. NOWICK:
I still can dock you guys.

P.O. HORSLEY:
"The Suffolk County Legislature welcomes the opportunity to pay tribute to our colleague, Lynne C. Nowick, in honor of her 12 years of dedicated service as a Suffolk County Legislator representing the Thirteenth Legislative District. Whereas, in formulating the 2014 budget, BRO researched and estimated a cost savings of $5,932.16 per year due to no longer having to run a space heater under the horseshoe at --

(*Laughter*)

-- at Legislator Nowick's seat during meetings and the savings will be touted in an upcoming press release. And whereas the determining that the Legislature and all staff members consumed an average of 2900 calories over and above their normal intake when Legislator Nowick provided the breakfast/dinner for meetings, it was determined that her departure would result in the loss of a full pound per employee per year. And whereas, the Suffolk County Legislature had a nickname of the Wild, Wild West due to its boisterous debate and personalities prior to Legislator Nowick's arrival, and her bipartisan spirit helped to shape the tone from Jerry Springer to Oprah Winfrey during meetings.

Now, therefore be it resolved that we, the members of the Suffolk County Legislature, do extend Lynne C. Nowick, Suffolk County Legislator from 2001 to 2013, our sincere best wishes as she brings her considerable constituent responsiveness and concern for all residents of her hometown of Smithtown and as Councilwoman following in her father's footsteps." And I want to emphasize to the public as you may know, Legislator Nowick is now Councilwoman Elect Nowick from the great Town of Smithtown and Lynne, all the best.

LEG. NOWICK:
Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
They're asking, they're saying to me, "Oh, you're retiring, right?" No, no. We're not retiring. We're going on, we're going to get better. Lynne, congratulations on your next move.

LEG. NOWICK:
Thank you.

Applause

LEG. NOWICK:
All right. I'm going to do like President Bartlet in the West Wing when he says okay, down, you know. Look, I'm not going to say a lot because I can't, but this was 12 wonderful years, and all of
you should be so proud of yourselves. You are such a great group of government representatives. You all do the right thing. Everybody’s a little different here, all of these Legislators are a little different, and I would go around the room and I would pick everybody out, but I know that we have the County Executive coming in, but I must tell you, it has been such a pleasure and such an honor. And I know you’ve heard those words before, but it’s not -- it’s from the Legislators, to the Budget Office, to the Clerk’s Office, to Legislator Lindsay’s Office, to Barbara, to all of you. To the people I see sitting in the audience all the time; Alex always in the audience, Rick Brand always in the audience. And our Legislative Counsel, our Aides, Paul. All of you have just made me feel like a million dollars.

Wayne, I will miss the days when one of us in the Legislature would talk on and on and on, he's not here anymore, and I would say get the white handkerchief, we'll wave it, he's got a shelf life, I know we're going to stop him.

I won't go on any further. This is wonderful and I know you all say that I'm in the middle, I'm bipartisan. If you think that I'm in the middle now, I'm going into the Town of Smithtown and I don't want to even go any further than that.

(*Laughter*)

Thank you all. Thank you very much. Thank you.

Applause and Standing Ovation

(Photograph Taken)

LEG. GREGORY: Good morning, everyone. It is my pleasure to recognize another of our colleagues that are leaving this year. This year there's a lot of change and sometimes change is good, sometimes it's bad, but I think most times it always has a little bit of difficulty. This particular person who is leaving is going on to the New York State Park System after serving the Fourteenth Legislative District very admirably, and went on to become our Deputy Presiding Officer and with the passing of our late Presiding Officer, Bill Lindsay, took the reins of Presiding Officer for how many days, I guess 36 days?

P.O. HORSELY: At least that much.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. GREGORY: You know, Wayne and I have a special relationship, not only because we were in a leadership together, but because, you know, he comes from Babylon, our districts abut each other, and we go back to our days in the Town of Babylon when he was a Councilman and I was a Commissioner there. I've always had a lot of respect for Wayne. He's always been a fair person, he's a person that tries to build consensus, get people around the table, you know, and he always has his eye on the ball. And he doesn't try to play partisan politics and he's been around forever, decades.

(*Laughter*)

P.O. HORSELY: That's true.

LEG. GREGORY:
So it was -- when I first heard that he was going to the State, and he told me, I remember it was in August, I guess.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
The longest good-bye.

**LEG. GREGORY:**
I told him, I said I'm shaking. He thought I was joking. I was like this is like a total shock to me. It was like totally -- it just rocked my world. And, you know, people would tease us when we would go out to Eagle Scouts and community events, oh, the Wayne and DuWayne show, you know.

(*Laughter*)

So in a lot of respects we're partners, and we certainly have been partners here at the Legislature. And through his leadership for the past two years when Bill was, you know, fighting his battle, Wayne certainly stepped up. I know Bill appreciated that. He told me that, you know, many times, the respect that he had for Wayne and all that he had done for him. So Wayne is going to be sorely missed. He's done a lot since he's been here. The MI-HEAP program, he's of course Mr. Sewer. He's going to have his input --

(*Laughter*)

-- on the future of Suffolk County for generations to come. And with his foresight -- not too many people, not a sexy issue, but certainly an important issue, with Clean Pass Bill, Sunshine Fridays -- Operation Sunshine and many, many more. Wayne has truly been a visionary. He's been a true advocate for his people that he represents in the Fourteen District, but also for all Suffolk County residents. I, for one, and I certainly speak for all of our colleagues, you will be sorely missed and we wish you the best of luck in the State. And I hope that I will have my standard tee times on Bethpage, on the Black course, I would appreciate that.

(*Laughter*)

So, Wayne Horsley, congratulations and we're going to miss you. Thank you for all that you've done.

**Applause and Standing Ovation**

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
It's so weird to get a proclamation from DuWayne.

(*Laughter*)

They do mix us up. You can see why.

(*Laughter*)

This is, you know, bittersweet, as you could all imagine. I love this place, I love the people in it, I love the public and I love Suffolk County. And I hope that as the Regional Parks Director that I can go on to make sure that we do things like, you know, fill the hole that Trump made at Jones Beach and all sorts of good things, because truly the parks are part of our quality of life on Long Island.

But I wanted just to take a second to talk to my colleagues. Keep listening, gang. I -- we have been through a lot these last couple of years. We, you know, certainly Bill's passing, very difficult, and the issues surrounding the recession. We don't have to list them, but we know that we are a
smaller government and those decisions were so tough. You know, the people out the doors and
the mashing of teeth and it was a very difficult time, and this Legislature stood fast. They -- they
did what they believed was right for Suffolk County. And they took a lot of hits because of that.
And I just can't tell you how proud I am to have been amongst one of you in the greatest
deliberative body in the world, right here in Suffolk County.

So I wanted to read something because he says it a lot better than I do, a comment by Teddy
Roosevelt. I'm a history teacher, guys, you got to bear with me. But I thought it was best, and I
thought this is what I think of you, all of you, all 18, 17 soon to be elect, and also to my successor,
Kevin McCaffrey, who's in the audience. Welcome, Kevin.

MR. McCAFFREY:
Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
It is by Teddy Roosevelt. "It is not the critic who counts; not the man who points out how the
strong man stumbles, or where the doer of deeds could have done them better. The credit belongs
to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who
strives valiantly; who errs, who comes short again and again, because there is no effort without
error and shortcoming; but who does actually strive to do the deeds; who knows great enthusiasms,
the great devotions; who spends themselves in a worthy cause, who at the best knows in the end
the triumph of high achievement, who at the worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so
that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who neither know victory nor defeat." Thank you everybody, I appreciate it. It's been a great eight years. And God bless Bill Lindsay.

Applause and Standing Ovation

(Photograph Taken)

P.O. HORSLEY:
All righty. I'm glad that's over. Ms. Nowick wants the public to consider term limits as maybe not
the greatest idea. But anyway, we are -- it is at this time I think it's before us, we are going to
interrupt what was going to be the public portion to introduce our County Executive Steve Bellone,
who is formally going to sign into law a piece of legislation that we here at the Legislature are
extremely proud of. Of course that is Resolution 1163-2013, Naming the North County Complex in
Honor of William J. Lindsay. And also joining us will be the entire -- the Lindsay family. So it is in
our honor. Welcome, Mr. County Executive.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE BELLONE:
Why don't we get a little closer. We're all friends here.

(*Laughter*)

Good morning. It is an honor to be here today in this Legislative Chamber, this chamber which was
dominated for so many years by the man that we are here to honor. Dominated by his leadership,
his kindness, his ability to listen to others, and his strength and his courage. And that, of course, is
our dear friend, Presiding Officer William Lindsay. I'm honored to be here with my legislative
colleagues, who adopted this legislation unanimously in his honor. And, of course, I'm most proud
to be here today with Bill's family; his wife, Pat and his son, Bill Lindsay, Jr., Legislator Elect.

I think that what we do here today when I sign this piece of legislation in renaming the North County
Complex in honor of Bill Lindsay, I think it is an act that is wholly appropriate and correct for us to
do. He was not only the -- as we know, the longest serving Presiding Officer in the history of this
body, he in my view, and I think a view shared by my colleagues, the greatest Presiding Officer we
have had. But it's appropriate that I think we're renaming this complex because this complex
includes, of course, the home of the Legislature, the body that he loved and embodied himself so much, but it's much more than that. This complex represents the whole of our government, so many different branches of our government here, parts of our government, that during his service he represented and embodied and pushed for and fought for that represent his tenure.

You have the Police Department here. Bill stood for law and order and supported our law enforcement, supported them wholeheartedly. The District Attorney's Office is here. Bill stood for justice in everything that he did. Consumer Affairs. He always fought for the public and for those who maybe needed a little bit of an extra help. He fought to make sure that his constituents and everyone in Suffolk County wasn't taken advantage of. The Department of Labor is here. Bill Lindsay stood for and fought for more than anyone I have known the working men and women of this County. He embodied that in his life's work with IBEW, standing up for and fighting for his colleagues. When mesothelioma first started gaining attention and becoming clear what its effects were, Bill immediately leapt to action and fought to protect his coworkers from the disease that ultimately took his own life.

But when I think of Bill, for me the thing that embodies him most -- I think, you know, all of us here have incredible recollections of him and were touched by him in so many different ways. He was a great family man, a great husband and father. He was a great coworker. You couldn't have a better coworker than Bill Lindsay. He stood up for people. He fought for people, especially people who needed it. He was a man of great character in so many ways. For me, what I think most is about his strength and his courage. He represented this County as Presiding Officer in one of the most turbulent and difficult times in the County's history. And he stood up and he fought for the people of this County, and he stood up and oftentimes fought with the Executive Branch in this County, because it was the right thing to do, because he was fighting for the people of this County and making sure that our government would work, and he had the strength to do that. But more than that, he also had the strength to work with the Executive Branch of this County, when a lot of people, it would have been very easy and in his case, in many ways justified not to do that, to say I'm going to continue to fight in every way. He had the strength to say when it was time to work together to get things done because it mattered to the people of this County. That was the kind of leader he was.

And then he demonstrated to all of us, I think, what courage really is, as he fought through his own personal health crisis and continued to lead here as Presiding Officer. And I can tell you, when I say the most difficult times, through the most difficult financial times this County has ever faced, despite his personal health crisis, Bill Lindsay was there fighting all the way as Presiding Officer and leading all the way to help get us through this crisis. And I will tell you today that we are in a position where we are moving out of this crisis, we are moving back again into a healthier place because Bill Lindsay was here to lead us through that. There is no question in my mind.

So for me is it is an honor and a privilege to be able to be here today in this Legislative Chamber to sign this legislation that was adopted by Bill's colleagues, here in this place that he loved so much and did so much in. And I just want to say thank you to Pat for sharing Bill with us the way that he did, the way that she did, and his family. He was called the Lion of the Legislature. I think Bill Lindsay ranks among the top, if not the top, leaders in the history of this County for everything that he has done, and that's why I'm proud today to sign this legislation into law, officially renaming the North County Complex the William J. Lindsay County Complex.

Applause

Now I would like to turn it over to Legislator Elect Bill Lindsay, Jr. Bill?

LEG. ELECT LINDSAY:
Thank you.

Applause
I just want to thank everyone, all of the Legislators here, as well as the County Executive, Steve Bellone, for all of the kind words that you've said. I know this would have been a very proud moment for my father. He worked so hard here, put his heart and his soul into working for the Legislature and working for the people of Suffolk County, and I know this is something that he would be very proud of and it's something that we are very proud of. On behalf of my Mom and the rest of our family, we thank you from the bottom of our hearts. We thank you for all of the support that you've given us through this difficult time and made it a little bit easier for us. We thank you all for everything that you've done. We know that he's looking down watching us right now and that he's as proud as we are of everything. Thank you very much.

Applause

MRS. LINDSAY:
I'd just like to thank everybody, especially the Legislature, for doing this. I know Bill would be so proud. He loved this job, he really loved it. In the beginning when he got sick I really wanted him to step down, mainly because I wanted him, I wanted every minute of him, but he loved his job, he really loved it. And it helped him through his illness. It helped him to stay strong and it gave him purpose every day and it took his mind off his illness, and I just want to thank you all for that.

Applause

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:
Pat, everybody on this side appreciates your husband as well. He was a champion for all, both the County Legislature and the people in this place. Thank you.

Applause

(*THE FOLLOWING WAS TAKEN AND TRANSCRIBED BY LUCIA BRAATEN - COURT REPORTER*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
All righty, everybody. Are you ready for the Public Portion? All right. We're moving into Public Portion. I think it's 11:00. I have to make a motion to extend the Public Portion, which hasn't started yet. So second by Legislator Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. We are extending the Public Portion that hasn't started. All right.

MR. LAUBE:
Thirteen. (Not Present: Legislators Browning, Montano, Cilmi, D'Amaro/Vacant Seat: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you. The first speaker we have today, and, of course, it's -- we have our three-minute rule, and is -- the first speaker is Dr. Luis Valenzuela, and on deck is Michele Lynch, two good friends. Doctor.

DR. VALENZUELA:
Good morning.

P.O. HORSLEY:
We've improved our technology since last time you were here.

DR. VALENZUELA:
Here we go. All right. Good morning, distinguished women and distinguished men. I'm Luis Valenzuela with the Long Island Immigrant Alliance. I'm here to talk about the agreement between Suffolk County and the Department of Justice, and you'll hear from other advocates today. But I just wanted to make a couple of points about where we've been, where we are, and where we're going.

In the '80s, with the increase of the Latino population and the immigrant population, a group of students got together and formed an organization to help them access services and to navigate Suffolk County Government and other institutions. During the '90s, that organization, along with other advocate organizations, rallied and mobilized the fight against the mainstreaming of hate, and that was done under the auspices of English-only.

In the Year 2000, after the attempted murder of two day-laborers, a lot of those organizations came together and formed the Long Island Immigrant Alliance, and for the major part of that decade, that Alliance fought against the introduction of anti-immigrant bills that were undergirded by an anti-Latino sentiment, and etcetera. You guys know the history well.

So where we are today is at an historic moment. The accord between the Department of Justice and this Suffolk County is an opportunity to move forward. There's been two accomplishments in the last couple of years. One is the Executive Order for English Language Access, and now this agreement is a pivotal moment and it can determine how we move forward. While we were here talking about the probability that some disaster was going to happen, given the climate, the anti-immigrant climate that we had here in Suffolk County, we were always talking about Suffolk being a welcoming community, and so we welcomed the agreement.

We have a new Commissioner. Our Police Force should not be second to none -- second to any, and we stand ready to work with the Suffolk County Police Department, as well as the Government in making that a reality. There needs to be some improvements to that agreement, but we urge you to move forward. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Doctor, and we appreciate you being here today, and thank you for what you've done for Suffolk County.

DR. VALENZUELA:
You're welcome.

(*Applause*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. Michele Lynch. Michele, I don't see you. Are you here?

AUDIENCE MEMBER:
She was here. She's outside.

P.O. HORSLEY:
She was here. All right. Let's -- we're bringing her --

DR. VALENZUELA:
She's right here.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. We're waiting for her. And on deck is Tom Detre (phonetic). Datre. I knew that. Michele, I feel like we need a drum roll here.
MS. LYNCH:
I'm sorry.

P.O. HORSLEY:
No.  You're up.  You're up.  You're up.

MS. LYNCH:
I have to get my paper.  Sorry.  Very sorry.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Oh, okay.

MS. LYNCH:
Okay.  Thank you.  Sorry, my apologies.  I was talking to Pat Lindsay.

I'm here about the Memorandum of Agreement between Suffolk County and the United States Department of Justice.  It's a major step forward in ensuring that the Suffolk County Police Department provides the same protections to Latino immigrants as it does for all who are in Suffolk County.  The Lucero Family, local immigrant and civil rights advocates and the Long Island Immigrant Alliance, LIIA, and national groups like the Southern Poverty Law Center and Latino Justice have achieved an important victory by providing the evidence that led to the Department of Justice investigation.

Going into 2014, we expect our elected officials to ensure that Suffolk County is a more transparent and a more welcoming County for all who live and reside here.  Thank you.

(*Applause*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Michele.  Tom?  And on deck is Keith Gordon.

MR. DATRE:
Good morning.  My name is Tom Datre.  I'm the Chairman of the Islip Plumbing Board, and also representing the Babylon Plumbing Board.  But I want to just sidestep real fast and just make a statement.

Something very important is going to happen this Thursday.  Will be history here in Suffolk County.  I'm also President of the Long Island Home Builders Care Development Corp., and we will be turning over six homes -- this is the first time in the United States anything that happened like this, six homes to our returning veterans from Afghanistan and Iraq, and you're all invited if you want to come on Thursday at 11 a.m.

(*Applause*)

I'm here to talk to you about the law, 2013.  I just want to state that, as the Chairman of the Islip Plumbing Board, and also the -- Chairman Russo from Babylon, we are against changing this law.  We have licensed plumbers that we put them through all kinds of testing to become a licensed plumber here in Suffolk County and all our towns and they should be the one to oversee the RPZ valve, the installation, and monitoring it, not anybody else.  They should be licensed.  They pay big dollars to become a licensed plumber here in Suffolk County and all our Towns.  They also go through numerous tests and they have to have at least five years experience to become a licensed plumber here in Suffolk County and our Towns.  So, please, vote on that bill today and vote no.  Thank you very much.
(*Applause*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Tom. Keith Gordon, and on deck is Joseph Bruno.

MR. GORDON:
Good morning, Mr. Presiding Officer and Members of the Legislature. I'm here today to discuss Bill 1910 as well, the law authorizing the exemption for the backflow certification. My name is Keith Gordon. I'm the Apprenticeship Training Director for Plumbers Local Union, and although I hold numerous certifications, none of these certifications exempt me from having to hold a plumbing license to do this work. I don't see why we need to do this with backflow testing.

The RPZ issue, it's a health issue. These individuals who do this testing now have to be plumbers. They have to go through five years of education with me or five years of knowledge out in the field before they are allowed to become a plumber.

The RPZ is merely a single skill set within a plumber's jurisdiction. To pull it out and allow somebody who does not have the knowledge of the plumbing system to handle all the testing and servicing of this device is defeating the intent of the bill originally.

So I would like to push that this get voted on today and that it get knocked down as a matter of protection of public health. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Mr. Gordon. Joseph Bruno, and on deck is Patrick Young.

MR. BRUNO:
Good morning. I'm Joseph Bruno. I've been a plumber in Suffolk County for 42 years, a master plumber since 1988. I'm on the Plumbing Board in Islip Town. You have to be a master plumber. These people are taking these units apart, they're replacing them, they're testing them. They shouldn't be allowed to touch plumbing in a house unless you're a master plumber. If something goes wrong, there's no way to shut anything off. You need to vote no on this and you need to do it today. We've discussed this numerous times in the Board and it's got to be taken care of. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you, Mr. Bruno. Patrick Young, and on deck is A.J. Bagnati.

MR. YOUNG:
I'm Patrick Young. I'm an Attorney for the Central American Refugee Center, CARECEN, which is located in Brentwood. I'm also a Special Professor of Law at Hofstra University School of Law.

You know, today is an historic day because you have the chance to vote for the Memorandum of Agreement between the Justice Department and Suffolk County concerning the Police Department, Police Department's relations with the Latino immigrant community.

I think it's important for us to recall that before the killing of Marcello Lucero, there had been attacks going on in central Suffolk County for almost four years; that we have the statements of many young people in that community that Jeff Conroy and his friends were the second generation of
people to engage in those attacks, that they had been going on since those young people were in middle school, so they had occurred long before they had become involved; that there are many young people in central Suffolk County, who are now in their twenties, who engaged in these attacks and are walking free; that there are many police officers who turn their backs when Latinos came to them to seek the help that anybody living in a civilized community is entitled to when they're a victim of a hate crime, and that those police officers are still on the force.

So, although Suffolk County has made significant improvements over the last five years in the performance of the police, in the decline in the use of hate rhetoric as a political weapon, we also have to understand that beneath the surface, there are many people who continue to have those same attitudes, including people who are employees of the County, and that the County Legislature must maintain, must maintain control over the way the Suffolk County Police enforces the law, whether it's in the current administration or in future administrations. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you, Mr. Young. A.J. Bagnati, and on deck, Joselo Lucero.

MR. BAGNATI:
Good morning. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak this morning. My name is A.J. Bagnati and I am a freight dispatcher for a freight company outside of JFK Airport.

I'd like to express my outrage with County Legislator-elect, forgive me for the mispronouncing, Trotta's initial decision to delay his oath of office this upcoming new year. Mr. Trotta ran on the platform of fiscal responsibility for the Suffolk County taxpayers. As of yesterday, his first order of business was to take advantage of a loophole to accrue vacation time from January to June of 2014, then promptly retire, allowing him to collect an extra $20,000 of hardworking Suffolk County taxpayer dollars.

Clearly, Mr. Trotta had no intention of using his vacation time as a Police Detective. Mr. Trotta's new job as County Legislator comes with a generous hundred thousand dollar annual salary and benefits package. There's no need for double-dipping.

As a Suffolk County resident working in Queens, I ask you to imagine how much good $20,000 could do for creating new jobs in the County. I urge you as a Legislative body to clarify the law to prevent this type of taxpayer exploitation. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Mr. Bagnati. Mr. Lucero, and on deck is Robert Ruggiero.

MR. LUCERO:
Good evening. Thank you so much for allowing me to speak in behalf of my community, also on behalf of my family and my brother. I'm going to try my best to read what I wrote yesterday, and it started like this:

Good morning. My name is Joselo Lucero. Thank you for this opportunity to speak. I speak for what we'll be voting today, approve the settlement with the Department of Justice, and I think it makes good sense. In fact, this document is -- these documents prove important. Why? Because it shows that regular everyday people were able to pursue our national government looking closely at how the Suffolk County Police Department has been investigating or not investigating hate crimes against Latinos and others. So I have no problem at all with the ideas there are in this 27 pages in the document, but I do have a problem with what is not in this document. That's why I'm here today, to remind you of how we got here to this point, to ask that you do more than simply approve
this settlement.

This began when the seven young men went out the night of 2008 beating anyone who looks Latino and was a sport that they admitted playing regular. My brother, Marcelo, fit the description and one of those young men stabbed him to death in the streets in Patchogue. His death was the event that later lead to the Department of Justice investigate. But the community would not -- we did not have to wait for the Department of Justice to tell us that something was wrong. We knew that Marcelo was not the first or one of the only victim attacks against Latinos. When they did, other Latinos began telling stories about hate crimes against -- since 2004, we began to get realized that the police had not acted to stop those crimes. Less than a year after Marcelo's death, the SPLC released its report, calling it Climate of Fear.

The report talks about something on the cases, and I know of many more. I bring copies of this today. I bring these copies today. But the Department of Justice doesn't tell us what happened with those investigations, and they tell us what the Suffolk County Police Department should do in the future, but does not tell us the details. The police have now failed to -- about the hate crimes in the past. It's what's missing in this report, a sense of responsibility what happened to those investigations for those cases. They would not investigate. Today they must be -- investigate now.

P.O. HORSLEY: Mr. Lucero, you're going to have to start to wrap it up. Thank you.

MR. LUCERO: It's just simple. You know, I just want to talk not about immigrants, because everybody stated that what is immigrants, you know, as every Hispanic in the street, it's not about that. It's about we start to change the tone, we got to change the name. You know, we are human beings and we're talking every human beings deserve to be justice, deserved to be treated as like it is, as a human being. Thank you. (. 

(*Applause*)

P.O. HORSLEY: Thank you very much. All right. Robert -- Robert Ruggiero, and Dick Leo on deck.

MR. RUGGIERO: My name is Robert Ruggiero. I'm a licensed master plumber in Suffolk County since 1977, and I'm a certified backflow preventer tester. I'd just like to speak for a minute on responsibility and accountability.

The Legislature has empowered the Suffolk County Department of Consumer Affairs to issue a plumbing license for master plumbers, fire suppression, electricians, and part of that that was delegated by the Department of Consumer Affairs was to install, test, repair, replace backflow preventers. Now, with that, the licensed fire prevention contractor cannot install a backflow preventer, test it or repair it. The licensed water main contractor cannot install, repair or replace the backflow preventer. It's given through the license plumber because he's the best qualified.

Now, in your own words, you state that the Legislature further finds that the certified backflow prevention testers should be a licensed master plumber, employed by a licensed plumber that also certifies the backflow prevention testers when he can address any problems which may arise during and after the testing. It is very important that we keep this under the licensed plumber who is best qualified to handle an emergency that these same backflow preventers may be in a residence, they also may be in a hospital or nursing home. If a valve should break and the backflow preventer is found invalid and the water has to be shut off, who is better to handle it than a licensed plumber,
without having to go out from the certifier and get another contractor and in the water down in the
nursing home, the hospital or the facility while they reach out to somebody to come in and repair it?
Then it has to be retested. The licensed plumber is the person that should be responsible and has
the accountability with his plumbing license to take care of this. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you, Mr. Ruggiero. Mr. Leo, Dick Leo, and on deck is David Medina.

MR. LEO:
Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Legislature, my name is Dick Leo. I'm here
representing Suffolk County Plumbing Licensing Board, which I've been a member since June of
1980. We work very hard not only there, but I'm a member of the Islip Town Board -- Plumbing
Board also, but collectively we work very hard to keep the health and welfare of the residents of
Suffolk County, and I think we've done a pretty good job of it. Two years ago we had the legislation
passed on the backflowers, that a master plumber has to install, test, and repair, if necessary, and
that shouldn't be changed to satisfy whomever.

It's very important that you folks vote on this today and vote this new resolution, 1910, down.
Thank you very much for your cooperation, and I hope we do the right thing. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you, Mr. Leo. David Medina, and on deck is Christian, I think it's Lister.

MR. MEDINA:
Good morning, and thank you for allowing me my three minutes. It's been an interesting morning.
So that my name is David Medina. I am the Supervising Instructor for the New York State
Department of Health Backflow Tester Training Facility in Copiague, Suffolk County.

So that there's no confusion, we are not asking for a change in the backflow testing law. I'm not
quite sure why everyone's confused about that. What we are requesting is that we are the
certifying agency of those backflow licenses. Without State certification, no one can test a backflow
device. It doesn't make a difference if they have a Suffolk County backflow certification or not, not
without State approval.

The State Department of Health or its training facilities have never, ever, ever excluded a Suffolk
County plumber from our program or a Suffolk County water company from our program, yet,
somehow, they managed to exclude us. We do the training from A to Z, and that includes
guidelines, policies, responsibilities, safety, plans and specifications, testing. We are not talking
about the installation of the device. The installation of the device is left up to the licensed plumber.

And I am very familiar with licensed plumbers. I have spent my entire adult career, 37 years,
working with licensed plumbers from Westchester County to New York City, Nassau and Suffolk
County. I have worked in the plumbing supply industry for 37 years. I'm aware of plumbers.
Yes, they are ones who are qualified to do installations. We're not talking about that. We're simply
asking and requesting that the State be put back in its own program at the request of a New York
State licensed plumber, should they require a backflow test in Suffolk County, and when they do, we
meet those plumbers at the facility. So, if anything does go wrong, they are there to handle it.

Who more qualified than those individuals that administer the training of testing a backflow device?
None that I can think of. The supervising instructor and his assistant instructors are more than
qualified for testing backflow devices. We're not asking for a change in law, we're simply asking to be reinstated into our own program. That is it. If there are any questions for me.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Mr. Medina, we appreciate it.

MR. MEDINA:
Thank you. Enjoy your holidays.

P.O. HORSLEY:

MR. LISTER:
Lister.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Lister. I'm having trouble reading your writing. And on deck is Foster Maer.

MR. LISTER:
Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Legislators. When the backflow preventer came back -- came in, the Legislators asked the License and Plumbing Board to come up with a law that would protect the water and the people of Suffolk County. All your Licensing Board people work exceedingly hard to get the words right, and we brought it back to the Legislators and you passed it. We have stood up behind that law and many people have come before us to try and get to be able to start a business up and test the backflow preventers. We stood behind the law that you approved and we turned down all of those people. One, in fact, even came with his own attorney.

One item that I don't know if the Legislature is looking at is when you change this law, you're taking one or three people and saying that they can do -- they can do the backflow preventers, but the law we passed said they can't do that. And what I'm afraid of here is the people that we've turned down, when they find out what you've done, you're going to be open for lawsuits, probably the County would be open for lawsuits, and our Department of Labor would be open for lawsuits. And I really wish you would look seriously into this thing, vote on it today and get it off the table and do the right thing for us. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much.

(*Applause*)

All right. Foster Maer, and Maryann Slutsky. Are you Foster?

MS. SLUTSKY:
No, but Foster had to leave, so he's not here.

P.O. HORSLEY:
So who are you?

MS. SLUTSKY:
Maryann Slutsky.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Oh, you're Maryann Slutsky. Oh, okay. I'm sorry.
MS. SLUTSKY:
Good morning. I'm Maryann Slutsky, Executive Director of Long Island Wins. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

The Department of Justice agreement with the Suffolk County Police Department is a meaningful and long-awaited victory for the immigrant advocacy and legal communities who worked relentlessly to seek an end to all the violence the Latino community has suffered since the early 2000s. We all support the reforms required by the Department of Justice settlement and look forward to a full and prompt implementation.

Many positive changes have been made during the Bellone Administration and we are very encouraged that this is a new, more welcoming era in Suffolk County. As advocates, we stand ready and willing and able to assist the Suffolk County Police with implementing the remedies set forth in the Department of Justice agreement, but there is still more to do. Developing and implementing remedies are only part of the solution, the other is to identify what caused the problem. The Department of Justice did not address the cause of what went wrong inside the Suffolk County Police force that led to a place of so many unsolved crimes and abuses against Latinos. Latinos in Suffolk County expected and are still waiting for an accounting for why their crime complaints were not investigated by the Suffolk County Police Department. And we must never forget the history in Suffolk County that brought us to this violence against immigrants. Suffolk County Police Department played a significant role in fostering the climate of fear that placed the Latino community in danger.

The Department of Justice Agreement takes important steps to build bridges between the community and the Police Department. The most important bridge to be built by this agreement requires that all people believe that crimes against all members of the community will be thoroughly investigated without regard to the race or ethnicity of the victim. For the Department of Justice agreement to sufficiently address this concern, it should have detailed how community members would be assured that this practice of Suffolk County Police failure to adequately respond to or investigate crimes impacting Latinos and immigrants would end.

The Suffolk County Police Department needs to reopen and fully investigate these past attacks, and the Suffolk County Legislature must hold the Police accountable to conduct these investigations. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much. All righty. The next speaker is Mario Mattera, and on deck is Cheryl Keshner.

MR. MATTERA:
Good morning. Good morning, Mr. Presiding Officer and all Legislators. First of all, I want to wish everybody a Merry Christmas and Happy New Year. And I'd just like to say that was a great tribute to our Presiding Officer, Bill Lindsay, which I loved dearly, and it was just a great tribute today.

I'm here, obviously, to speak again about 1910. This backflow, which needs to be killed today. It needs to be voted on today and it needs to be killed today.

You had other speakers, my colleagues came here today, and made sure they're very responsible. They made sure they came here today, not from my mentors, but from my -- from the instructor from Plumbers Local 200 that does have certifications, but, guess what, cannot perform the work, but he does have the certifications to teach. Just like what I said, the paralegal could go and shuffle papers around, but cannot go and practice law because they did not pass the bar. I said it last
time. I want -- I could go in my truck right now again and go grab the device that was a two-inch. I told you, the twelve-inch device I cannot fit in my truck that I would bring in there. Nobody should be touching this apparatus unless they're a licensed responsible plumber. Okay?

We have an obligation, as sitting on this Board, as sitting on the Consumer Affairs Board, to protect the consumer. I'm very, very proud that this Board unanimously chose me to sit on this Board to do a job, not with the union, not nonunion, this is about protecting the consumer.

Please, 1910 today needs -- I need a Christmas present. Christmas present today to the Plumbing Board would be killing this bill today, voting on it no, not tabling it, because tabling it, it will happen -- it will happen again and be reintroduced in 2014. Please.

Everybody spends a lot of time doing this. You have to be responsible. It is not a level playing field when no one's paying the insurances, no one has a plumbing license. Nine hundred and sixty-eight plumbing -- licensed plumbers have to pay $400 every two years for his license, plus insurances. I have one of my contractors here; 65 licenses in this town -- in the State of New York that he has to pay for every two years. I really don't know the number of it, but I know it's a lot of money. Workman's Comp is applied to this, all the insurances.

Please, we need to have somebody that if there is a problem, Consumers Affairs Board could go with the inspectors and go after the person. If you do not have a license, it's very difficult to go after them. We have to go after somebody that has a license.

Please, I'm going to say it again, 1910 needs to be killed today. Vote no, please vote today, do not table this. And I need a Christmas present. And my -- Lynne Nowick and Wayne Horsley, but I'm sorry. Lynne is my Council -- Councilperson. And you know what, Lynne, again, thank you for 12 unbelievable years. You're very special to me and Plumbers Local 200 and the Consumers Affair Board. Thank you so much. Merry Christmas.

(*Applause*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you, Mario. Cheryl Keshner, and Martha Maffei.

MS. KESHNER:
Good morning. My name is Cheryl Keshner. I am a Senior Parallel and Community Advocate with the Empire Justice Center, and I'm the Coordinator of LILAC, the Long Island Language Advocates Coalition, and I'm here today to encourage you to approve Resolution Number 2104, which approves the execution of an agreement between the Department of Justice, the U.S. Attorney's Office, and the Suffolk County Police Department.

As other speakers have testified, there has -- we know there has been a history in Suffolk County of anti-immigrant bias, and, fortunately, we are seeing a change. We do feel that County Executive Bellone is taking positive steps to reverse that. And we know that immigrant advocates have been very vocal, and we feel that our voices are starting to be heard and we thank you for that.

Some of the positives in the resolution agreement are that there will be more data collecting to identify patterns of hate crimes, more training and cultural competence, prohibition against discrimination based on national origin, assessment of proficiency of bilingual officers, which we know has been a big problem, provision of timely and accurate police services to limited English proficient community members, translation of vital documents and websites, and more engagement with Latino community advocates on an ongoing basis.

Our coalition, LILAC, has -- we formed because we saw that there were many disparities in services
that were being -- supposed to be available to limited English-proficient community members, to all community members, but that those who had difficulty expressing themselves in English were not being given the same level of services, and that included the Police Department, the Courts, Social Services, our schools, so many different levels.

We've spoken with the Police repeatedly and we have seen some improvements, but we know that there are still a lot of problems. We know that there are still difficulties when people need to file reports and can't have their stories accurately taken because an interpreter is not provided, when information is not provided in the person's native language. We hope this is going to be reversed, but we need to just be vigilant about this, continue to aggressively investigate crimes, and give everybody an equal voice when they need to have their voice heard by the Police Department.

So, please, approve this resolution, but also allow us the opportunity as community advocates to continue to be involved in its implementation to make sure that it is implemented correctly. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you, Ms. Keshner. The next speaker is Martha Maffei, and on deck is Greg Maney.

MS. MAFFEI:
Good morning. Thank you so much for the opportunity. My name is Martha Maffei and I am Executive Director at SEPA Mujer. SEPA Mujer is a Latina immigrant right organization and we represent survivors of domestic violence.

I want to share this story how SEPA Mujer got involved in 2009 with an investigation of the Department of Justice. Victims and survivors of domestic violence came together to talk with the Department of Justice about how -- the problems and the issues that they have when they go to the police to report domestic violence crime. So it was very difficult for them to come out and share their stories.

Now we feel as a grassroots organization this is a great victory, a victory that you take and hold and make accountable for our community. We don't -- we can not anymore in the future tell the stories about how the police is not accountable for -- to protect victims or immigrants or for -- to report a crime. So we have now the agreement from the Department of Justice. We have that -- we have right now the Executive Order that we are very pleased to have these two important tools to ensure that all residents are treated and provided services equally. So I am very thankful to be here and say that we believe and we trust you, and I know that you will pass this resolution. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you, Ms. Maffei. Greg Maney, and on deck is Amol Sinha.

DR. MANEY:
Good morning. My name is Dr. Greg Maney. I'm a Professor of Sociology at Hofstra University. I'm also a member of the Immigration and SOCIAL SERVICES Committee of the Irish American Society of Nassau, Suffolk and Queens.

Beannachtai na Nollag agus athbhlian faoi mhaise duibh. Blessings of the season upon you and Happy New Year in advance in Irish.

I'm here to speak about Resolution 2104. I brought for each of you a matrix that I created
evaluating the agreement in reference to the technical assistance letter from the Department of Justice to County Executive Levy, dated September 13th, 2011, as well as evaluating and in reference to the recommendations from the Long Island Immigrant Alliance on how to reduce and prevent hate crimes in Suffolk County.

The agreements signed between the U.S. Department of Justice and Suffolk County Police Department is a step in the right direction. It begins to put behind us a decade of hate, and points us towards a future where the County can take full advantage of the diversity of its residents by exercising responsible leadership. The agreement, however, is by no means perfect. It fails to explain why no action was taken in several cases of reported hate crimes. It fails to commit the Suffolk County Police Department under the Department of Justice's supervision to investigation unsolved hate crimes. It is vague in many parts, many important parts. For instance, how the Suffolk County Police Department's procedure for arresting non-U.S. citizens and dual citizens is to be revised to protect immigrants from arbitrary arrest, in summary, deportation. This must be revised if immigrants are to trust the Police Department enough to report hate crimes that they've either experienced directly or witnessed.

Also, the agreement omits important recommendations from the Department of Justice's Technical Assistance Letter of September 2011. For instance, having the Police Department explain what secure communities is to the public, and what role, if any, the Police Department is playing in it. The agreement also admits important recommendations made by the Long Island Immigrant Alliance. In particular, the agreement fails to utilize immigrant advocacy organizations for monitoring and reporting hate crimes, something that the Department of Justice encouraged in its Technical Assistance Letter.

In contrast to the police, LIIA's member organizations are trusted by the immigrant community. If police advocate cooperation around domestic violence and human trafficking are any indication, the Suffolk County Police Department can significantly increase immigrants' reporting of hate crimes by establishing a joint protocol whereby law enforcement and trained representatives from LIIA-affiliated organizations work together to ensure that the victims' and witnesses' immediate needs are met, their rights are respected, while assisting law enforcement to the fullest possible extent and taking actions against the perpetrators. Additional steps must be taken to ensure that the Suffolk County Police Department serve and protect immigrants. Again, I reiterate, serve and protect immigrants against bias and hate.

LIIA is developing a memorandum specifying these steps, and we hope that you will encourage the Suffolk County Police Department and the Department of Justice to develop an addendum that takes into account the recommendations that we will be providing you and with them in partnership with the community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(*Applause*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Doctor.  All righty.  The last speaker is Amol Sinha.

MR. SINHA:
That's right.  Good morning.  My name is Amol Sinha.  I'm the Director of the Suffolk County Chapter of the New York Civil Liberties Union.  I'm here to discuss the resolution to adopt the agreement between the Suffolk County Police Department and the U.S. Department of Justice.

As you've heard from many advocates here, including powerful testimony from Joselo Lucero, Suffolk County's Police Department and government has had a shameful past of indifference towards
Latino community members, but things have changed. We have a new Administration, a County Executive Office who is willing to sit down with advocates to address problems and make changes, but today is another historic day. Today the County has an opportunity to take steps to earn the community's trust, to restore its reputation as a welcoming place for all people of all backgrounds.

As you may have read in the settlement agreement, the Police Department will be subject to monitoring by the Federal Government. It's also required to conduct significant outreach to advocates and community members on a regular basis. Advocates in this room and throughout Long Island stand ready to collaborate with the Police Department to ensure successful implementation of the settlement.

We want to make sure that everybody in the County is safe. We want to make sure that everybody in the County has the dignity that belongs with each individual human being. And we want to make sure that the County is not only accountable to the Federal Government, to the Legislature, but also to the people it serves. So I urge you to vote yes on Resolution 2104. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much. All righty. That's the last card that I have. Would anyone else like to be heard. Mr. Finland?

MR. FINLAND:
Good morning, everyone. My name is Michael Finland and I'm the Executive Vice President for Suffolk County AME.

First of all, I want to thank and commend the Suffolk County Legislature for putting forth the official name change of the North County Complex in honor of Legislator William Lindsay. He was a pioneer in County Government, and his legacy as a lawmaker will forever remain with us. His memory will be kept alive whenever we utter the name of the William Lindsay County Complex.

I also want to wish each of the lawmakers a happy and healthy holiday season. I want to extend a fond farewell and thank you to departing Legislators Lynne Nowick, Wayne Horsley and Rick Montano. You're always considerate, accessible and responsive to myself and to the needs of our membership. I'm grateful for your thoughtful consideration in listening to whatever issues were key and vital to the County workforce.

I just want to offer my thoughts and perceptions regarding two resolutions. In addressing I.R. 2037, sponsored by Legislator Kara Hahn, I want to state for the record that I'm grateful for the strong support demonstrated by this Legislative body with regard to staff shortages in the Police Emergency Unit of the Suffolk County Police Department. In speaking with employees in that unit, it is my hope that this Legislative body will consider reaching out to TERT support staff in the event of extreme emergencies or extreme weather-related issues.

I understand that -- reaching out to retirees to work in a part-time capacity with aid and assistance dealing with staffing problems. However, we have come a long way in terms of remediating staff shortages in this unit. SCIN forms were signed in November 2012 and March 2013, and those brought on board will be fully trained in the early part of 2014. Bringing in retirees might be counterproductive, because, as we all well know, technology is forever changing and improving. It would be prohibitive for a retiree part-timer to step in if they weren't fully knowledgeable on P.D. technological procedures. In contrast, I believe that employing the services of TERT workers when needed would be more effective. Also, this Legislative body is considering perhaps using the services of Patchogue Village workers to perform work currently being performed by our County DPW workers.
I am understanding of the logistics of this resolution, but, first and foremost, my role at AME is to always look out for the interests of our workforce. I am pleased that you -- I'm wrapping up -- passed our successor CBA, which contains an historic no-layoff clause. I just want the assurance that our DPW workers will not be displaced in light of this resolution. I thank you for your time and consideration in this matter. And, again, I reiterate, happy holiday season to all of you. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you, Finland. We appreciate your comments, and happy holidays to you as well.

LEG. SPENCER:
Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All righty. I do not have any other cards. Would anyone else like to be heard? Would anyone else like to be heard? I'll make a motion to close the public hearing, second by Legislator Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. All right. The next --

MS. ORTIZ:
Thirteen. (Not Present: Legislators Browning, Montano, Cilmi and D'Amaro/Vacant Seat: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you. I'd like to take out of order I.R. 2104, the Justice Department resolution, Page 9 of the agenda, 2104. Why don't we call all the Legislators in, into the horseshoe, if they aren't out. All right. I'm taking it out of order. I'll make the motion, seconded by Legislator Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. So 2104 is out of order. We have the --

MS. ORTIZ:
Thirteen. (Not Present: Legislators Browning, Montano, Cilmi and D'Amaro/Vacant Seat: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Commissioner Webber is here, as well as, I believe, Mr. Brown. And what we'll do is -- why don't you come on up just quickly. And, Commissioner, did you want to make a quick statement or -- I know you spoke before the Public Safety Committee. If not, would you like to just open it up, and then what I'll do is we'll -- I want to see if there's any questions.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:
Can you hear me?

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes. Well, I'm not sure.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:
Can you hear me now?

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes, I can.

COMMISSIONER WEBBER:
Okay. We discussed it at length the other day, but, you know, again, we all have the common goal. We're here to work with all and to have equal protection under the law of all the residents of Suffolk
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County and people visiting and working here. And based on that, you know, we discussed some of the items the other day, that one of the most important ones, of course, is that the Justice Department did do a thorough and exhaustive investigation. They brought in police experts from around the country, they brought in attorneys from around the country. For months they were here. They pored through all our records, reviewed all our reports, and made some recommendations, many of which we've implemented already, but they had no findings of police discriminatory -- police -- discriminatory policing in Suffolk County. And that's very important, no findings of discriminatory policing in Suffolk County.

You know, there is a cost. There was a question the other day about cost. We estimate about $650,000 next year. I think there's something -- while we have tight fiscal concerns at the moment, not doing it would be worse to lose the trust and confidence of the communities in which we work and serve.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
I think one of the comments I had at that time was that we'll find the money, and I understand that we'll find it out of your budget. I'm kidding.

First of all, I'd like to just quickly thank the gang, the whole team that put together the Suffolk's response. And I know that you worked collaboratively, and it was a good job, and I know that it was a lot of detail work and a lot of issues that had to be resolved. Are there any questions from the Legislature?

**LEG. HAHN:**
(Raised hand).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. HAHN:**
Thank you, Commissioner. Thank you for, you know, all that you're doing to ensure, assure community members that the Suffolk County Police Department will be vigilant to make sure that any anti-immigrant bias does not exist. Maybe, you know, it never did, but doesn't ever rear its ugly head here. And I know that you will do all that you can to make sure that our communities feel thus ensured.

I also just want to reiterate again on the record here in front of all of my colleagues that your willingness to also -- as you report to the Department of Justice, that you will also update our Public Safety Committee with what we need to know to keep our eyes on this and make sure that we are doing what we need to do here at the Legislature. So, thank you for that, and I just want to have you reiterate that for everyone here as well.

**COMMISSIONER WEBBER:**
By all means. As reports, as you know, there are about 13, some of which are one time only, many of which are either semiannual or annual. And we mentioned at the Public Safety, we have no problem whatsoever to discuss them as they're prepared.

**LEG. HAHN:**
Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Thank you, Legislator. Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**
And I also want to thank you, you know, for looking into the reports and, you know, making sure that our Public Safety officers are focused on the most important thing, which is the safety of our communities. They have a lot of pressure, and they have a lot of outside, you know, issues in trying to understand how they can best deal with the situation.

I just wanted to bring to light, too, though, that, you know, when you're creating these training programs, I think one of the most important things that needs to be included is crisis intervention training, and, again, that's including the issue with mental illness. You know, how does an officer understand the difference between dementia, mental illness, schizophrenia, drug addiction, you know, things like that? And that's what I meant by these outside pressures. You know, how can they determine what the best course of action is? And, again, I would hope that you would, you know, look into that, you know, and being inclusive in the training program.

But, again, thank you for your attention to this issue, it's very important. Thanks.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Legislator Anker. Legislator Spencer?

LEG. SPENCER:
Good morning. I did have the privilege of being on Public Safety and hearing the presentation, so my question is to the County Attorney, to Dennis, I guess.

I appreciate that there's no findings of any substantial, I guess -- well, not maybe wrongdoing. Could you ask -- answer for me, when I hear the word "settlement," it implies that there were findings that were a violation and that something has to be settled. I mean, this is a substantial document. So are we talking about these are recommendations? Are we under -- and I'm not trying to be provocative. I guess if there's no findings, then are we under any obligations? Are these just best practices, or is this a settlement? And if there's a settlement, then they're saying that there is something that was not in order.

MR. BROWN:
There were no findings of discriminatory or biased-based policing. It is an agreement between the Suffolk County Police Department and the Department of Justice, the Civil Rights Division. They did issue an advisory letter in September of 2011, and much of what the agreement that you see here is based on discussions with the Department of Justice, practices already in existence or put into existence by the Police Department, and what was in the advisory letter. But, as Commissioner said, there have not been any findings of any type of discriminatory policing.

LEG. SPENCER:
And I do appreciate that. I guess, then, the next question, if this Legislature were to say, "Well, there are no findings, we're under no obligation to have this agreement," and we were to reject this, what would be the consequences?

MR. BROWN:
That would really be the call of the Department of Justice. And just on the basis of the discussions and the agreement that we reached, I cannot say that they would or would not take it to any other level.

LEG. SPENCER:
If there are no findings of any wrongdoing, then they really -- that's where I'm kind of -- you know, I could see where they could say, "Well, we could have better practices. But they're saying there are no findings, so how do they have any leverage to make any sort of demand that we enter into an agreement?
MR. BROWN:
Well, I can't speak for the Department of Justice.

LEG. SPENCER:
Sure.

MR. BROWN:
But it's not that it's presented as a demand, but there has been negotiated terms and conditions that were thought by the Department or thought by the County that these are best practices, help make the Department a better Department, and also to help foster and better the perception of cooperation and understanding between the community and the Police Department.

LEG. SPENCER:
Well, I support our Police Officers and I think they're doing a fantastic job. I really applaud the Administration for working on this agreement. And, you know, I do plan to support it, but I did need to kind of clarify that, you know, why there's an agreement if there's really -- you know, there's always room for improvement, but we could make those -- you know, those decisions on our own, and we don't necessarily need the Department of Justice to tell us what to do if they don't have any reason to do so, but, thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Legislator Spencer. Does anybody else have any questions? All right. I'll make the motion to approve 2104.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Barraga. All those -- are there any other motions? Anything on the motion? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been approved. Congratulations to all.

(*Applause*)

MS. ORTIZ:
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Montano and Kennedy/Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
All righty. We're moving right along and it looks like we have time to take on the Detectives' contract, which is apparently on Page 8, and that's 2102. I'm going to need a motion by Legislator Gregory to take 2102 out of order. Can I get a second on the motion?

LEG. CILMI:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. 2102 is now on the floor.

MS. ORTIZ:
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Montano and Kennedy/Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. I have a motion by Legislator Gregory to approve 2102. Do I have a second on the motion?

LEG. MURATORE:
(Raised hand).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Second by Legislator Muratore. So are there any -- is there any discussion? You guys good? Any questions? Okay. We have a motion to approve. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MS. ORTIZ:**
Fifteen.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
The Detectives’ contract has been approved. Congratulations to all.

**LEG. HAHN:**
I would like to thank Budget Review Office for getting that report to us, too.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Thank you very much, Budget Review Office, for getting the report to us. Congratulations, guys.

All right. I have -- since we’ve got a little time left, I understand that Legislator Krupski would like to take a couple of issues out of order. Legislator Krupski, I’m going to turn it over to you.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
I make a motion to take 2090 out of order.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Do you want to speak into the mic, please?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
I make a motion to take 2090 out of order.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Which is -- 2090 is -- okay, it’s on Page 7, it’s about three-quarters of the way down -- amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program, appropriating funds for the study and monitoring of Public Health Related Harmful Algae Blooms (CP 8224)(County Executive). Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Second by Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. 2090 is now taken out of order.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Montano and Kennedy/Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. Would you like to make a motion on this bill?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
So moved.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
So moved. Legislator Krupski makes the motion.

**LEG. HAHN:**
Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Legislator Hahn makes the second, seconding motion on 2090. Okay. Hang on one second. We'll see if I have anyone -- any of the Legislators would like to speak on this?

**LEG. NOWICK:**
Yeah, I'd like to speak.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Sure, Legislator Nowick.

**LEG. NOWICK:**
Just what are we doing with this money?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
We have a motion -- we're taking 2090 out of order. We make a motion to approve. I'm glad to have a second motion, if there's a second motion. Is there a second motion on this? No. Okay, we're good on -- we're good on the approval. Okay? Lynne, okay, it's --

**LEG. NOWICK:**
Taking it out of order?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
We already took it out of order, we've already done that. I have a motion to approve. And now, unless a Legislator would like to speak, I'm going to call on Mr. Vaughn.

**LEG. NOWICK:**
Okay.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay? Mr. Vaughn. True to my word.

**MR. VAUGHN:**
Good morning, sir. I believe that this bill is actually in your red folder, since there had to be an amendment to the SEQRA clause, so I believe it will be a CN this afternoon.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
I don't have my red folder. Anyone -- do you guys have red folders yet?

*(Negative Response)*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Mike Pitcher says it's in the folder.

**MR. PITCHER:**
It is.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. So what you're saying is that it's -- do you know what the changes are?
MR. VAUGHN: Yes, sir. The change was a minor change to the SEQRA amendment, but, unfortunately, we caught it before the amended copy deadline, which is why we had to amend it via CN. We do have Alison Branco from the Division of Environmental Quality, she can speak on the bill now, but, as I said, it was just a minor amendment to the SEQRA clause.

P.O. HORSLEY: Okay. So --

LEG. KRUPSKI: I will withdraw my motion.

P.O. HORSLEY: Is that -- the second on that motion, okay with that?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN: Yeah.

P.O. HORSLEY: All those in favor?

MR. NOLAN: You don't need to, he's withdrawing.

P.O. HORSLEY: Okay, withdrawn. Withdrawn, you don't need it, right, absolutely. Mr. Krupski, did you want to take it out of the red folder, I mean, while you're on it?

LEG. KRUPSKI: It's the only red folder I have.

P.O. HORSLEY: Okay, right. It's coming. I'm not sure why you took it out of order to begin with, so I'm going to --

LEG. HAHN: There was someone in the audience.

P.O. HORSLEY: Because he wanted it for somebody in the audience? All right.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN: Should we try to get Gil out of the way before lunch?

P.O. HORSLEY: Why don't you take a look at the new piece of legislation and we'll see if we can take Gil out of order, as it's been put. Would you like to make that motion, Mr. Schneiderman?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN: Well, my thinking is, you know, there's a snowstorm out there, we probably should let our Commissioner of Public Works go back to work. So, if we could try to get -- we may need that CN. Oh, we have it now, okay. So, yeah, why don't we -- why don't we try to get through the Public Works agenda. I'll make a motion to take 2074 out of order.
LEG. KRUPSKI:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Where is that?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Page 9.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. There's a motion to take 2074 out of order.
(Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with strengthening and improving County Roads (CP 5014)(County Executive).
Do I have a second?

LEG. HAHN:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Hahn. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, 2074 is now taken out of order.

MR. LAUBE:
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Montano and Kennedy/Vacant Seat: District 8).

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Approve.

P.O. HORSLEY:
The Gil bill. Okay. Legislator Schneiderman, you made the motion to approve?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Seconded by Legislator -- was that Hahn? Second by Legislator Hahn. On the motion?
Anybody -- everybody all right with this?

Gil, did you want to -- anything you want to -- we want to get you out in the snow. I don't even see him. Oh, there he is. Okay.

LEG. CALARCO:
Call the vote.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Gil, why don't you come on up, because maybe we'll just do a couple more of yours if you have any. Okay. Anybody have any questions on this? Gil, while we got you up there, anything you'd like to say on it? Is there something -- okay. We have a motion to approve. All those in favor?

LEG. D'AMARO:
Hold it.  On the motion, please.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
On the motion, Legislator D’Amaro.

**LEG. D’AMARO:**
This is the third or fourth bill we've taken out of order, so just bear with me for a moment.  I want to know what I’m voting on before we vote.

So this is 2074, which is amending the Capital Budget, and it’s appropriating funds for strengthening and improving County roads.  Commissioner Anderson, good morning.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
Good morning.

**LEG. D’AMARO:**
Can you just be a little more specific as to which roads?  Is there a plan?  Has there been an evaluation?  Just give us the status of the project, if you would.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
Okay.  This request is appropriating 660,000 for construction services.  We're looking to offset the funds from three different capital programs, CP 5557, which is the intersection improvements at Nugent Drive, CR 97, CP 5601, hybrid electric vehicles, and then CP 5602, which is alternate fuel and compressed natural gas vehicles.  We would be looking to offset 200,000 from Nugent Drive, 230 from the hybrid electric vehicles, and another 230,000 from the alternate fuel vehicles.

The roads, there is a list that was attached, but I'll read them off.  These are roads we are projecting to -- excuse me -- to use this funding to repave.  This is part of our current listing of projects under CP 50 -- sorry, 5014, which is Straight Path, Pinelawn Road, Pulaski Road, Oak Street, Horseblock Road, Carleton Avenue, New Highway, Park Avenue, Great Neck Road, Riverhead-Moriches Road, Howells Road, Lake Avenue, Long Island Motor Parkway, Montauk Highway and Broadway, Broadway-Greenlawn Road, and then Captain Daniel Roe Highway, County Road 111.  So there was a whole list that we would like to use this for, but not necessarily will use this for.  We may use another County road.

**LEG. D’AMARO:**
So this was an existing project where you're appropriating funds from other capital projects where you've determined that there's an excess of funding --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
Right.

**LEG. D’AMARO:**
-- or won't be utilized at least this year.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
Correct.

**LEG. D’AMARO:**
And --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
We can use these funds to -- it's a repaving program, and, you know, that's one of our major components of our maintenance program.
LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. So -- right. So we're putting this funding from these other programs, capital programs, into our repaving program.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
And the determination's already been made with respect to what roads should be targeted for resurfacing?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
And has -- okay. That's what I wanted to know.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
You're welcome.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Thank you very much, Legislator D'Amaro. Gil, the Park Avenue, is that the Park Avenue in Babylon Village? Just for my own edification.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, it's up in Huntington.

P.O. HORSLEY:
That's the Huntington Park Avenue?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Oh, boy.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. SPENCER:
It's a good thing, good thing.

P.O. HORSLEY:
It's a good thing, Legislator Spencer says. There you go. I have a motion to approve 2074. Anything else on this -- on the motion? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.
MR. LAUBE:
Fourteen.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you.

MR. LAUBE:
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Montano and Kennedy/Vacant Seat: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
And we also have the corresponding bond resolution, 2074A. Same motion, same second. On the motion? Legislator -- Clerk, would you please give a roll call?

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

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
(Not Present)

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:
(Not Present)

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Montano and Kennedy/Vacant Seat: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much. Do you want to continue along, Mr. Schneiderman?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah, let's give it a shot. So I'll make a motion to take 2098 out of order. (Appropriating funds in connection with improvements to Environmental Recharge Basins (CP 5072)(County Executive).

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Montano and Kennedy/Vacant Seat: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
2098 is now taken out of the order, which is appropriating funds in connection with the improvements in environmental recharge basins.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
On the motion?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I make a motion to approve.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion to approve by Legislator Schneiderman, second by Legislator Krupski. We have a motion on the floor. Anyone on the motion? Everybody good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.
MR. LAUBE:
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Montano and Kennedy/Vacant Seat: District 8)

P.O. HORSELY:
2098 has been approved. Same motion, same second on the corresponding bond resolution. Mr. Clerk, would you please call the roll call.

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

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
(Not Present)

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:
(Not Present)

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.
LEG. BROWNING: 
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY: 
Yes.

MR. LAUBE: 
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Montano and Kennedy/Vacant Seat: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY: 
All righty. Legislator Schneiderman, you want to keep going?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN: 
Yeah.

P.O. HORSLEY: 
Make the motion?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN: 
I make the motion to take 2099 out of order. (Amending the 2013 Capital Program and appropriating funds in connection with the improvements to buildings and facilities Countywide (CP 1817)(County Executive).

P.O. HORSLEY: 
Legislator Schneiderman takes the motion -- makes the motion to take 2099 out of the order; Legislator Hahn makes the second on the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE: 
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano/Vacant Seat: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY: 
2099 has been taken out of order. On the motion, every -- make a motion to approve, Legislator Schneiderman?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN: 
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY: 
Seconded by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. D’AMARO: 
On the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY: 
On the motion, Legislator D’Amaro.

LEG. D’AMARO: 
Yes, thank you. Commissioner Anderson, just once again, I see that this was discussed in committee, and I understand that there wasn't any specific project that you had in mind. Is this just that you're appropriating the funds at the end of the year for needs that may arise next year, or what's the plan?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: 

Correct, that's exactly it. This money is available. We always can use money in this fund. This capital project improves existing building systems. It's for the smaller projects, and with five million square feet of buildings that we maintain, they always come up. So --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right. So that's good planning, so we have the appropriations ready to go in advance.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay, very good. Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

P.O. HORSLEY:
It still warms my heart. Okay. We have a motion to approve on 2099. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano/Vacant Seat: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
All righty, very good. 2099A, same motion, same second on the corresponding bond resolution. Roll call vote.

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

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

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

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**
Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano/Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Thank you very much.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
There's one more, there's a CN.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
And actually, if I could impose. There's also --

**LEG. HAHN:**
On the Environment agenda.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Wait, wait, wait. Gil, you can stay for lunch on this one. Okay.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Do you want to do the Environment first and then the CN?

**MR. NOLAN:**
Somebody make a motion.

**LEG. HAHN:**
Yeah. I'd like to make a motion to take 1563 out of order.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
What page?

**LEG. HAHN:**
On Page 7.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. 15 -- okay. First one in EPA, 1563. Legislator Hahn makes a motion to take it out of order, seconded by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**1563 - Authorizing execution of a Consent Judgment with the United States Environmental Protection Agency concerning County underground storage tanks and universal waste (County Executive).**

**LEG. HAHN:**
Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Would you like to make -- Legislator Hahn makes a motion to approve.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
(Raised hand).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Seconded by Legislator Krupski. On the motion?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
A quick question on the motion, I guess, maybe Legislator Hahn or to Gil. All tanks? Does it cover all tanks, just specific tanks? What are we looking at?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
This is -- this is our program for underground storage tanks, so it's gas tanks, it's fuel tanks for the buildings, things like that.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Which we routinely do anyhow. Why do we have Justice involved here?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
Back in '07, there was a fuel spill at the Cohalan Court Building. We advised the DEC. The EPA came and found numerous issues with our systems and numerous violations. We have since '07 initiated a program. We are currently not in violation, but, unfortunately, for better or worse, Department of Justice also stepped in. They normally take a certain number of cases from EPA. They became involved, and it -- rather than just becoming a program where we have gone through -- improved all the gas facilities, all the underground storage facilities that you see in the back, out in Westhampton, Yaphank, we've updated our program, we have two full-time staff. There had to be a settlement of this prior to them issuing, I guess, an agreement with the County. And this is the negotiated resolution of -- or these two bills are the negotiated resolution of those --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Do you have tanks scheduled to be abandoned next year?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
There are -- I'd have to check. We usually have a couple.

LEG. KENNEDY:
We do "X" number, I mean, like every year?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah. We always find a couple of more here and there throughout the year.

LEG. KENNEDY:
And we pump them, and we pull them, we excavate, we don't cut and cap, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct. And this is --

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay, fine. That's fine.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Okay.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay? Leave it at that. Legislator D’Amaro.

LEG. D’AMARO:
Thank you. Just to carry that a little bit further, this is an order, a consent order that we're signing off on with the Department of Justice.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. D’AMARO:
And I just want to get a little more specific into what exactly the terms of that order are. Is there any finding that there was actually contamination to groundwater or to the environment?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, I don't believe there was. This was just more recordkeeping where deliveries would be made, and we didn't -- you know, we didn't -- we weren't there to witness them or we didn't have records of it. There were some occasions where just below the cover, there might have been a little bit of fuel, but there were no spills, there were no environmental, you know, impact to the groundwater, things like that.

LEG. D’AMARO:
Okay. I appreciate that. I think it's important to put on the record the fact that there was no environmental contamination. This has to do more with, as you say, with recordkeeping, or deficient procedures, or what have you, with respect to these different systems or tanks.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. D’AMARO:
Is that right?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
Yes, it is.

**LEG. D’AMARO:**
Yeah. And this is going to -- just so we're going in with our eyes open, what is the County then, after signing off on this, required to do? You don't have to be too detailed, but what -- are we changing procedures? Are we reviewing procedures? I mean, we certainly don't want to find ourselves back in this position again.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
Right. I mean, the agreement basically -- as I stated earlier, we have worked with the EPA to initiate the program. I have -- Marty McMorrow, one of our Mechanical Engineers oversees it. I have two full-time Maintenance Mechanics that go from pump to pump or tank to tank to make sure that we're up to grade and make sure we're in compliance with all the requirements. We've set up remote monitoring, we've upgraded all our pump systems, things like that, with the environmental EPA's full input and, you know, review, so they're aware of that.

**LEG. D’AMARO:**
Right. You'd certainly want to have them on board when doing that. And it also results in a penalty to the County, this order?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
Yeah. Unfortunately, yeah. The Department of Justice demands that we have to pay a quarter of the fine in cash, and that's where the 500,000 comes in.

**LEG. D’AMARO:**
I see. Okay. Thank you, Commissioner, I appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
You're welcome, Legislator D’Amaro. Okay. We have a motion and second to approve 1563. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano/Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
It has been approved. Now, I'd like to make sure that we don't forget this. I'll make a motion to approve the Consent Calendar, seconded by Legislator Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, the Consent Calendar has been approved.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano/Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. I've got -- we've got four minutes, and Barbara has told me that the food is on and we must break exactly then, and I listen to Barbara.

(*Laughter*)

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
We have a couple of more that involve Commissioner Anderson. Maybe we can -- hopefully, we can get through them. The first two on Page 7 are related to the bill we just passed.
LEG. KENNEDY:
Can we do the tabled resos, please? Can we just -- there's only three tabled resos.

P.O. HORSLEY:
I don't think so, to be honest with you.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I would like Gil to able to go out and clear up the roads.

P.O. HORSLEY:
I don't think we're going to have time, we got three minutes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
So a motion to take 1564.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Why don't we just do 1564 and then we'll break?

LEG. HAHN:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. We have a second on -- from -- he's been calling longer. Seconded by Legislator Hahn on 1564. That's on Page 7, right at the top.

Amending the 2013 Operating Budget and appropriating funds in connection with bonding for a Consent Judgment in partial settlement with the United States Environmental Protection Agency concerning County underground storage tanks and universal waste (County Executive).

So I have a motion and second to take it out of order. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it is out of order.

MR. LAUBE:
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano/Vacant Seat: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
1564 is now before us.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion to approve.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, second by Legislator Krupski to approve.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
This funds what we just agreed to in the settlement, the Consent Judgement, so we have to do this.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. We have -- I had a motion and a second on 1564. Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Thank you. I just want to explore for a moment whether or not with Dennis Brown, if the fines that were imposed, were they mandatory fines or were they negotiated fines? I don't understand how it's -- as the Commissioner stated, there was no finding of any environmental contamination, maybe some deficiencies in procedures and recordkeeping, and you have a higher level of government here imposing this settlement on the County. Were their hands tied in negotiating this, or was this something that was discretionary and there could have been no fine?

MR. BROWN:
Discretionary, but there is a -- there is a stipulated amount that is a fine for these types of violations. So this was a violation of the statute, as well as the regulations. It's the Solid Waste Disposal Act and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. So even though this was a negotiated fine, the fines were as high as over $16,000 per violation per day.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So this is a settlement of what could have been much higher fines?

MR. BROWN:
Much higher, yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah, okay. Good job. Thank you.

MR. BROWN:
Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Thank you. Is there anybody else on this motion -- on this I.R.? Okay. We have a motion to approve 1564. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano/Vacant Seat: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you. We have also the corresponding bond issue, which is 1564A. I have a motion from Legislator Schneiderman to take that out of order, seconded by --

MR. NOLAN:
No.

P.O. HORSLEY:
I don't have to do that? Okay, good. All right. We have a motion to take the -- to approve the pending bond resolution for 1564. Legislator Hahn makes the motion.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Schneiderman. Roll call vote.

MR. LAUBE:
Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Hahn first.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Okay.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
I'm quick. You got to keep up with me, Tim.

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

**LEG. HAHN:**
Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**
Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**
Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**
Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**
Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Yes.

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

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**
Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano/Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. That has been approved. And we have one minute to go, so I am going to move to recess.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
You want to do the CN for Gil?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
No.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
His last one.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Barbara has told us, we are -- the food is on, and I have been told twice now not to go a minute over.

(*The Meeting was recessed at 12:29 p.m. and reconvened at 2:36 p.m.*)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. Mr. Clerk, how are we doing? Do we want to call the roll?

**MR. LAUBE:**
Surely.

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

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

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
He's here.

(*Roll Call Continued by Mr. Laube - Clerk of the Legislature*)

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Here.

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

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Here.
MR. LAUBE:
Fifteen (Not Present: Legislators Browning & Montano - Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
All righty. Are we ready to begin? We are going to be turning to page three of the agenda, Public Hearings. And it looks like we have three Public Hearings. Everybody on board, everyone good?

The first one is (Public Hearing on) IR 1666-13 - Calling for a public hearing upon a
**Proposal to form Suffolk County Sewer District No. 4 - Smithtown Galleria (County Executive).** Mr. Kennedy, what do you want to do with this?

**Leg. Kennedy:**
Motion to close.

**Leg. Cilmi:**
Second.

**Leg. Nowick:**
Second.

**P.O. Horsley:**
Legislator Kennedy makes the motion to close. Legislator Nowick seconds the motion.

**Leg. Schneiderman:**
On the motion.

**P.O. Horsley:**
On the motion?

**Leg. Schneiderman:**
Legislator Kennedy, if we recess it -- if we close it, can we vote on it today?

**Leg. Kennedy:**
Yes.

**Leg. Schneiderman:**
We can, okay.

**Leg. Kennedy:**
Yes.

**Leg. Schneiderman:**
Okay, fine.

**P.O. Horsley:**
Okay, we have a motion to close. On the motion?

**Leg. Spencer:**
There is a card from someone that would like to be heard on this.

**Mr. Nolan:**
Yeah, it's on the Galleria, yeah.

**P.O. Horsley:**
Oh, that's why? Oh, okay.

**Mr. Nolan:**
Yeah, yeah.

**P.O. Horsley:**
We were trying to figure it out; we had one card and we couldn't figure out what it was for.

LEG. KENNEDY:
That's Counsel from the Homeowners Association.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Ah ha! Okay, Mr. Mark H. Schneider, is that it?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:
There you go. Come on up. I'm sorry, we got confused.

MR. SCHNEIDER:
Thank you very much. Good afternoon. My name is Mark H. Schneider, Schneider Mitola, LLP. I am Counsel to Windcrest at Galleria Homeowners Association, Inc. We are the homeowners association that is presently one of the one of the three residential housing communities that actually is part of this sewage treatment plant that is presently being operated privately which is being considered to be part of the district that is being formed here.

I just wanted to address a couple of issues. And Legislator Kennedy, we've had -- I've had some discussion as well with Counsel -- Counsel Lolis on this issue as well, and I believe that we hopefully have some resolution. I'm sure we'll hear more from Legislator Kennedy on this matter. There are a couple of items that are out there, one of which is there's a report that was issued in -- which is being relied on for purposes of forming this district and that report I believe has an erroneous item in it which references the fact that there will be -- in order to tap point into the -- to be limited to the 3% cap each year, it indicates that we would not be subjected to that, meaning we would not get the benefit of that for three years. My understanding is, from speaking with a number of parties, that that is intended to be one year, not three years, and I'm sure we'll hear a little bit more on that shortly.

I also understand that the rate that's being proposed has nothing to do with the out -- with the present litigation which exists relating to some of the parties in this intended sewer district, in that Famous Dave's and Carrabba's are intended to be hooked up to this sewage treatment plant and that has already been factored in. And that regardless of the outcome of that or whether they're hooked up, that the rate will not be impacted and that the rate is being set as indicated in the report.

So those were the two issues and the two comments that I had. And subject, of course, to those not being issues are certainly the residents, the board of the homeowners association would support the formation. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Mr. Schneider.

I do not have any other cards for 17 -- for 1666. Would anyone like to be heard? Would anyone like to be heard. We have a motion to close and seconded? Everybody all right with this? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been closed.

MR. LAUBE:
Sixteen (Not Present: Legislator Montano - Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Mr. Kennedy, you got it under the deadline, is that what --

LEG. KENNEDY:
We're getting there, Mr. Chair. We're getting there.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Good, good, good.

LEG. KENNEDY:
We're almost there.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right.

(Public Hearing on) IR 1690-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to amend Section A13-10 of the Suffolk County Administrative Code to authorize donation of property held by the Police Property Bureau (County Executive). I do not have any cards on this. Would anyone like to be heard? Would anyone like to be heard on 1690? This is the County Executive's. The County Executive; what do you want to do with this, Tom?

MR. VAUGHN:
If you wouldn't mind recessing the bill, please, that would be great.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. I'll make a motion to recess. Seconded by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. It has been recessed.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
On the recess; if we recess, does it die or does it recess to the first meeting?

MR. NOLAN:
It doesn't -- anything's going to die. You could close this, recess it, it doesn't matter because the underlying bill is dying at the end of the year. So everything's going to have to start over next year.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Unless you recess to a date certain, right?

MR. NOLAN:
No, the bill's dying.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay.

MR. NOLAN:
So you've got to get rid of the public hearing.

MR. LAUBE:
Sixteen on the vote (Not Present: Legislator Montano - Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
(Public Hearing on) IR 2068-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to strengthen policy against dual public salaries (Cilmi). I do not have any cards on this. Would anyone like to be heard on 2068? Would anyone like to be heard on 2068? Seeing none, Mr.
Cilmi, what do you want to do with this?

**LEG. CILMI:**
Motion to close, please.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Makes a motion to close. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Second by Legislator Kennedy. On the motion, everybody good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been closed.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Sixteen (Not Present: Legislator Montano - Vacant Seat: District #8).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
If we move to page six, **Resolutions Tabled to December 17th:**

1307-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Charter Law adopting and incorporating 2% Property Tax Cap into the County budget process (Cilmi).

**LEG. CILMI:**
Motion to table.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Makes a motion to table. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. GREGORY:**
(Raised hand).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Second by Legislator Gregory. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been tabled.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Sixteen (Not Present: Legislator Montano - Vacant Seat: District #8).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
IR 1465-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Charter Law to strengthen farmland and open space preservation in Suffolk County (Krupski).
Mr. Krupski, what do you want to do with this?

**LEG. KRUPSFIGE:**
Motion to approve.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Makes a motion to approve. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAGAN:**
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. HAHN:
Motion to table.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Hahn makes a motion to table.

LEG. GREGORY:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Gregory. We have a motion to table and a motion to approve. Tabling motion goes first.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
On the motion. Sure, on the motion.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
You know, this is -- this is something that's really important to the County. And if you look at -- if you look at land preservation you look at it one way, whether it's farmland preservation or open space. If you look at all the other actions that the County takes, whether it's Wyandanch Rising or the Ronkonkoma Hub or all of these, that's really our legacy, that's what we do here. You know? And years go by, you've got to look at -- you look at all the pictures on the wall behind me and you think What did those people do? And that's really their legacy.

If we -- we're spending money on open space and we're spending money on farmland preservation, you really -- you know, the next generation and the generation after that is going to say they bought -- why did they buy that or why didn't they buy this? And they're going to -- if you make good choices and if you prioritize the way you spend the money and you do a good job at it and you buy the best open space and you buy the best quality farmland, it will pay off in the future and people will be grateful for that in the next generation.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Legislator Gregory.

LEG. GREGORY:
I just want to reiterate my comments from the prior meeting, that I think Al has done a great job, you know, having -- opening this discussion. I just think that the legislation as proposed needs to make some changes and I'm fully willing to work with him during the next -- in the new year to address some of the concerns that he has to make this legislation better. But I can't support it as it is right now.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Would anyone else like to be heard on this?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Well --

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
I think Al's on the right track as well. I mean, we have very little money to spend, we better spend it wisely. We should be only buying things that really meet the maximum threshold in terms of their value for open space or for farmland, etcetera. So I'll -- I'd like to see it pass; if it doesn't, though, I'll work with Legislator Krupski and the Legislature in trying to come up with something that will achieve that in a slightly different way.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. All right, anybody else? We're all good? Oh, yes, Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
It's actually surprising that people would find this in any way controversial, that we'd want to spend our money wisely.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Well, that's pretty good. I like that. That was convoluted, but I liked it. Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Thank you. Al, Legislator Krupski, could you just explain to me exactly how you're modifying the acquisition program?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Currently there's the -- there's the current rating system, there's no for open space and for farmland and there's no change to that current rating system. What this would do is say we're not going to spend money and order appraisals on these parcels unless they reach a certain threshold. Now, the threshold is 45% for both, both open space and farmland preservation. So if the parcels do not meet that threshold, then they would be told by, you know, the public, whoever owns them, the private landowner would be told, Well, we don't have the money to buy these because we have so many other parcels that meet this or exceed this threshold that we should be buying the very best. And then those parcels can then go through the Triple A process which is going to be rolled out next -- well, in January at the next meeting, the next EPA meeting. And then those parcels will be vetted according to not only their ratings, but also to their value, per acre value and total value. So we'll have a better idea as to how to prioritize and to purchase this land, either for open space or for farmland.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
So, through the Chair, if I may, you're not changing the new system or procedures that we put in place earlier in the year.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Uh-huh.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
The Triple A procedures?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
That's correct.
What you're doing is changing the rules in order to get into that procedure.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
And what you're trying to do -- when you say 45%, you're using it by percentage, you're stating it by percentage because there are different rating systems for the Farmland Program as compared to the Open Space Program.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
That's right. The Farmland Program is rated at a scale of 25 and the Open Space at a scale of 100; so 45% is the same either way.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So in the Open Space Program, under your bill a score of 45 would be codified as a threshold.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Uh-huh.

LEG. D'AMARO:
A hard threshold where if a property did not meet a 45 rating, it would not be considered.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Well, there is an out for a parcel that would be considered locally important. And the last meeting that we had there was a parcel in Huntington Harbor. It would not have met the threshold, however, because the Town of Huntington, and also the local North Shore Conservancy, partnered with the County, they made the match. And any time there's a municipal partner, then it automatically, you know, becomes eligible for the program.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So that would be an exception, if there was a partnership with a municipality that the threshold does not apply.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
That's right.

LEG. D'AMARO:
And then who -- so right now properties that don't have a 45 -- let's say don't score a 45, we have the ability or the discretion to consider them.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right. So how is it to our advantage to remove our ability to look at parcels piece-by-piece, on a piecemeal basis, in order to determine -- even let's say a parcel has a 44 rating, we would not, under your system, be able to consider that; under the current system we would.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
That's right.
How is it to our advantage? I mean, mindful of the fact that we realize that we have limited funds.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Because we have limited funds. Because those parcels probably below a 45 wouldn't be purchased under the new system, where we're going to get together, put all the parcels together as a unit and take a look at them, not only on the rating system but also on their value.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Uh-huh.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
So the parcels that don't rate well, it's unlikely that we would be purchasing them. And it would be -- it's fairer to the property owner to say *These aren't going to come up to our standards, you should make other plans, or Wait till the County has more money.* It's also fair to Real Estate to say *Let's not order these appraisals because we're never going to put these parcels into the system. Don't even spend the money on the appraisals.*

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
So if we're below 45, given the limited funds, you feel we wouldn't get to a purchase anyway, is what you are saying.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
That's right.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
All right. And I had another question for you. You know, my experience here has been -- especially when I was on the Environment Committee, Vice-Chair for six or seven years -- that the rating system was a factor in determining whether or not to purchase but not the factor in making that decision. This, by codifying a threshold, would now elevate the importance of the rating system to something that's actually determinative of whether or not we go forward. And I'm not sure that that was the intent of doing the rating system.

The rating system is not a complete analysis of the property. And there's been many instances where a parcel may have received a lower rating, but a Legislator was able to make the case here that, nonetheless, the Legislature should go ahead and purchase that particular parcel. So codifying the rating system and making it the standard I'm not sure is -- was ever intended for that system. Do you have any reaction to that?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
That still wouldn't be the only standard, because you still have the other variables of the other parcel's rating and also the value.

So if you have one parcel that rates highly, you're going to look at that but you're going to say *But it was* -- you know, it was appraised at $300,000 an acre and it's a 30-acre parcel, versus maybe there's ten other parcels that are valued high on the rating system but monetarily are much lower. And you're going to say *That's a much better way to spend our money, our limited money.* Because now we're going to spend the money down, we have a couple of million to work with, let's spend the money here as opposed to there. So the variable now becomes the amount of money you have to spend, but you know that you're going to get either a high quality open space or high quality farmland; you're going to be guaranteed of that.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Well, that's assuming, though, that the parcel has at least a 45%. But what I'm talking about is getting into the program in the first instance where a parcel may have something lessor or slightly less than 45%, and now you've relied on a rating system or criteria that's incomplete and was never
really intended to be the deciding factor in whether or not to go forward.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
It still wouldn't be the deciding factor. It would still be -- it would still be all the other parameters that you'd look at a parcel, including the price.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
No, I mean it would be a deciding factor of whether or not we even go forward with considering the purchase. If a parcel scores a 25 under your bill, it never even -- there's no appraisal, it's rejected, there's no vote, there's no consideration at all.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Exactly.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Right. So what I'm saying is that that is, therefore, relying solely on the rating system to decide that that parcel will never be considered by the Legislature; is that correct?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
That's correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Okay. All right. Okay, thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Thank you very much, Legislator D’Amaro. Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. HAHN:**
I don't think I need to reiterate what I said last time, I don't think I do.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Accepted. Legislator Spencer.

**LEG. SPENCER:**
I have listened to definitely your arguments with regard to this. And I think that just as a matter of a general statement, where I like the fact that on this body we make decisions all the time to represent the interest of all of Suffolk County and as individual representatives of our district, I think we have that responsibility, and from time to time, though, we may make decisions to support our colleagues for things that are important to them locally, but may not help us in our own home district.

My concern when we look at open space in general, there's a lot of reasons to do open space; farmland preservation, environmental, clean water preservation. And when -- what my concern is, is that over -- because we're talking about a particular pot of money, as we start to codify these rules, one of the things I discovered when we were looking at all the open space programs since it began -- although the Legislative Districts 1 and 2 represent 50% of the land area of Long Island, they have over 80% of all the open space, and if you throw in the Pine Barrens you go to 90%. And so when we look at the other eight towns within Suffolk County, there's a massive disproportion in property values as you go from east to west because of -- as we look at just development, so representing a western town district. And currently there's already more farmland preserved in the 1st District than there's all of open space in the entire Township of Huntington.

And I definitely appreciate the support that we have gotten, but you can get hundreds of acres out east for what you can only get maybe a dozen or so acres out west. And so we've always fought
that battle because of the cost of land where we have been not fairly represented. If you look at a map of where all the open space is preserved, it is very heavily stacked to the east and when we look -- if you look at open space as a whole, this is important geographically, especially in the more developed areas, to look at open space preservation. So I have a difficult time codifying something that's going to make it more difficult. If it was a particular piece of property and Legislator Krupski needed my support, I could look at it. But to set a rule that would cause me to put my constituents at a disadvantage permanently, I have a very difficult time doing that.

I've looked at this very -- in a very detailed manner. I'm happy -- if Legislator Krupski has a particular piece of land that he would like me to support, I'm happy to do that, but to -- I already feel the deck is stacked against us with the current rules and to shift that even a very small amount, I don't think I'm doing my constituents a service. So I would -- I cannot support this.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Legislator Krupski, back to you.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
But don't forget, when I support things like -- that are in your district like the Vanderbilt Museum that have great value to everyone in Suffolk County, I do it because of everyone in Suffolk County even though it's in your district.

LEG. SPENCER:
I agree. That's my point, and I think there are things that I support in your district, too, that are a benefit to all of the people in Suffolk County, that it's not in mine. But you're setting standards that will -- you know, if there's something that you came to me and said I need your support on this particular issue, but you're setting standards for the program moving forward and I need to try to do more. And I think a lot of my colleagues are in the same position, that there are probably three Legislative Districts that have 90% of the open space. And so it's -- that's what the difference is here. I support you 110%, you know. You're a great Legislator and a friend and I believe in you, but I don't believe in this program. Sorry.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Okay.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Merry Christmas.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Bah humbug.

(*Laughter*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. We have a motion; both tabling and approval, right?

MR. LAUBE:
That's correct.
P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay, tabling motion goes first. Do we need a roll call or are we good? All those in favor of tabling?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Opposed.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Raise your right hands; how's that?

LEG. CALARCO:
To table?

P.O. HORSLEY:
To table. Yes to table. Your right hand, yes.

MR. NOLAN:
The other right hand.

P.O. HORSLEY:
The other right hand, right. How we doing; are we doing good?

MR. LAUBE:
I have thirteen.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thirteen, okay.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Opposed.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All those opposed?

(*Legislators Krupski, Schneiderman & Barraga raised hands*)

MR. LAUBE:

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you. All right, the motion's tabled.

IR 1599-13 - Establishing new fee policy for County health centers (Calarco). Legislator Calarco?

LEG. CALARCO:
Motion.

LEG. HAHN:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion to approve. Second by Legislator Hahn. Anyone on the motion? Are we all good?

**LEG. GREGORY:**
Motion to table.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay, I have a motion -- where is that? Legislator Gregory makes a motion to table. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Second by Legislator Barraga. We have a motion to table and a motion to approve.

**LEG. CALARCO:**
On the motion?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
On the motion, Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Thank you. Yes, this issue is -- goes right to the heart of what our health centers are supposed to do and that's providing affordable health care and health opportunities, medical coverage for our residents of Suffolk County. And when we made a policy change quite a few years ago to amend the structure, it had a disproportionate effect on our residents. We've seen anywhere between a 30 to 50% drop in patient usage at our health centers as a result of this policy being put in place.

And in short, what it does is say it doesn't matter whether or not you qualify for the sliding scale income fee schedule to get a lowered copayment. When you go to the health center, if you haven't applied for Medicaid and haven't been able to get a denial letter based on income, you will pay the $75 surcharge, the $75 fee. And unfortunately, there's a lot of people in this County, and it's proved out by the numbers, that simply, for whatever reason, can't get that denial letter. It doesn't mean that they qualify for Medicaid, it just means they can't get the denial letter. They can't get their paperwork together, maybe they have a mental health issue that's preventing them from getting the paperwork done, but they're not able to get it accomplished. And the $75 is prohibitive to them getting care and we've seen a dramatic decrease and it's having a disproportionate effect on our residents here in Suffolk County.

What this fee schedule does is it brings us back to the old policy. It sets us in par with FQHC model that we've set up at a couple of our other health centers which are prohibited from having such a policy as this, and it's going to allow us to provide and meet the goals of what the health centers are there for, that's providing an affordable option for the residents to get preventative medical care and I'd just ask everyone to support this resolution. And for whatever it's worth, I had a conversation this morning with Roger Clayman from the Long Island Federation of Labor and they are supporting this resolution.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Anyone else? Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Through the Chair, I'd like to ask the sponsor a couple of questions to clarify in my mind whether or not I want to support this bill. I know I voted to table it in the past, but I have a concern. Rob, tell me if I'm wrong, but what's happening here is that there are individuals who would qualify for the
lower payment, but for the fact they cannot produce this required denial; right?

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Right. And you're saying the reason that these individuals are not getting that denial is not because they're not applying, it's for some other reason.

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Many times what you come across is the individuals, for one reason or another, just simply are not able to get that denial letter. Maybe they are unable to produce a birth certificate that shows that they would qualify for Medicaid in the first instance, maybe they're unable to produce the income documentation to prove their income level, maybe they're unable to -- you know, when I was in Aging, one of the problems that we ran across often was, you know, you had a widow who was unable to produce the documents to prove that she married and changed her name, but any of those instances you're going to come across a difficult time. Try getting a birth certificate for an 80-year old woman who moved here from Brooklyn; it's not exactly an easy thing to accomplish. But if that woman is going to get on the Medicaid, you've got to get her that birth certificate.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
All right, so let me -- I understand that. So let me ask you this. So the goal here is not to make the proper payment dependent on whether or not you can get this piece of paper. The goal should be to get the proper payment to you if you, in fact, qualify. So what do you propose -- if this bill is enacted, what happens in the health center? Does someone still have to establish that they would have been denied or meet some income guidelines? How would that work?

**LEG. CALARCO:**
No. If this bill passes, you still have to establish your income. So the sliding fee schedule, which ranges from 15 to a $75 fee, is based on your income level. So you still have to establish your income; and if you're unable to establish that, you're going to pay the $75 fee.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Uh-huh.

**LEG. CALARCO:**
But what it doesn't make you do is go to Medicaid, get the application process done, establish that you do not qualify for Medicaid based upon income eligibility.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Right, so it's not a prerequisite. But let me ask you this, then.

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Would that somehow be discouraging individuals from going in the first instance to Medicaid, which of course benefits the County? How do you deal with that situation?

**LEG. CALARCO:**
The way I would see us dealing with it and the way I prescribed in the resolution to deal with it is, one, make sure that we make the Medicaid applications available in the health centers; two, when the people present themselves for the copayment and we see that they would qualify for Medicaid,
we give them the application. Maybe we have staff there that's available to help them apply in the first instance so that instead of telling these people who, for whatever reason, sometimes it's a mental health issue, maybe they qualify and they could get in there but they just can't get their act together to do it, to help those people get that Medicaid application done and completed and get them enrolled.

And the other opportunity that we had until the Health Department decided to continue the exclusivity with the Suffolk Health Plan entity, which boggles my mind why we would do that, is to allow that entity to send their own people into the health center because they're going to be benefitted by having higher enrollment in the plan. So you allow them to establish their own advocates within the health centers who could then help people enroll. And if you talked to the folks who work in the Medicaid offices, you will come across oftentimes that they will be doing the Medicaid interviews and they will have people from the various Medicaid HMO providers actually doing the application process for these clients because the more people they enroll, the more money they make.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So you want to err on the side of catching those who don't have the Medicaid denial for reasons other than the fact that they just didn't want to go and apply.

LEG. CALARCO:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
And there will be a group of individuals that could have gone, should have gone but did not go, but to prevent them means we would have to prevent everyone.

LEG. CALARCO:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
And what you're saying is that you'd rather come at it from the other direction I think and allow everyone, and then if someone is in the health center in a position where we feel they could qualify, that we can go ahead and try and come up with some kind of program or assistance to get them to qualify.

LEG. CALARCO:
That's correct. The mission of our health centers is to provide affordable medical care to the residents of Suffolk County.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

LEG. CALARCO:
If we're denying them that medical care because -- then we're not actually meeting the mission of the health center in the first place.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Well, not denying the care, it's just a higher fee, but I understand.

LEG. CALARCO:
If we're making it unaffordable, we're not providing affordable health care anymore.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. So my last question is if we make this bill law, what is the impact to the County as far as, you know, a fiscal impact to the County?

LEG. CALARCO:
Well, I think that's a question for Budget Review, I know they put something together. There is the potential loss -- actually, potential increased cost in having to provide care for more patients. But on the flip side, you might actually -- I think Budget Review said you might actually see some more revenue come in on the other end.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Well, would it result in the County picking up more of the health care costs than the Medicaid program?

MR. FREAS:
Our original fiscal stated that because we felt that the County -- at the current time, 2013, that the health centers were at full capacity, that there would be no fiscal impact. Basically because if we changed the policy, it's not like we were going to get new patients at this lower cost level.

That being said, when we -- when the policy was changed in 2011, despite the fact that we've had two different iterations where we've actually reduced capacity in the health center, we've actually increased cash collections, we've almost doubled them or close to doubled them; I believe they went from about a million to two million, I'm not talking from my notes. But there is a potential here -- either we would have to increase capacity, which might incur a cost and we're in the middle of negotiations to divest ourselves of our Article 28 license, or there would be a cost to the County either because we get less from a cash visit than we do from a Medicaid visit, or because if we can no longer collect at the level that we are collecting now, we're basically lowering our prices, in which case there would also be reduced revenues to the County.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Well, there was a time where we did not have this policy in place, so.

MR. FREAS:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Was the Budget Review Office able to project in real dollars, or estimate, rather, in dollars what the cost would be of going back to the prior policy?

MR. FREAS:
We projected -- hold on. We didn't look at it that way. What we looked at was the potential -- we compared the current -- the current cash collections to the cash collections prior to the policy being initiated.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay, and what was the impact?

MR. FREAS:
Just a second.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Thank you. *(Brief pause)*. Just through the Chair, while they're doing that, to the sponsor, Legislator Calarco. One of the things cited by the Budget Review Office is that an impact would be increased -- you know, we'd have to increase our capacity. But to me, that means that individuals are being denied access when they should have access.
LEG. CALARCO:
That's what it means to me, too.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right. So getting less from cash visits than from Medicaid is a possibility, but if you meet the guidelines you meet the guidelines, so that's an impact that we'd have to tolerate, I believe. But I would like to know overall what the projected cost is of going back to the original policy.

LEG. CALARCO:
The question is, is whether or not we want to continue to provide care or if we want to make it cost prohibitive to individuals so that we can save money.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Well, when you put it that way (laughter). Unfortunately, all of these things have many levels of consideration, so I just would like the full picture before deciding.

MR. FREAS:
Cash collection collections for 2011-2012, which is since we've implemented the new policy, have been about $1.9 million. That's an increase of 54, 55% over the previous four-year average, despite the fact that we've had a decrease of visits from 2010 to 2011 of 14% and then another 32% decrease from 2011 to 2012.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Is the decrease in visits due to the change in policy?

MR. FREAS:
Due to the change in capacity, primarily. We have less people to take care of because we've either laid them off or they've retired.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yeah, and I --

MR. FREAS:
Less doctors.

LEG. CALARCO:
And I would challenge the assumption that it's simply less capacity. When this issue first came to me directly from my health centers, from going to our advisory board meetings, it was very clearly pointed out by the administrators of the Patchogue/Shirley centers that they had the capacity. They were actually the most efficient health centers that we had operating in Suffolk County and they saw this dramatic decrease, and as a result they became less efficient because they couldn't have their doctors constantly working. They were having them basically waiting for patients to come.

Now, while we may have taken the initiative of decreasing staffing levels at some of the other centers or continuing to cut costs which causes the staffing levels to decrease, the capacity was there, we just kind of weaned the people out and then reduced the doctors and the nurses and the staffing loads because, you know, we made it more difficult for people to use our facilities.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Uh-huh. So the difference is about a 50% -- I'm sorry, you said a 55% drop after the policy -- I mean there was a 55% increase after the policy was initiated.

MR. FREAS:
Correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Okay. And in dollars, that's about 800,000?

**MR. FREAS:**
Yeah, eight hundred, 900,000 on 1.965.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Okay. And through the Chair once more -- thank you, Legislator Calarco -- does the Administration have a position on this bill?

**MR. VAUGHN:**
Thank you very much, Legislator D'Amaro. Yes, the Administration does. Actually, the Administration has a position on health care in general and that is that we would like to make sure that we provide the best possible health care to the residents of Suffolk County in the most economical manner possible, and to do that, we are trying to move as swiftly as possible to the FQHC model. And that is how we think that we can accomplish the goals and the intent of this legislation rather than the adoption of this legislation. So we would support the tabling of this administration -- of this legislation.

**LEG. GREGORY:**
Freudian slip there?

(*Laughter*)

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Well, how do you respond, if at all, from the claim from the sponsor that this policy is denying access to individuals to medical care that we have an obligation to deliver?

**MR. VAUGHN:**
We agree with the Budget Review Office about the level of capacity, and we also think that to provide the best possible services is to move to the FQHC model.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Well, I can agree with that and we'll have that discussion, I'm sure, next year further. But my concern is only that by having this policy in place, there are individuals who would qualify for Medicaid denial, or who would be denied Medicaid, but yet because for some reason other than them just being lazy and not going and applying, there are many other reasons why it's happening that they don't get the denial and then they are charged more at the health center, which some cannot afford.

So if we go to the FQHC model, it's my understanding that this -- this policy would -- your -- Rob, your policy would go into effect through the FQHC model?

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Currently, at the Coram Center, the Elsie Owens Center which is our FQHC model -- I don't know if the Southampton facility is up and running yet -- they are prohibitive as an FQHC from requiring that Medicaid denial and doing what we're doing. They must, by -- to continue to be an FQHC, must allow for the sliding fee schedule.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Right.
LEG. CALARCO:
And just to clarify, I'm not saying that this current Administration necessarily doesn't want to provide the necessary health care coverage; this policy was put in place prior to their taking office. But nonetheless, it is continued and this is an opportunity for us to fix it.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay.  Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you, Legislator.  Legislator Gregory?

LEG. GREGORY:
Thank you, Mr. Chair.  And I don't see Dr. Tomarken here, but if I may, through the Chair, to Mr. Vaughn. I was at the committee meeting, it's my recollection that Dr. Tomarken said that this bill wasn't necessary because they were going to do it -- try to accomplish this through the FQHC model, that there's some national standards or part of the legislation or whatever it is that they have to lower the fees; do you recall that?

MR. VAUGHN:
My recollection, Legislator, is that going to the FQHC model would accomplish the goals of this legislation, but that there are efficiencies that are present within the FQHC model. So for example, one of the efficiencies that are present in the FQHC model is they're being held harmless for -- it just went out of my mind. Being held harmless for malpractice, so that makes the FQHC's more affordable which means that they can change the -- they can change and provide different services at different rates than the County models can. We're still self-insured, we still bear the burden of malpractice -- of the malpractice suits. We've all watched and seen a large number of those elements come through this year. So I think that the goals of this legislation are certainly laudable, but we would just -- we would like to see this get changed over through the -- through the change into the FQHC model rather than doing this now at this point in time.

LEG. GREGORY:
And I agree with the intent of the legislation. You know, particularly one of my health centers, the MLK -- excuse me, Tri-Community Health Center has experienced significant loss as well as significant staff loss; they've lost at least 50% of their staff. I don't even know how many thousands of visits they've lost with the increase in the fees. But I remember the Commissioner saying that this would be accomplished through -- and I don't remember his exact words, but I'm summarizing -- through the transition to the FQHC. Where are we? I mean, when we had discussed this I guess a few months ago, it seemed like, well, it's not really relevant because it's almost right around the corner. And I understand that we're not going to do -- transition all the FQHC's at the same time, but, you know, where are we with that transition?

MR. VAUGHN:
So the RFP on the transition to the FQHC's was closed without making an award, which has put the Administration in a position to negotiate directly with health care providers to provide -- to go to an FQHC model through the waiver provisions of the RFP process. So that's where we are on the transition.

LEG. GREGORY:
Okay.  So I guess -- I guess the bottom line for me is will passing this legislation hurt the negotiations for FQHC?

MR. VAUGHN:
I'm hesitant to use the term *hurt*, although I believe using the term --

**LEG. GREGORY:**
Or will it have a negative impact in any way?

**MR. VAUGHN:**
I would put it like this, Legislator. There is a set of givens currently in place right now at the health centers. The staffing level is a given, the -- the fee policy is a given. As we are negotiating, I don't believe that it is to our advantage to be changing those givens. So I would say that when you are negotiating something, to be changing the variables upon which you are negotiating, you are not doing yourself a favor.

**LEG. GREGORY:**
So you're -- if I summarize what you just said; so you're saying lowering the fees would put the County in a negative, virtually harmful position as they go forward with the negotiations? But you stated before that you're going to negotiate a lower term, that's the -- that's what's expected, to have a lower fee scale.

**MR. VAUGHN:**
We are expecting to go to a lower fee scale; that fee scale currently does not exist, though.

**LEG. GREGORY:**
Okay, but lowering the fee scale for this legislation, will it --

**MR. VAUGHN:**
We do --

**LEG. GREGORY:**
Would it weaken your bargaining position? *(No response).* It's okay, it's okay to say you don't know.

**MR. VAUGHN:**
*(Laughter).* Thank you very much. No, it's -- I'm not -- I'm quite clearly not a negotiator, Legislator Gregory. I do not believe it is to our advantage to change the variables when you're negotiating something, at this point in time.

**LEG. GREGORY:**
Well, do you know if the County Executive would support this bill if it passes?

**MR. VAUGHN:**
The County Executive does not support this bill in its current form.

**LEG. GREGORY:**
So he would veto it?

**MR. VAUGHN:**
Which is -- I've also learned a long time ago that coming over here and stating that you're going to veto something is a pretty good way to ensure adoption, so I am not going to go on the record right now and say that we're going to veto something.

(*Laughter*)

**LEG. GREGORY:**
Okay. So the -- all right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Tom.
P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. Tom, just quickly. So what you’re saying is that because we’re moving towards the FQHC structure, that the -- it’s just a matter of time in which they’ll go to a model that is similar to what Rob is portraying and -- but could one argue that we’re playing with people's lives in the meantime? I mean, that --

MR. VAUGHN:
I don’t think that we’re playing with anything, sir. I think that --

P.O. HORSLEY:
Playing, that’s probably the wrong term. But, I mean, we -- you know, there may be some people that may not get health care because they can’t afford the $75.

MR. VAUGHN:
And I don’t -- the reason that I don’t agree with that, sir, is if you were to tell me today that there was the flexibility in the scheduling, that we would be able to increase the visits, I think that that might make this a different conversation. And while I understand the position of the administrators at Legislator Calarco’s health center, that’s not the position of the Budget Review Office and it’s not the position of the County Executive’s Office. We do believe that lowering the fee is not going to necessarily generate an increased number of visits. And for that matter, I don’t believe this is a -- I would be very hesitant to say that we are, quote/unquote, "playing with people's lives".

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yeah, that was probably improperly put. But the bottom line to the question, I guess, is, you know, will some people not take -- take our service because of that difference in the dollars, and I’m not sure you can answer that. I don’t think, you know, that --

MR. VAUGHN:
I’m not positive at this point in time.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yeah.

MR. VAUGHN:
I think that there is just an honest disagreement.

P.O. HORSLEY:
But there is a question, and I think that’s the question in which Mr. Calarco is asking, and you don’t want to be on the wrong side of that answer.

MR. VAUGHN:
No, sir, I do not want to be on the wrong side of that answer, which is why I certainly would say that -- you know, our numbers, people have looked at whether or not there would be increased capacity with a lower fee. Budget Review Office has looked --

P.O. HORSLEY:
I understand, you don’t want to hire people now if all of a sudden there’s going to be a deluge of people, there’s going to be more people and suddenly you have to go and hire because we’re going to the FQHC model and maybe sooner than later; it’s a question. You know, I think it’s something that’s arguable, though.

Okay, I think I know where I am on this now. What else we got? Anyone else would like to be heard on this? You would.
LEG. CALARCO:
Yeah. I would just, you know, respectfully disagree. I think you put it pretty well, that we're playing with people's lives here in terms of providing them the health care. But I also would just like to quote from Dr. Tomarken, from our February 28th, almost a full year ago, when I asked him originally about this administrative -- this fee and the structure and I asked him about his thoughts on changing it and what his recommendations would be and he said, "The answer is we made that suggestion. We cannot -- it cannot be done by us because it came out as a County Executive order in the previous administration. It has been -- it has to be reversed at that level of government." I said, "Have you had a conversation with the Administration on that," he said, "Yes, we put a proposal forward. What we were to propose is that we move to the Federally Qualified Health Center payment schedule." I said, "So are you suggesting that we shift to a similar schedule that we have at the Coram centers," and he said, "Right. It is consistent, one; it makes sense, it tries to embrace more people, it would have a very positive effect on the number of people who would access, could access the health centers." I think that pretty much states it.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. Anybody else? Legislator Gregory.

LEG. GREGORY:
I'm going to withdraw my second motion to table.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. There's a withdrawal of the second motion on the tabling. Is there another second on the tabling motion? The tabling motion then dies.

LEG. CILMI:
The tabling motion?

P.O. HORSLEY:
They need a second.

LEG. CILMI:
Who was it?

P.O. HORSLEY:
Who was the tabling motion?

MR. LAUBE:
I had Legislator Gregory as the motion and Legislator Barraga as the second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
So you were the --

LEG. GREGORY:
I'll withdraw the --

P.O. HORSLEY:
You're withdrawing your motion to table.

LEG. GREGORY:
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. So there's no motion to table. Would someone else like to make the motion to table? Okay.

We just have a motion to approve. All those in favor? Opposed?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
Opposed.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Opposed.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Opposed.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Fourteen (Opposed: Legislators Krupski, Cilmi & Barraga - Vacant Seat: District #8).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
The motion passes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Congratulations.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
All right, 1601-13 - To appoint member to the Early Intervention Task Force (Salvatore Caravella, M.D.)(Spencer). Dr. Spencer?

**LEG. SPENCER:**
Motion to approve.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Makes a motion to approve. Is there a second on the motion? I'll make the second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
1753-13 - A Resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the establishment of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 4 – Smithtown Galleria (County Executive). We're back to this again.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Mr. Chair, having closed the public hearing, I'm going to make a motion to approve and I'd like to speak on the resolution.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. Is there a second on the motion?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
I'll second.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
(Raised hand).
P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Schneiderman. On the motion?

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes, on the motion. This actually today culminates an initiative that actually, believe it or not, began with my predecessor, Legislator Crecca, now Judge Crecca. This district formation goes back to early 2004 and has seen a number of iterations. It is for a mixed-use community. We heard Counsel on behalf of Galleria which is a 188-resident townhouse unit. There is also a relatively large apartment complex, Avalon Gardens, which is about 320 units, and then there's 23 free-standing residences.

This is a sewage treatment plant that was constructed under the general proviso that most STP's are constructed here in Suffolk County, with the understanding that they're built by the developer with the proviso that they will be turned over to the County for formation of a municipal and sewer districts.

There has been much discussion with Counsel, with Commissioner Anderson from Public Works, with Dennis Brown, and it transcends, actually, two County Executives. We're at the point today where we can close the findings and recommendations. There is some reference that you had heard previously from Counsel and on a three year limitation against access to the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund. But there's also been acknowledgement by the County Attorney's Office and by the Commissioner of Public Works that this district, because it has been ten years in the making, is not bound by that three-year prohibition. And in fact, 2014 will serve as the base year and then the 3% cap regarding increases that all other municipal sewer districts enjoy will be in place as well.

Furthermore, if there's any type of catastrophic or unforeseen consequences that occur with the district, which, by the way, should not happen, as it most recently had a full vetting and inspection by Public Works determining improvements that needed to be made or were made. For all intent and purposes, formation should go smoothly. It's my understanding from Public Works that January of 2014 will be the commencement for operation and we will have succeeded in establishing yet another Suffolk County municipal sewer district.

I would specifically like to thank County Executive Bellone for his commitment to support formation of yet another municipal sewer district. And based on that, I ask my colleagues to support this.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. We have a motion to approve. Anyone else on this? All right. We have a motion and a second, right, on that?

MR. LAUBE:
That's correct.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. All those in favor? Oh, okay. Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:
Gil, can you come up and just give us a little bit of information on this? Gil? Sorry, didn't mean to get you going.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Gil, we thought we got rid of you.
LEG. ANKER:
I just want to make sure you're good with this to go.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Gil, now that it's raining we'll keep you here.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
That's right. Yeah, it stopped snowing so now I'm here for the duration.

P.O. HORSLEY:
(Laughter). We're into sewers, as we should be.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right. I don't know what type of information the Legislator would like. I don't have any particulars. We have been working on this, we have met with the community. We have inspected the plant, the plant does meet our approval. You know, we're ready to take it over probably the first -- after the first quarter of next year we'll come in there, if not sooner. You know, we'll define that after everything is approved, hopefully, and move forward from there.

P.O. HORSLEY:
You're good with this then.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, absolutely.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay.

LEG. ANKER:
Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
You're welcome.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. Anyone else? We have a motion to approve. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. Congratulations, John.

MR. LAUBE:
Seven --

LEG. KENNEDY:
Thank you to my colleagues. Thank you very much.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. 1964-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with the construction of a recharge basin --

MR. NOLAN:
You skipped one.
P.O. HORSLEY:
Did I?

MR. NOLAN:
1910.
P.O. HORSLEY:
Oh, I'm sorry, I apparently skipped 1910.

1910-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law authorizing an exemption in County's Backflow Testing Law (Schneiderman).

LEG. D'AMARO:
Motion to approve.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Oh, Barry would have lost his mind. Motion to approve by Legislator D'Amato.

LEG. STERN:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Seconded by Legislator Stern.

LEG. ANKER:
Motion to table.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion's to table by Legislator Anker and seconded by Legislator Krupski. On the motion, anybody?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
If I may.

P.O. HORSLEY:
You may.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Let me just explain so we all know what we're voting for. So New York State a few decades ago passed a requirement for certain types of facilities that they have backflow prevention devices; these valves that prevent water from the facility from going back into the public water supply lines. It was a New York State requirement, New York State said they had to be inspected every year by a certified inspector, and then they licensed people, certified people to do these certifications. So we went beyond that, as this body, and we said No, that won't be enough. You're going to have to, whether you're a plumber or just a layperson with a certification, you're going to have to work under a master plumber, and we passed that law and I supported that law.

The individual that's been training the backflow inspectors, the plumbers and everyone else came to me asking that this be revisited because they never got to chime in; they never got to weigh in on this. I said, "Look, I'm not going to open this up again to undo this law." He said, "Well, what about the teachers? Can we do it?" And I said: "Well, are you willing to work under a master plumber?" He said, "Well, we'd work at the request of a master plumber." There's only three of these guys. I said, "You know what? I'll give you your day in court. I'll put this bill in and you can make your case," which he did; he came, he spoke today and he made his case. It doesn't matter how you vote on this, I just want to make sure you understand exactly what you're voting on. There's three guys who are affected. This doesn't open them up to change the valves or do
anything to the valves other than to certify that they're working. Without this, they can still do it, they just have to affiliate with a master plumber; with this they can do it at the request of a master plumber. It's a subtle difference, one I think that the plumbers are not happy with, but at least you understand what the bill does. If there's any questions, I'd be happy to answer. And I actually would say don't table it. Let the guy who's been advocating for this have a vote. Let him know whether you support it or whether you don't support it.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Legislator Anker just said over here on my right that she is withdrawing her tabling motion. So there's no tabling motion without that. Legislator D'Amaro, do you want to --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Well, I just want to -- I agree with Legislator Schneiderman that we should take an up or down vote, if for no other reason to send a clear picture of where we stand on this type of legislation in granting an exemption to what I think was a good rule and a good bill that we passed previously. So I would urge my colleagues to vote no on the approval motion.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I wasn't actually going to motion to approve. I thought we would not get a motion to approve or a second, but you made the motion to approve, so.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yeah, we have a motion to approve and a second.

LEG. NOWICK:
We have to vote it up or down.

P.O. HORSLEY:
We do not have a tabling motion anymore, correct?

MR. LAUBE:
That's correct.

P.O. HORSLEY:
So, everybody else -- everyone good on this? All right. We have a motion to approve. Do you want to do a roll call? Yeah, let's do a roll call. It could get confusing otherwise.

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

LEG. D'AMARO:
No.

LEG. STERN:
No.

LEG. SPENCER:
No.

LEG. GREGORY:
No.

LEG. NOWICK:
LEG. KENNEDY:
No.

LEG. BARRAGA:
No.

LEG. CILMI:
No.

LEG. MONTANO:
(Not present).

LEG. CALARCO:
No.

LEG. ANKER:
No.

LEG. HAHN:
No.

LEG. MURATORE:
No.

LEG. BROWNING:
No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Abstain.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. KRUPSKI:
No.

P.O. HORSLEY:
No.

MR. LAUBE:
Zero.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:
Thank you, everybody. Merry Christmas.

(*Laughter*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. All right, 1910 has failed.

1964-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with the of construction of a recharge basin at North Fork Preserve, Town of Riverhead (CP 7143)(Krupski). Legislator Krupski?
LEG. KRUPSKI:
So moved.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Wants to make -- makes a motion to approve. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the question?

P.O. HORSLEY:
We have a motion and a second to approve.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion?

P.O. HORSLEY:
On the motion? Sure.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
This will remediate the drainage problem that we inherited when we bought the parcel. I've worked with DPW, I've worked with the community there, we've had a number of meetings on the site and in the office about this and hopefully this will solve -- this will begin to solve the drainage issues there. No backflow valves will be used in the project.

(*Laughter*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
By teachers or otherwise. There we go. Okay, we have a motion to --

LEG. SPENCER:
On the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
We have a motion to approve. Oh, on the motion, I'm sorry. Legislator Spencer, I didn't see you.

LEG. SPENCER:
Although this will not benefit my constituents --

(*Laughter*)

-- it does benefit my colleague, Legislator Krupski's constituents and I find him to be an upstanding, fine Legislator and I will support this.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. STERN:
One hundred and ten percent.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Well, kumbaya.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right, we have a motion to approve and we've got a roaring yes from Legislator Spencer. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. Sixteen (Not Present: Legislator Montano - Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
1964A, we have a Bond Resolution, *(Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York)*, authorizing the issuance of $850,000 Bonds to finance the cost of construction of a recharge basin at North Fork Preserve, Town of Riverhead *(CP 7143.310)*. Same motion, same second. Roll call vote.

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

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D’AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:
*(Not present).*

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:
*(Not present).*

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Fifteen (Not Present: Legislators Nowick & Montano - Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay?

2009-13 - Amending Resolution No. 500-2011 to modify appropriated funds in the HazMat 2009 Grant (County Executive).  This comes from the County Executive.  Anyone want this one?

LEG. GREGORY:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Gregory makes a motion to approve.  Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. D'AMARO:
Second.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Krupski.  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Fifteen (Not Present: Legislators Nowick & Montano - Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
2037-13 - Amending the Temporary Classification and Salary Plan to add the Emergency Complaint Operator and Emergency Complaint Operator (Spanish Speaking) Titles (County Executive).  What do you want to do on this?  Ms. Hahn, is this one yours?

LEG. GREGORY:
Motion to table.

P.O. HORSLEY:
No, it’s not yours.  It’s the County Executive's, apparently.

MR. NOLAN:
You need a motion to table.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
I'm sorry, motion to table by Legislator Gregory.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Second by Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. HAHN:**
I'll make a motion to approve.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Legislator Hahn makes a motion to approve. Is there a second on the motion to approve?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
I'll second the motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Second the motion by Legislator D'Amaro. Okay, we have -- on the motion, Legislator Vaughn? Legislator -- Mr. Vaughn, do you want to make a comment on this?

**MR. VAUGHN:**
No.

(*Laughter*)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
You just got up (*laughter*). It's good exercise, though. I mean, we applaud you for that.

Okay, we have a motion to table. Okay? Yes, Legislator Gregory, on the motion?

**LEG. GREGORY:**
It's my understanding that there was an issue with the Administration and AME and they hadn't negotiated. There was concerns that there weren't -- that they were taking away jobs. Has there been a conversation?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
This is why I thought Mr. Vaughn was going to comment on this, but you're back.

**MR. VAUGHN:**
The Administration did talk to AME. AME has told us that they feel that the situation over in the EOC has improved. We still feel that the adoption of the bill is best because it's what was prescribed under the ECAT law, so we would like to see that go because it is what was prescribed under the law.

**LEG. HAHN:**
Through the Chair?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Yes, Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. HAHN:**
It has been suggested that we reach out to the TERT, and I actually have done so, but I think it would be much, much, much more productive if -- you know, if the Executive Branch does that and we continue to look for the best solution, you know, to the problem that we have here, which may include more SCINS in the future. There have been retirements, of course, I recognize that, that we always want to make sure that this -- this particular body of workforce is properly staffed at all times, because emergencies can happen at any time. But that being said, having this in place and also investigating a TERT or however you say it, CERT? TERT?

**LEG. BROWNING:**
TERT, T-E-R-T.

**LEG. HAHN:**
TERT. You know, would -- I don't think that this bill is the be-all/end-all, and I think that we need to continue to work towards getting to where we need to be.

**MR. VAUGHN:**
I think the Administration agrees with you, Legislator Hahn, wholeheartedly on that. We think that this is simply a tool, and there are many tools that we can use, SCIN forms, TERT and this piece of legislation. So we don't think that this is the be-all and the end-all, but it was what was prescribed under the law.

**LEG. HAHN:**
Right.

**MR. VAUGHN:**
It was what was requested of us to do and that's why we're supporting it going forward.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. Legislator Kennedy has been talking to me and I don't know what just happened.

(*Laughter*)

**MR. NOLAN:**
Roll call on the tabling motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. Tabling motion, everybody's good? Tabling motion; why don't we do a roll call?

**LEG. GREGORY:**
I'm going to withdraw my motion to table.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Legislator Gregory withdraws his motion to table.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Also on the motion. We already passed the bill to put this policy in place.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Right.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
This is just finding a way to fund the policy that we've already put in place. Now, let's give it a chance. We'll put this in place, even the sponsor, Legislator Hahn, is saying it's not an end-all, it's just a tool. Let's put it in place and see then if there's a way to work this out or improve on it, but I
think that we have to stand behind the policy that we already voted for. You know, otherwise we'll be debating this bill for the next six months next year

P.O. HORSLEY:
Oh, boy.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:
I'm sorry. I know I want to get out of here as much as everybody else, but, you know, I did have a discussion with a labor lawyer with regards to this. And George, maybe you could give us some information on this also.

Being that the Administration hasn't really had a conversation or done any kind of Memorandum of Agreement with regards to this, I would say that this -- and my question of the lawyer was would this be an unfair labor practice, to not have a negotiation with AME at all with regards to this?

MR. NOLAN:
They're just creating titles. So I don't think this would cause that type of problem at this point, it just wouldn't because you're just creating the titles.

LEG. BROWNING:
You know, I knew it, I'm going to have to get a third lawyer (*laughter*), to respond to this. Because the labor lawyer, that was my question, said *Yes, it could be an unfair labor practice.*

MR. NOLAN:
The union --

LEG. BROWNING:
You're just creating the titles, however, there's no agreement at this point in time if they start to hire people.

MR. NOLAN:
I don't know. The union was here, they never mentioned that they thought it was an unfair labor practice.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
They were opposed to it, though.

LEG. BROWNING:
They are opposed to it.

MR. NOLAN:
Not because it's an unfair labor practice.

LEG. BROWNING:
No, but how much negotiation has occurred since the last the time we -- since our last committee meeting or since the last General Meeting?
Through the Chair?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. Yes, through the Chair, Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. HAHN:**
Tom, can yo -- obviously, if this is a concern that our attorneys, which one of them doesn't -- but, you know, hopefully in the implementation of this you will continue to talk to AME as needed.

**MR. VAUGHN:**
I personally think that I have a pretty good relationship with both Mike Finland and Mr. Farrell, and when I say a pretty good relationship, I mean that I can speak to them; not obviously negotiate contracts with them, but I'm able to have conversations with them. I'm more than happy to have additional conversations.

I have personally sat down with both Mr. Finland and Mr. Farrell to discuss the issues over at the EOC and to try and provide -- try and provide solutions to those concerns over there. I've been assured by Mr. Finland that even AME believes that the situation over there is getting better. We do realize that they have presented some concerns over this bill, but I think that honest people can disagree honestly.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. Right now we have a motion to approve. We do not have a tabling motion. So, everyone ready? All those? --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
No, motion to table.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
No, the motion was withdrawn by Legislator Gregory; is that correct?

**MR. NOLAN:**
Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
I'll make a motion to table.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
I'll second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
All right. There's a motion to table by Legislator Browning, seconded by Schneiderman. So we now have a motion to table and a motion to approve. Tabling motion goes first; roll call vote.

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

**LEG. BROWNING:**
Yes to table.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Yes to table.

**LEG. SPENCER:**
No to table.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
No.

**LEG. STERN:**  
Nope.

**LEG. GREGORY:**  
No.

**LEG. NOWICK:**  
No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**  
Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**  
No.

**LEG. CILMI:**  
No.

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

**LEG. CALARCO:**  
Yes to table.

**LEG. ANKER:**  
No.

**LEG. HAHN:**  
No.

**LEG. MURATORE:**  
Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**  
No.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
No.

**MR. LAUBE:**  
Five *(Not Present: Legislator Montano - Vacant Seat: District #8).*

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Okay. Motion to approve. Roll call.

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

**LEG. HAHN:**
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO: Yes.

LEG. SPENCER: Yes.

LEG. STERN: Yes.

LEG. GREGORY: Yes.

LEG. NOWICK: Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY: No.

LEG. BARRAGA: Yes.

LEG. CILMI: Yes.

LEG. MONTANO: (Not Present).

LEG. CALARCO: Yes.

LEG. ANKER: Yes.

LEG. MURATORE: No.

LEG. BROWNING: No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN: Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI: Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY: Yes.

MR. LAUBE: Thirteen (Opposed: Legislators Browning, Muratore & Kennedy - Not Present: Legislator Montano - Vacant Seat: District #8).
P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay, the motion passes.

All right, page seven, *Introductory Resolutions Budget & Finance*:
We've already done 1564 and 64A.

**Economic Development:**

2103-13 - Accepting and appropriating a 100% grant --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Wayne?

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'm sorry. Can we let Gil go home? We have just one resolution I believe he's waiting on.

P.O. HORSLEY:
We have been --

LEG. KRUPSKI:
There's someone waiting for this next resolution, too.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. Then after this one, let's do the one for Commissioner Anderson.

P.O. HORSLEY:
After which one? I've got **Economic Development, 2103-13 - Accepting and appropriating a 100% grant funds from the N.Y.S. Housing Trust Fund Corporation for U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery Funds and authorizing the County Executive to execute agreements (County Executive).**

LEG. SPENCER:
Motion.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

MR. LAUBE:
Sixteen (Not Present: Legislator Montano - Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you.

**Education & Information Technology:**

2100-13 - Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in
connection with a Countywide replacement of computer equipment/ infrastructure (CP 1816)(County Executive).

LEG. ANKER:
Motion to approve.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Anker makes a motion to approve.

LEG. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. KENNEDY:
On the motion?

P.O. HORSLEY:
On the motion.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Quick question for either Commissioner Rogers or somebody from IT. We talked about this extensively in committee. I just want to confirm that this is for procurement of equipment only?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Donald Rodgers, Commissioner of IT. No, it is for equipment and infrastructure, only if we need to purchase software to support the equipment.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. Well, here again, that's something that I guess I like to believe I understand but I don't quite. I understand a laptop, I understand a PC, I think I understand a server, I understand a rack, things like that. The software that's necessary to make those hardware pieces of equipment operate, would that be analogous? We're not buying something like an operating system with this, are we?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
No, we are not purchasing an operating system with this.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. So no Microsoft, no other types of operating systems, merely simply it would just be whatever is necessary to maybe make the laptop turn on or the server to recognize another machine?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
In order for the server to recognize another machine, we may need software, correct. If we were to virtualize some of this equipment, then we would need software to interact in-between.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. But I'll go back to the first thing; we're not buying Microsoft, we're not buying, you know, any other type of operating system? This is for hardware, things I can touch and I guess whatever's got to go into that to make it kind of like wake up and operate.

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
If I could just say this, Legislator Kennedy. If you’re asking me is this is a way for us to work around the Enterprise agreement, the answer is no.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Good. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Well, I'm glad we got that straightened out. Legislator Spencer.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
Good afternoon.

**LEG. SPENCER:**
Good afternoon. I had a couple of questions with regard to just some of the detail, looking at the equipment. We were discussing this amongst ourselves with regards to the $7500 cost per unit, and that seemed a bit high. What -- when we say a unit, what does that include and why is it so much higher than me going out and buying the most up-to-date, powerful, souped-up computer possible, it wouldn't cost me $7500?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
We don't give you a car with red lights on the top of it at the same time. The device you're talking about is a multiple -- is a mobile device for the police cars, its price is approximately $6500. That includes the cost of all the associated equipment to actually mount that in the police vehicle. The actual Toughbook, which is the laptop itself, has a purchase of about $3200. The associated mounting and necessary equipment that goes with it is about another $3300 for us. Now, when we -- when we look at that and the question really becomes why don't we just put a laptop in the police vehicle as opposed to a Toughbook? A Toughbook is a ruggedized laptop. When we look at the actual numbers on these, the Toughbooks have about a 2.0 to a 2.5% failure rate on them. A standard laptop would have about a 15% on average failure rate associated with it. So when we consider that the police vehicle is in use around the clock and that it would require us to actually engage a technician to take the vehicle off the road, and at the same time take the Police Officer off the road, the actual cost of the Toughbook is cheaper than if we consider the failure rates of the laptops and their inability to necessarily deal with the overall environment that the Police Officer operates in.

**LEG. SPENCER:**
I know just within my business, looking at -- I have a computer network and I pay a higher price, but if something fails, that item is automatically replaced. Is that included in this? If there is a failure, are these unit -- does the company send out a new one?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
The equipment is warranted for a period of time after purchase, and I don't know -- I don't have the numbers with me right now for exactly how long that is. It's at least a year after the time of purchase.

We do do maintenance on the equipment or we will replace it. But the whole approach to us using the Toughbook is geared towards its durability within the vehicle.

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

**LEG. SPENCER:**
I could appreciate that. I think my concern comes from -- and, again, you're going to be in a much better position, and the fact that you're up here advising us weighs heavily. So I could understand there being a higher cost. You know, for instance, if I buy a Mophie PRO Case for my iPhone, I may
spend $150 for it, but -- and a truck can run over the phone and it survived. But I wanted to make
sure that, you know, if you say a laptop would cost $2,000, then it seemed that a Toughbook would
cost $3,000, when you're adding the brackets and mounting. But when I hear 7500, again, that
may be the actual cost, but I want to make sure that we're not just paying that much more because
we're a government entity. And if someone were to go out and buy that identical system and
mount it in a car and do exactly the same thing, that they wouldn't be paying half price. There is
always that concern that government will pay $20 for a screwdriver.

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
No, and I can understand that. The purchases that we make are all made off of New York State
OGS contract, so we pay the New York State negotiated rate for the equipment through the
approved vendor, which is in this case Dell. The devices are --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Dell?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
I'm sorry. Yeah, that's my fault. They're Panasonics, they're not Dell's. These standard laptops
would normally be about $719; this laptop is about $3200. So the actual net -- the overall cost for
putting it in a vehicle is $6500. I know there was a number of 7500 out there, but it's 6500.
Okay? So we're paying about 3200 for the device. We're paying approximately 3300 for the
associated mounting equipment.

So, when we look at the 719 compared to the 3200, you're looking at about five times the price, but
the failure rate is significantly lower. And the length of time and the reduction in risk of us not
having to pull the vehicle off the road, which is significant to us, is what also weighs into this for us
making these purchases this way.

LEG. SPENCER:
Thank you so much.

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
You're welcome.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much. Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:
One more time. So the laptop itself costs $3200?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Correct.

LEG. HAHN:
And that's a rough --

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
It's called a ruggedized laptop.

LEG. HAHN:
It's a Roughbook?
It's called Toughbook.

**LEG. HAHN:**

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
It comes with a standard operating system. It's a computer.

**LEG. HAHN:**
And what does the laptop do for you?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
In our case?

**LEG. HAHN:**
Yes.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
Are we talking about a standard laptop?

**LEG. HAHN:**
We're talking about a standard laptop.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
Standard laptop would generally be provided to workers who go out into the field by various departments, Health Department, Department of Social Services, Probation.

**LEG. HAHN:**
And the remainder of the cost is how much?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
No, no. Standard laptop is $719, that's our price.

**LEG. HAHN:**
No, no, no, no.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
Toughbook is $3200.

**LEG. HAHN:**
Toughbook is $3200. I'm okay with that.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
Okay.

**LEG. HAHN:**
But the remainder of the cost per piece is $3300?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
That's correct.

**LEG. HAHN:**
And what do you get for your $3300?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Well, I can have Matt Jones from the Police Department, who's here, come up and probably provide better detail on that for you.

LEG. HAHN:
Please.

MR. JONES:
Good afternoon. Matt Jones, Director of Information Technology for the Police Department.

So we've been using Toughbooks in the patrol cars since back in 1999. We did a full evaluation. Just to give a little bit of background, we put a regular laptop in the cars. When these guys are driving around in bright sunlight, you can't read a laptop in the sunlight. They're using the car seven-by-twenty-four.

LEG. HAHN:
I'm sorry. I'm sorry, I'm going to stop you right there. I'm not arguing with you on the cost of the laptop, the Rough Book, I'm not arguing with you on how much it cost more for a police officer's Toughbook. I'm having a real hard time that it costs a little more money for the piece of metal, the screws, and the nuts, and the bolts to put it in the police car, okay, because we're getting a hell of a lot of activity out of that data entry center, the computer itself that's, you know, taking in data, spitting out data, communicating with home base, whatever it's doing. The thing that's holding it in the police car shouldn't cost us more money. So I really need to understand why that is, that a piece of metal and a couple of screws and bolts is going to cost us more money than the computer itself. I'm having a very hard time with that.

MR. JONES:
Sure. There's a -- in the -- there's a center console. Every car now has a customized center console. It holds the radios, it holds the laptop. The laptop also has an electronic device of a docking tray that the laptop goes into inside the car. That docking tray has the associated antennas, ports, pass-through connections, and provides the power for the docking tray itself.

LEG. HAHN:
Okay. So it's more than just something that's holding it up. So it includes like a modem almost, but much more advanced?

MR. JONES:
Right. And the docking tray is the electronic pass-through that all the other devices within the car connect to, whether it be the printer, the bar code scanners, the interface connections onto some of the license plate reader devices that are in these cars. You know, it's more of an intelligent hub than just a piece of metal acting as a cradle to hold the laptop. It's a, you know, intelligent hub for the laptop.

LEG. HAHN:
Good. I'm glad you're here, because I had a really hard time with the fact that the mounting was going to cost more than the computer. So keep going, because I'm still not convinced it should cost more than the computer itself, but tell me more about what it does. Does it include the printer?

MR. JONES:
Well, again, those associated costs, the $3,000, right, are the printer, they're the customized brackets that have to hold the mount in place to keep it from breaking loose in the event there's an accident. You know, there's a lot of -- there's customization for all that equipment that goes into
place. The consoles are modified in order to fit the laptop. There's cabling that's necessary for the power to the back. There's a separate network that the Police Department has for some limited data capacity. There's also -- so there's connectivity for that. So it's really -- the car is becoming a central hub of intelligence with multiple devices connected into this base station.

LEG. HAHN:
Sure. Are these new cars? Should they have some of that already for the old Toughbooks?

MR. JONES:
No. The new cars basically come strict --

LEG. HAHN:
No. I mean --

MR. JONES:
-- as a car, and then we take all that equipment and put it in --

LEG. HAHN:
No. I mean, are these -- all of these computer systems that we're buying right now going into new cars?

MR. JONES:
For the most part. There's still a combination. If we have an older car or a car with a laptop that's coming off warranty and fails, then we're going to have to swap that laptop into one of the older Crown Vics. But, for the most part, yes, we're putting the stuff into the new cars as well.

LEG. HAHN:
Okay. I think I'm okay with that. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
Very briefly. Thanks for the presentation. Matt, thank you for your clarification. I really wanted to just reiterate the concern that I expressed during our committee meeting with regard to our continued reliance on, or it seems like our increased reliance on, bonding to pay for things that have been traditionally paid for out of operating expenses. That being said, I will support this resolution. And I wanted to thank and compliment Commissioner Rodgers and the Department for what I found to be a very informative and thorough dialogue, both through email and one-on-one with respect to this resolution and why it's so important. So thanks, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Thank you.

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

LEG. D'AMARO:
Just curious, how many laptops are you purchasing?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
For the Police Department, we are looking -- we are looking at 67 mobile data units.
LEG. D’AMARO:
So that's about half of the funding.

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
The Police Department, right now, we are looking at probably about 53% of the funding total going to P.D.

LEG. D’AMARO:
So you've explained that with the -- what are they, Tough Guy, Tough Boy?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Toughbooks.

LEG. D’AMARO:
Toughbooks.

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
They have requests in for desktops, for some servers, and some standard laptops as well.

LEG. D’AMARO:
Okay. So what's the other funding going towards?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
The other funding is going to -- Social Services is receiving about 33, 35% of the funding.

LEG. D’AMARO:
That's just for hardware, computer terminals?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Yeah.

LEG. D’AMARO:
Okay.

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
It's for --

LEG. D’AMARO:
How old are the terminals that are being replaced?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
There's nothing less than -- there's nothing less than five years old that's being replaced.

LEG. D’AMARO:
Okay.

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
All right. The last --

LEG. D’AMARO:
Are we getting more powerful computers? Are we getting something that will increase or make the Department more efficient or increase their ability to -- or enhance their ability to process constituents?
COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
One of the -- and as I had explained to some members of the Legislature when we were doing this, we put this proposal together with absolutely the intention of, as we move forward with it, assessing what is the best solution. We requested from the departments what their needs were.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay.

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Their needs came back to us at about 2.6 million in requests. We have a million. What we want to be able to do is provide the most hardware we can to them --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
That's going to give them the best performance.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So you went to the departments and said, "What are your needs?" And you have combed through that and pared that down to what you thought was more essential, given the tight budget?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Yes. Now the rest of it is -- as I said, if we can virtualize some of this equipment and provide actually more end product to the user and greater performance, that is also our intention as we go forward with this.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So that shouldn't be an if, that should be when you buy these computers, right?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Well, the short answer to your question is yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay.

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Our intention is to provide them with more performance capability.

LEG. D'AMARO:
What do we do with all the old laptops and computers that we're actually replacing?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
We -- some of them are distributed to --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Surplus.

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Surplus, members of your group. And where licensing enables us to, we redistribute those.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So with the case of the Police laptops, are we replacing existing laptops in patrol cars, or are we putting in new cars -- into new cars?
COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
I think we're doing both.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Both?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
We're putting into new ones which --

LEG. D'AMARO:
What percentage of the equipment that we are replacing is not functioning?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
I would expect that all the equipment that we're replacing is functioning.

LEG. D'AMARO:
No, that's -- I'm sorry, I wasn't clear. Of the equipment that's being replaced, how much of it is nonfunctional?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
It should all be functional, it's coming off of people's desks.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So everything that's being replaced is working right now?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
But you're convinced that we need to replace it nevertheless?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Yes. Some of this equipment's eight years old.

LEG. D'AMARO:
But the age of the equipment is one thing, but if it's working and it's getting the job done --

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Well, again --

LEG. D'AMARO:
-- why replace it?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Because I go back to the Department's request as compared to what we're actually providing them with, and that comes down to us making an assessment as to is the piece of equipment performing at a level that's appropriate for the work that the individual has to do. And in many cases, at this point, they can get better performance --

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay.

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
-- which is really what we're looking for.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Right. That's what I'm looking for, yeah. Okay. As long as you've done that analysis, I appreciate that.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
And we will continue to do that analysis as we deploy.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Good. Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
You're welcome.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
All right. Thank you very much, Legislator D'Amaro. Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**
I just have a quick question regarding the Police Toughbooks. I don't know if you would like to come up real quick. So, again, you know, I'm supporting this resolution. I think we do need to make sure that our services are -- you know, have the computers that they need and the technology that they need. But my question is the Toughbooks for our Police. When they take reports, and we've had -- I've had a number of complaints by constituents, you know, the Police Officers write the report down, handwrite them and it's hard to read, and they may not include all the information that the constituent may have wanted on their police reports. Is there -- is there a way to create a more accurate -- I don't know what you'd call it -- a complaint form that can then be printed from this equipment that we're investing in?

**MR. JONES:**
Right now, I mean, we do about 95 reports online, so the patrol officer is doing it online. He may be just giving them a receipt with just some of the basic information of person one, person two and a case number for them to go to Central Records and obtain an official report.

**LEG. ANKER:**
Again, it would be -- just hearing from my constituents, they would prefer to have, I guess, more details, and if we have this type of technology available, maybe, you know, in the future we can look to include some more details and, you know, give that to the constituent, because that's what they use when they're going to Traffic Court, or whatever.

**MR. JONES:**
Right.

**LEG. ANKER:**
But I do appreciate your, you know, facilitating the technology that our -- our public safety has, so thank you.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
And, Legislator Anker, if I can just say, as -- with regard to the Traffic Court, the Police Department is moving to TRACS, which is an automated ticket generation system that's part of New York State.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
All right. Thank you very much, Legislator Anker. Legislator Muratore.
LEG. MURATORE:
Thank you. Commissioner, Legislator D’Amaro asked how many we were buying. You didn't tell him how many, you told him a percentage. So, number one, how many Toughbooks are we buying, total number?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Sixty-seven.

LEG. MURATORE:
Sixty-seven, that's it. So 67 times -- how much are these apiece, 3200 bucks?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Because I just went to the website, the Toughbooks, they’re on sale, 2599. So why can't we get them cheaper as a -- I mean, it's a CF31. Is that the Toughbook we're buying? It looks like that's the top of the line for Panasonic. So why can't we get them cheaper than 2599 if I can go on and buy them now?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
If we -- if we don't purchase off of New York State contract, then we would have to put it out to bid. And if we have to put it out to bid, then we would do that. But our base price that we've seen is $3200. What website did you go to?

LEG. MURATORE:

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
I'll be happy to look at it, Legislator Muratore.

LEG. MURATORE:
It's on sale.

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
And if it has the same configuration as what we're purchasing --

LEG. MURATORE:
It was 3579, now on sale 2599. We could put through and, you know --

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Again, I'll be very -- believe me, I'll be very happy to take a look at it.

LEG. MURATORE:
But, again, you know, are we buying a total number of 67 for the Police Department?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Are we buying anymore Toughbooks?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS:
Right now.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Yeah.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
Under this particular take?

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Yes.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
No, not under this particular offering.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Because you made a comment that Social Services is getting 35%?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
No, no. We are, absolutely. The total --

**LEG. CILMI:**
Not the Toughbooks, though.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
Right, not the Toughbooks.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
We're not buying -- we're buying -- besides Toughbooks, we're buying other laptops.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
Absolutely, and we're buying servers and we're buying desktops.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Right. And we need over a million dollars for this, one million.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
Well, what we're requesting now is a million dollars. The request we received from the departments in total was in excess of 2.5 million.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
For the 67 laptops for the Police Department, 35% for Social Services, and some wires, and screws, and bolts for the material to put them in police cars?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
We are -- we're purchasing equipment effectively for most of the departments in the County. We're purchasing for DPW, we're purchasing for Health, purchasing for --

**LEG. MURATORE:**
It's not only the Police, it's everybody.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
Excuse me.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
It's not only the Police.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
Yes, correct.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
You're welcome.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
All right. That's the last on my list.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
No.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Are we good? Oh, Mr. Schneiderman.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Go right ahead.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Thanks, Mr. Presiding Officer. You're always patient. Thank you, Don. You said about half of this bond is going toward -- I guess, it's Police patrol car computers. Maybe this is a question more for --

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
And additional equipment for the Police.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Right. Maybe this question is more for BRO and Robert Lipp. These -- typically, a patrol car would be paid for through the Police District, not by the whole County. That's what is confusing me here, because half this bond looks like it ought to be paid by the Police District and half of it by the whole County. Robert, is there a way to segregate this?

**MR. LIPP:**
Well, okay. So this is a Fund 16 expense and debt service. So, at least in theory, they would be able to charge back appropriately Fund 115, the Police District, versus the General Fund. I'm not exactly sure how they'll figure out the accounting, but, in theory, that's the way it would be done.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Right. And that's the law, right? They have to account for it separately, unless it's in that Headquarters. You know, some of the Police functions, there are specific tasks that are whole County.

**MR. LIPP:**
Right. So the point here is that --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Like the Hate Crimes Unit, for example.

**MR. LIPP:**
So the point here is that Fund 16 is a service fund, you know, cars and computers basically, and there's a chargeback or an expense in different funds, General Fund, Police District in this case here, that pays for services that Fund 16 provides. So, conceptually, there'll be the charge back that will be associated with the approximately 50% of this for police cars.

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
In those departments.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Fund 16 is the Suffolk County P.D., that's not the 01 or the Headquarters?

**MR. LIPP:**
No. Fund 16 is a service fund. Basically, it's cars and computers, and it services the different funds, and there's a chargeback and expense in the General Fund and in the Police District here.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Okay. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay? All right. That's the end of my list. We have a motion to -- I think it's just approve.

**MR. LAUBE:**
That's correct.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
All right. We have a motion and a second to approve on 2100, amending the Capital Budget for the equipment. Are we ready for this? All those in favor? Opposed?

**LEG. MURATORE:**
(Raised hand).

**MR. LAUBE:**
Fifteen.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
So moved. Okay. Okay. We have a -- the same motion, same second on the corresponding bond resolution. Roll call vote.

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

**LEG. ANKER:**
Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**
Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**
Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**
Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**
Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**
Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
No.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Sixteen. (Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
All right.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Can we do the Gil resolution now?

**COMMISSIONER RODGERS:**
Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Make a motion, Mr. Schneiderman.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Can we take the CN, it's **2110 - Authorizing an Intermunicipal Agreement with the Village of Patchogue and the County of Suffolk for exchange services for the Mutual Benefit of Residents of the County and the Village (County Executive).** This is the Village of Patchogue Salt Agreement. I think this is the last one that Commissioner Anderson has been waiting for, and we can let him deal with the snowstorm.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
It's all rain, Jay.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
All right. We have a motion to take out of order the --

**MR. NOLAN:**
The CN.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
-- CN 2110, and seconded by Legislator Calarco to take it out of order. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Seventeen.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
I'm opposed.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Opposed? Sixteen. (Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. Legislator Calarco makes the motion to approve, seconded by Legislator Schneiderman on -- to approve the CN. On the motion, everybody good?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Just the one clarification, because --

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Sure.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
-- I know that there were some concerns about employment. I guess, AME had a concern about this. We're not -- you know, maybe Commissioner Anderson can explain this, but, basically, we are not using our staff. It's basically, instead of going out to private contractors, we'll be able to use Patchogue Village to do some of the plowing in exchange for the salt and we'll see how the numbers work out, right?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**
That's correct, yeah. This will allow us -- we've had a number of contractors, snow contractors actually withdraw their contracts from the County because of work elsewhere, and this will allow us to minimize the need to get other contractors. The Village will take care of the County roads and the Sixth District Court and the Fifth Precinct property as well.
P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay? We have a motion and a second to approve. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. It has been approved.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All righty. Let's see. 1563 we've already done. 1797 - Directing the Division of Real Property Acquisition and Management to canvass the owners of the Master List Properties (Hahn). Legislator Hahn?

LEG. HAHN:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Makes a motion to approve. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. BROWNING:
Second.

LEG. ANKER:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Browning.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
On the motion.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So the motion is to canvas people on the Master List with a rating of 50 or higher; is that correct?

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So what about the people -- so, if you're a -- you score a 49 on the Master List in the rating, so you don't get a letter, so that means the County's not interested in purchasing your property?

LEG. HAHN:
No. They've gotten letters 10 years ago, and so we want to -- everybody should know that we're interested, and the Department -- you know, we had problems when I originally put in the legislation, which was the entire Master List, but I think you and others suggested that we break that down and go after a smaller number. This encompasses 49% of the Master List, and anyone 50 points or higher will get another letter asking if they're interested to sell.

The Department said that they would make it clear to the individuals that we were canvassing that
we might not have the money to buy, but I want to make sure that when we're moving forward with our AAA program that we have the best properties in our pots of properties that move forward. And, clearly, anything on the Master List with 50 points and above falls into that category and should be -- if there is an interested buyer -- and, again, these individuals had been -- most of these individuals had been canvassed as much as 10 years ago. Obviously, some of those properties have probably turned over and they need to be recanvassed. They might have different situations where they just need to be reminded that we have this program. We are -- they are on a list of priority properties for the County.

We want to know if they're interested so that we can know whether or not they're in the pool of properties that we should be buying, and that's all this is about.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So this is basically busy work for the Department to try to reach out to people over -- 50 and over. Now you said that they -- everyone already knew that the County was interested in buying their property. If they're on the Master List, then why would we have to recanvas them.

LEG. HAHN:
So, no. I said that they were canvassed when the Master Lists were created in 2003, 2004, 2005, or 2004, 2005, 2006. So it's been about a decade on average for the properties as to when the last time they were canvassed in bulk, and I just think it's time to re-ask, in case the properties have switched hands, to know who out there -- we keep talking about the Master List properties that could come forward, and it might -- I think it's just in our best interest as we move forward trying to buy the most environmentally sensitive properties to know which properties on the Master List that are the highest rated are interested right now. And, really, all this is going to cost us is a couple of hundred stamps and a little bit of staff time possibly to put the letters out and maybe draft the letters, so -- and I think the letter can be crafted in a way that doesn't mislead anyone into thinking that they'll all be bought.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Why didn't we -- you know, I think -- I make a motion to table, because I think we should see a copy of the letter first. And, also, if we're going to reach out to people 50 and over, why would we pick 50, and why wouldn't we also reach out to owners of farmland who might be interested in selling their development rights at the same time?

LEG. HAHN:
We could do that.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. We have a motion to table. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'll second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Seconded by Legislator Schneiderman. So we have a motion and a second to table, and we also have an approval. Anyone else on this? All right. Tabling motion goes first. Roll call vote.

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

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**
No to table.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
No.

**LEG. STERN:**
No.

**LEG. GREGORY:**
No.

**LEG. NOWICK:**
No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Yes.

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

**LEG. CILMI:**
No.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
Pass.

**LEG. CALARCO:**
No.

**LEG. ANKER:**
No.

**LEG. HAHN:**
No.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
No.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
No.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
No.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
No.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Three.  (Not Present: Legislator Barraga/Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. Motion to approve.

**LEG. HAHN:**
Motion.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
On the motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
I mean, not motion. Roll call to approve.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
On the motion, please.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Sure, on the motion.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
How many pieces meet that -- what is it, 50 points or above?

**LEG. HAHN:**
Okay. This is from memory. I think it's like in the neighborhood of 714.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
So we're going to send 714 letters to people that we might be interested, we might not?

**LEG. HAHN:**
Right, just asking what's -- you know, who's interested.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Shouldn't we -- since we know we can't come anywhere near buying 700 parcels, shouldn't we just kind of identify what the ones we really want are and send to them, rather than giving the people the false hope and creating -- you know, because somebody's got to put the letters out, somebody's got to read the letters and the responses. A lot of people, they have to respond back. It just seems to me that we could refine this even more and have our Planning Department say, "Look, these are the top 20 parcels, let's see if they're interested."

**LEG. HAHN:**
I think it's in our best interest to know who's interested in selling of our properties that we've identified as our priorities, regardless of whether -- I think that they are big enough boys and girls that they can craft a letter that, you know, doesn't mislead anyone into thinking we're going to buy it if they come back and say yes, and that it's in our best interest to know who out of our -- the list of priority properties, who is interested in selling to us. I just think that's in our best interest, regardless of how many we get back. And that's what the AAA process is for, is to cull among the properties that we have to buy and pick the ones that are the best.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay? Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. My question is to BRO. How much will there be that we can utilize for land acquisition purposes in 2014?

**MR. LIPP:**
I believe it's an additional -- the cash is an additional, I'm going to say, about six million dollars or so, off the top of my head, and that would be the 2013 actuals; that we don't spend 2014 money until the year after, so it would be 2013 money additional cash above and beyond what's already been allocated.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Well, what's already been allocated is -- so, if I was to ask you today, Robert, we just -- clock was going to end at the end of next year. We had to go out and had to spend every dollar that we have for land acquisition. How much would we have to go ahead and commit for -- from, here we are, December 17th to the next December 31st?

MR. LIPP:
I have to get back to you on that. There's a lot of stuff in the pipeline that -- the way Real Estate Division looks at the money is they consider it being sort of quasi-encumbered, even though we don't actually have -- we haven't gone to closing or anything. So there's a lot of money in the pipeline, that the way they like to do business is to not, you know, utilize the funds for anything other than what they think they may buy. But, you know, there's a range of probabilities and we won't buy it all.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Fair enough, that's a fair enough answer. So, through the Chair, then let me go back to the sponsor, to Legislator Hahn. We don't even have a solid answer as to the amount that we have to spend, let alone the query that we would make regarding prioritization. I understand what you're saying, and all things being equal, it seems like several of us are trying to come at how to best expend property, whether it's on the East End for farms, or whether it's you, from EPA, to say, "Let's get a general query," or for me to drag, you know, another wetland or marsh. But wouldn't it be important for us to get some kind of snapshot on what the amount is we have to spend before we generate some even marginal interest?

LEG. HAHN:
Through the Chair, am I allowed to answer?

P.O. HORSLEY:
Sure, you can answer that.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Sure.

LEG. HAHN:
So I'd argue, regardless of the money, whether we have a million dollars left or we have 10 million and found old money, which they've been talking about as well, or if we decide to find new money somewhere, we want to have a firm understanding of where we are with these Master Lists properties, who's interested. They're out there, they've been determined -- this Legislature has determined that they're priorities. They rank -- the ones that we're talking about rank extraordinarily high --

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes, they do.

LEG. HAHN:
-- in comparison to things that we've purchased in the past. And I don't think it hurts anyone, except for those with lower rankings, to know who -- to know who is interested. Now, I would -- I would venture a guess that we're not going to get hundreds back. But I think it's in our best interest to know if there are one or two out there, or a handful out there that rank high that are in
everyone's districts, because, from what they've said, these Master List properties are all over the County, they're in every district. And it would just -- it would be to blanket the highly ranked ones with just an "Are you interested in selling?" We're not necessarily going to buy, but we want to know for the purposes of, as we move forward with whether -- again, whether we have a small amount of money or not, it's in -- it's in our best interest to know where we stand with those properties.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Do you recall, Kara, did we apply the same ranking process? You know, the Master Lists, I remember when they came out, the former County Executive's Administration was very prolific. They were rolling in 60, 70, 80, maybe 100 properties in one fell swoop.

**LEG. HAHN:**
So I'm pretty sure that the rating system was established. And correct me if I'm wrong. I don't think Jill's here. I think the rating system was established in 2007, and the Master Lists were created before that.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Yeah, they predate it.

**LEG. HAHN:**
And that's kind of why, you know, having this rating number was important, just so that we're talking about today's rating system, today's numbers, you know, what's a high number for today. And, again, 50 is sort of, you know, an arbitrary number, but it's a number that I think we all can recognize is a high -- is a high number to reach. And we just should know if these folks are interested in selling to us.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
So let me --

**LEG. HAHN:**
And then it would be up to us to decide if we buy them.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Well, and --

**LEG. HAHN:**
That's still our prerogative.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
No. It's late in the afternoon, so let me cut the debate this way: Notwithstanding the query, do you see this process as impacting the ability for any other parcel that's in there? Let's say I'm sitting on a 35. I still have to make the case to everybody, but your process doesn't necessarily aid, nor impact, the ability to go ahead and move forward on any one particular property.

**LEG. HAHN:**
Correct. I don't say if these Master List properties come back as interested, we should automatically buy them. They still go through our AAA rating system, our --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Okay.

**LEG. HAHN:**
They'll go through Environment, Planning. We have to rate them, we have to decide, you know, this month we have two million dollars to spend. Are we going to spend it all on one property that's rated as 70, or are we going to invite it up amongst others? We -- it will be a policy decision that the committee and the Legislature make, and so this does nothing to block any other properties.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Fair enough. And then, lastly, I guess I would just ask either to yourself or to BRO, when would we expect that we would be getting some kind of guidance on what, in fact, we may have to commit for 2014?

MR. LIPP:
I'm not sure you're asking -- I think you're asking how much revenue we would have for land acquisitions in 2014?

LEG. KENNEDY:
How much money we have to spend, yes.

MR. LIPP:
Okay. So I'm going to take a very quick look at our review.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yeah. I'm not asking you to do it now, Robert. All I'm just saying --

MR. LIPP:
This is a 2014 --

LEG. KENNEDY:
-- can you give me a time when you think we might be able to know?

MR. LIPP:
We could give you an answer almost immediately, as soon as I look up the numbers, but, you know, when you're talking 2014 actual revenue --

LEG. KENNEDY:
Some time in January. I don't need it to know -- we're not buying property today, I don't think.

MR. LIPP:
Okay.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Don't push it, Rob.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. HAHN:
Well, that's just it, is the number changes every month.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. I've got Legislator Cilmi next in -- next on line. Legislator Nowick, you're on next.

LEG. CILMI:
Through the Chair to the sponsor, when we send these letters out, do they indicate any proposed purchase price?
LEG. HAHN:
No, absolutely not.

LEG. CILMI:
So how -- if I'm a property owner and you ask me, "Are you willing to sell your property," I mean, it sort of depends. If you want to give me 10 bucks for it, no. If you want to give me a couple of hundred million, sure. So how would I --

LEG. HAHN:
So, again, I'm not looking to --

LEG. CILMI:
Is it a real test of what their interest is, I guess is my question?

LEG. HAHN:
So, again, I'm not trying to micromanage the way the department does this, so I wasn't looking to write the letter, as per Krupski; that they are going to try to assess if there's an interest. If that property's for sale, chances are the owner will come back and say, "Yes, put in an offer," which then we will -- you know, if it goes through our process, we'll get an appraisal and we'll put in the market value and we'll make an offer.

LEG. CILMI:
And you said there are several hundred of these that rank above 50?

LEG. HAHN:
That's correct, parcels.

LEG. CILMI:
How many more are there that rank below 50?

LEG. HAHN:
Well, if 49% rank above 50, 51% rank below, so --

LEG. CILMI:
So roughly the same number?

LEG. HAHN:
That I can't -- yeah. I imagine if the 49% is number of parcels versus acreage, I'm not sure --

LEG. CILMI:
Right.

LEG. HAHN:
-- if she was talking acreage or number of parcels, but I would imagine it's roughly the same.

LEG. CILMI:
Right. So why would we not just send to all of them? I mean, it's a couple of hundred more letters.

LEG. HAHN:
Yeah. My original bill was for everyone, but --

LEG. CILMI:
Was it?

LEG. HAHN:
Yeah.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'm thinking the opposite, I'm thinking 70.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Are you done?

LEG. CILMI:
Yeah. I think that's all the questions I had. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes, it is. Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:
Yeah. I'm sitting here thinking about this, and I think in the best of all worlds, of course it's a great idea. But, given the fact that we're always shorthanded with people working in the County, wouldn't it be just as -- just as efficient for each Legislator to take a look at the Master List, see what's in their district, and see what maybe is a real possibility, so everybody gets a -- you know, it would be an easier way. There wouldn't be any postage involved. We could all look at the Master List and see if there's anything that we're interested in.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. All right. And Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I mean, it may not be that hard. Kara, maybe you reached out to the Planning Department and maybe they had no objection with doing this. It just seems with six million dollars, maybe that's 10 parcels we can buy. We're sending out 700 letters. I would have felt more comfortable if we would have even created a higher threshold so that we're only send out 100 letters. I don't have a strong objection to it, I'm just concerned that the Planning Department, this is busy work for them, and, you know, they have a lot of things to do, and we've given them a lot of work to do. And I like Legislator Nowick's suggestion, is maybe we, as Legislators, could also look and give some direction as to what we think is important, knowing our Districts, but I'll leave it at that.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. All right. So I think we're about ready to vote on this. If all Legislators would please come back to the horseshoe. I think this $300 issue is --

LEG. CILMI:
Mr. Presiding Officer, has the County Executive's Office weighed in on this?

P.O. HORSLEY:
I have no idea. Well, we can find out. Mr. Vaughn, do you want to weigh in on this $300 issue?

MR. VAUGHN:
We appreciate the fact that Legislator Hahn has worked with the Planning Department to craft a more manageable version of this bill. We support the bill as it stands.
There you go. A definitive "Yes, we do." All right. We're -- everyone ready? We have -- I think we lost the tabling motion, right?

**MR. LAUBE:**
Tabling motion failed.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Failed, right. Okay. So we have a motion to approve. Well, let's do a roll call vote. It sounds like there's a lot of questions on the table.

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

**LEG. HAHN:**
Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**
Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**
Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**
Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**
No.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**
Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Yes.
LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
No.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:  
Fifteen. (Vacant Seat: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:  
All right, we're through it.

LEG. MONTANO:  
Mr. Horsley, if I may.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
You may.

LEG. MONTANO:  
All right. I wasn't able to be here this morning. Apparently, you took 2104 out of order and it was approved. I'd like to make a request to reconsider so I can have an opportunity to vote on this. It's the DOJ.

LEG. CALARCO:  
I'll second that. I'll make the motion.

LEG. HAHN:  
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Page 9.

LEG. CILMI:  
Are you going to debate it?

LEG. MONTANO:  
No.

(Laughter)

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Motion to reconsider?

LEG. MONTANO:  
I used to do these. I'm not going to debate it.

LEG. CALARCO:  
I'll make the motion to reconsider.

LEG. HAHN:  

And I'll second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Is that the motion?

**LEG. HAHN:**
And I'll second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
And you'll second it. Legislator Hahn, okay, has made the second on the motion to reconsider 2104, which is page --

**LEG. CILMI:**
Who made the first.

**LEG. CALARCO:**
I made the motion.

**MR. NOLAN:**
Calarco.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Calarco.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
Did you make the motion to approve?

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. All right. We got the motion to reconsider. All those in favor?

**LEG. CILMI:**
Who was the motion? I'm sorry.

**MR. NOLAN:**
Calarco.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. We're going to reconsider 2104.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
Who made the motion originally?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
I have no idea.
MR. LAUBE:
The original?

P.O. HORSLEY:
The original one, do you know?

LEG. MONTANO:
Well, if it doesn't matter, I'll make it, I mean, but it really -- should it be the original person? Doesn't have to be.

P.O. HORSLEY:
It was about six hours ago.

LEG. BARRAGA:
I seconded the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Barraga confesses to seconding the motion.

MR. LAUBE:
Legislator Horsley.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
You were the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Oh, I was the motion.

MR. LAUBE:
And Legislator Barraga was the second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
As it should have been. All right. So what do we want me to do? You want me to --

MR. NOLAN:
Make the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Make the motion?

LEG. MONTANO:
Do whatever you want, I just want to vote on it.

P.O. HORSLEY:
I'll make the motion. You're going to like it. Motion to approve.

MR. NOLAN:
Second by Barraga.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Barraga.  Okay.  This is on (2104) Authorizing the execution of an Agreement with the United States concerning an investigation of the Suffolk County Police Department (County Executive).  Oh, yeah, right, of course, that one.  Okay.  I guess we had unanimity, whatever, unanimous vote on it.  So all those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen.  (Vacancy:  District 8)

LEG. MONTANO:
Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
You're welcome.  We're here to please.  2070, right?

MR. NOLAN:
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right.  2070 - Authorizing appraisal of land under the Old Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, [C12-5(E)(1)(a)], as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007, the Ethel and Alexander Nicholson Foundation, a Charitable Trust - Town of Babylon (SCTM Nos. 0100-211.00-02.00-010.002, 0100-211.00-02.00-020.000, 0100-211.00-02.00-024.000, 0100-211.00-02.00-025.000, 0100-211.00-02.00-031.000 and 0100-211.00-02.00-032.000)(P.O. Horsley).  I'll make motion to approve.

LEG. HAHN:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Seconded by Legislator Hahn.  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen.  (Vacant Seat:  District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right.  I don't think we did 2090.

MR. NOLAN:
It's a CN.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
We did not.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Oh, we're going to do this, right.  This is the one that was a CN.  Let's do the CN.  You go to your manila folder.  (2090)Resolution amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program appropriating funds for the study and monitoring of Public Health Related Harmful Algal Blooms(CP 8224).  This is the one that was amended.  Legislator Krupski, you're the one that wanted this originally, right?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So moved.

LEG. HAHN:
And I'm a second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
And seconded by Legislator Hahn. We have a motion and second on the CN. Anyone on the motion? We're all good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Seventeen. (Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. We have a corresponding bond issue for that - Authorizing the issuance of $25,000 bonds to finance the cost of the marine monitoring equipment relating to the Public Health Related Harmful Algal Blooms. Same motion, same second. Roll call vote.

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

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**
Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**
Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**
Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**
Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**
Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**
Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Seventeen. (Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
All right. We're moving down to *2093 - Appropriating funds in connection with the Peconic Bay Estuary Program (CP 8235)(County Executive).*

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
I'm sorry. Who said that?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
(Raised hand).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Legislator D’Amaro said that. Mr. Krupski, do you want to second the motion?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Gladly.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
We care. That's our message today.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
I hear you loud and clear.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
There you go. Okay. We have a motion and second to appropriate funds for the Peconic Bay Estuary. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Seventeen. (Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
All right. Same motion, same second on the corresponding bond resolution. Roll call vote.

*(Roll Called by Mr. Laube, Clerk of the Legislature)*
LEG. D'AMARO:  
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:  
Yes.

LEG. STERN:  
Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:  
Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:  
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:  
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:  
Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:  
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:  
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:  
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:  
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:  
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:  
Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:  
Seventeen. (Vacant Seat: District 8).
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, PERSONNEL, HOUSING & CONSUMER PROTECTION

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. Thank you. All right moving over to Page 8, Government Operations, Personnel, Housing and Consumer Protection.

2089 - Authorizing the disbursement of funds from the Suffolk County Living Wage Contingency Fund for Lazy Cow, Inc., dba Kiddie Care Early Learning Center, The Community Programs Center of Long Island, Inc. - Ronkonkoma, Colonial Youth and Family Services, Inc. and Brightwaters Child Care and Development Center, Inc., dba Kiddie Academy of Brightwaters Day Care Providers under contract with the Department of Social Services (County Executive).

LEG. CALARCO:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Calarco makes the motion, seconded by Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacant Seat: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. 2092 - Authorizing funding of infrastructure improvements and oversight of real property under the Suffolk County Affordable Housing Opportunities Program, Woolworth Building in Riverhead (County Executive).

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So moved.

P.O. HORSLEY:
So moved by Legislator Krupski.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacant Seat: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
It's approved. All right. 2101 - Amending the hourly rate for temporary positions in the Suffolk County Classification and Salary Plan (County Executive). Who's this one?

MR. NOLAN:
County Executive.

LEG. CALARCO:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
County Executive? I'll make the motion to approve.

LEG. CALARCO:
I'll make --

P.O. HORSLEY:
You know what it is? You wanted to make a motion?

LEG. CALARCO:
I'll make the second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. You make the motion, I'll second the motion. How's that? We're good. Did you get that?

LEG. D'AMARO:
On the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. On the motion, Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:
I just wanted an explanation of, you know, what this bill is doing. Something about raising wages?

LEG. CALARCO:
What this is doing is because New York State has increased the minimum wage starting at the beginning of the year, we have a couple of -- well, actually, a number of part-time positions that are not in compliance, and this is raising the wage so that we're in compliance with State Law.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Oh. So we would be required to comply and raise?

LEG. CALARCO:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Very good. Okay. We're ready? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been approved.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacant Seat: District 8).

HEALTH

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. 2102 we did. We're moving on to Health: 1679 - To appoint member to the Teen Pregnancy Advisory Board, Lawrence Philips (Spencer). Dr. Spencer?

LEG. SPENCER:
Motion to approve.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Makes the motion.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Seconded by Legislator Montano. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Hahn/Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
2105 - Declaring January 26th as "Langerhans Cell Hist" -- all right. Say it.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Histiocytosis.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
"Histiocytosis Awareness Day" in Suffolk County (Cilmi).

**LEG. CILMI:**
Motion.

**LEG. SPENCER:**
Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Thank you, Mr. Cilmi, for that. And seconded by Doc Spencer. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Hahn/Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Histiocytosis, yeah, I could say that. I could say that, Histiocytosis.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Once you say it once.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Yeah, you got it. All right. Luckily we have a whole month for it. We'll be saying it every day.

**PARKS & RECREATION**

2094 - Appropriating funds in connection with restoration of West Neck Farm, aka Coindre Hall, Huntington (CP 7096)(County Executive).

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Who said that? I'm sorry.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
(Raised hand).

**MR. NOLAN:**
D’Amaro.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Legislator D’Amaro makes the motion, second by Legislator Spencer. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Hahn/Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Thank you. Same motion, same second on the corresponding bond issue. Roll call vote.

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

**LEG. D’AMARO:**
Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**
Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**
Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**
Yes.

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

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**
Yes.

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

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislator Hahn and Nowick/Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
All right. **2095 - Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with construction of maintenance and operations facilities – Charles R. Dominy County Park, West Sayville Country Club, West Sayville, Town of Islip (CP 7173)(County Executive).**
Whose is that? Is it yours Tom? Legislator Barraga.

**LEG. CILMI:**
No. I'll second it.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. Legislator Barraga makes the motion, seconded by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

Same motion, same second on the corresponding --

**MR. LAUBE:**
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislators Hahn and Nowick/Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
-- corresponding bond issue resolution. Roll call vote.

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

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**
Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**
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**LEG. GREGORY:**
Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**
Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
Yes.

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**
Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**
Yes.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Seventeen. (Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
All right, very good. **2096 - Appropriating funds in connection with improvements to water supply systems in County Parks (CP 7184)(County Executive).**

**LEG. NOWICK:**
Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Legislator Nowick?

**LEG. NOWICK:**
Motion.
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P.O. HORSLEY:
Makes the motion.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacant Seat: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Same motion, same second on the corresponding bond resolution.  Roll call vote.

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

LEG. NOWICK:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Yes.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Seventeen. (Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Very good. Okay. **2097 - Appropriating funds in connection with the construction for beach replenishment at Meschutt County Park (CP7163)(County Executive).**

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, second by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Seventeen. (Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Thank you. Same motion, same second on the corresponding bond resolution. Roll call vote.

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

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Yes.

**LEG. SPENCER:**
Yes.

**LEG. D’AMARO:**
Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**
Yes.

**LEG. GREGORY:**
Yes.
LEG. NOWICK:  
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:  
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:  
Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:  
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:  
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:  
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:  
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:  
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:  
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:  
Seventeen.  (Vacant Seat:  District 8)

**PUBLIC SAFETY**

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Very good.  Okay.  Moving over to Page 9, Public Safety:

2076 - *Authorizing the transfer of funds from the Sheriff's Office Prisoners' Commissary Account to the General Fund (County Executive).*  
Anybody on that?  Motion by Legislator Gregory, second by Legislator D'Amaro.  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

MR. LAUBE:  
Seventeen.  (Vacant Seat:  District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Very good.  We've done 2104.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Mr. Chair, before you leave under Public Safety, I'm going to ask an accommodation on behalf of my colleagues. I was out of the room when we had the opportunity to vote on the Detectives' contract.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Sure. I got it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
I was consumed all morning with that waste treatment thing. So I'm going to ask if one of the --

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
You want to make a motion to --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Well, I can't make a motion because I wasn't in the room.

**LEG. CILMI:**
I make a motion to reconsider.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Legislator Cilmi makes a motion to reconsider, seconded by Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. Okay. That's 2104, right? 2104 is now under reconsideration.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
No, 2102.

**MR. NOLAN:**
No, no.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
It's 2102.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
We already did that one twice.

**MR. NOLAN:**
It's in Government Ops.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Oh, I'm sorry.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
2102.

**MR. LAUBÉ:**
Seventeen. (Vacant Seat: District 8)

**LEG. GREGORY:**
You're confusing everything.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Leave it to me. You know, up to my eyeballs in waste treatment.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
2102, okay. All right. 2102 *(Authorizing the County Executive to execute an agreement with the Suffolk County Detectives Association covering the terms and conditions of employment for the period January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2018.)*, we have a motion and a second on it to reconsider. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Who was the motion and second on that?

**LEG. CILMI:**
Reconsider, I made the motion.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Not the reconsider. I called the vote.

**LEG. CILMI:**
I made the motion.

**MR. LAUBE:**
I have that.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. So we got the reconsider? We got that? We're all set?

**MR. LAUBE:**
I just need to take the vote.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
All those in favor?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
You need a motion, right?

**MR. LAUBE:**
I didn't get the motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
We're just reconsidering.

**LEG. CILMI:**
This is the reconsider motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Just to reconsider still.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Seventeen. (Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Very good. Okay. Same motion, same second on the motion to approve, right, correct. Okay. All those in -- excuse me?
LEG. CILMI:
Never mind.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen.  (Vacant Seat:  District 8).

LEG. KENNEDY:
Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
You're welcome.  All right.  Public Works we --

MR. NOLAN:
We did.

P.O. HORSLEY:
We're all good.  That's the Gil motions that we did all day.

WAYS AND MEANS

To Ways and Means.  Is he still here?  No, he finally left.

LEG. CALARCO:
He's plowing.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay.  Ways and Means:  2060, we have a Local Law, amending Local Law No. 38-2013 to clarify the fee structure for the Traffic and Parking Violations Agency (Calarco).  Legislator Calarco?

LEG. CALARCO:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Makes the motion to approve.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator D’Amaro.  On the motion, everybody good?  Okay.  All those in favor?  Opposed?

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen.  (Vacant Seat:  District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right.  We're going to the manila folder, and let's see what we got left.  2107 we apparently haven't done - Amending Resolution No. 1172-2013, implementing budget, staff and taxes for the Fiscal Year 2014, Discretionary.  It's my understanding there were some errors that were at the Town level and not with the County.  So we are -- I'll make the motion to approve.  Is
there a second on the motion?

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
I'm sorry, who said -- Legislator Muratore seconds the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Seventeen. (Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

**MR. LAUBE:**
Seventeen. (Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
2109-2013 - *Authorizing amended Tax Warrant for Resolution No. 1174-2013 for the Town of Southold and Brookhaven to be signed by the Presiding Officer and the Clerk of the County Legislature.*

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Same, motion same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Seventeen. (Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
All right. Okay. We got one CN, Counsel informs me, left. Which one is it? All right. We got -- we have one more in the CN package, the read folder, of course, it is 2111. Everyone find it? It's *accepting and appropriating a grant in the amount of $960 -- we're ending with a big note -- from the New York State Governor's Traffic Safety Committee grant, GTSC Fiscal -- you know, whatever -- 2013, Buckle-Up New York Program with 100% support for Park Police Traffic Safety Initiative.* Who makes the motion? Legislator Krupski makes the motion, second by Legislator Muratore. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Seventeen. (Vacant Seat: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Is that it? Is that everything we got? Anything else I'm missing? We're good. Okay. Christmas break.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Merry Christmas, Mr. Presiding Officer.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Thank you very much. Everybody, we're adjourned. And Merry Christmas.

**LEG. NOWICK:**
Point of personal privilege.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Yes. Before we -- before we adjourn.

**LEG. NOWICK:**
I just want to thank everybody for everything they've done and working with you all. You are the greatest bunch of Legislators, Administration, Attorneys. I will miss you terribly. And if I could come back, I will.

(*Laughter*)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Well, there you go. Now that's a declaration of candidacy or --

**LEG. CALARCO:**
Two years.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Hang on one second. I'm being whispered to. Are we good? All right. Ditto on Lynne's remarks. Merry Christmas.

**LEG. NOWICK:**
Merry Christmas, everybody.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Excepting the come-back part.

(*Laughter*)

*(THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 4:55 P.M.)*